

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Peter Dent Boyse for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Education presented on July 29, 1987.

Title: An Analysis of Trustee Role Perceptions in the State Controlled Washington Community College System and the Locally Controlled Oregon Community College System and the Relationship Between Trustee Personnel Characteristics and These Role Perceptions

Abstract approved:

Redacted for Privacy

~~_____~~
Charles E. Carpenter

This study examined the role perceptions of trustees in the locally controlled Oregon community college system and the state controlled Washington community college system. Authorities in the literature were consulted to define the "ideal trustee role" and the study determined which governance system was most effective in fostering this "ideal trustee role" as measured by trustee role perceptions.

The relationship between the personal characteristics of trustees and trustee role perceptions were also studied. This part of the study showed which trustees in each system perceived their role as being closest to the "ideal trustee role."

A questionnaire was developed and disseminated to all

105 Oregon and all 115 Washington community college trustees. This questionnaire was a series of thirty-six trustee responsibility statements that related to the "ideal trustee role." Trustees were asked to respond to these statements on a Likert scale. Personal demographics were also gathered on all respondents.

The components of the "ideal trustee role" were defined as:

(1) Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes.

(2) Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer.

(3) Interpret community interests to the college and college interests to the community.

(4) Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities.

Washington trustees perceived themselves closer to components 1, 2 and 3 of the "ideal trustee role" than Oregon trustees and Oregon trustees perceived themselves closer to role component 4. However, the similarities in the role perception responses of the two populations were more noticeable than the differences.

In general, trustees who fell into the following demographic categories perceived themselves closer to the "ideal trustee role" than trustees who fell into other demographic categories. These groups included trustees who were female, trustees that held, at least, a

bachelor's degree, trustees with annual incomes above \$50,000, trustees who were members of a community service organization, trustees with more than four years service on the board, trustees that held managerial/professional jobs, and trustees who were Democratic or Independent politically.

AN ANALYSIS OF TRUSTEE ROLE PERCEPTIONS IN THE STATE
CONTROLLED WASHINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM AND
THE LOCALLY CONTROLLED OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SYSTEM AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRUSTEE PERSONAL
CHARACTERISTICS AND THESE ROLE PERCEPTIONS

by

Peter Dent Boyse

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Completed July 29, 1987

Commencement June 1988

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Education in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Head of Department of Post Secondary Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of the School of Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented July 29, 1987

Typed by Pete Boyse for Peter D. Boyse

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my father, John Wesley Boyse, Sr., and mother, Ellen Elizabeth Boyse. Education has always been an extremely high priority for both of them and consequently for everyone in our family. Having grown up during the Great Depression, neither had the means to complete their own college education. However, their dedication to learning provided them both with a better education than most college graduates. They also worked very hard to assure that my brother, sister and I had the resources to continue our education beyond the high school level and provided us all with the motivaton and encouragement to be successful students and people.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No one completes a document of this size without the assistance, support and encouragement of many people. The process of disseration writing is a lonely and difficult one but having people to rely on and encourage me made the process much easier.

I give special recognition to my doctoral committee who provided guidance, expertise, and encouragement throughout the process. Charles Carpenter, my major professor, was always there to answer questions or, more often, to get me to answer my own and, more importantly, to assure me that there was an end to the dissertation process. I am also grateful to the other members of my doctoral committee; Forrest Gathercoal, J. Roger Penn, John Ringle, and John Keltner; who provided critical comments and support.

This study could not have been completed without the cooperation of all the community college presidents in both Oregon and Washington. A special thank you also to the 180 Oregon and Washington community college trustees who completed the questionnaire and returned it to me.

I wish to thank Roger Bassett, Oregon Community College Association, and Robert Wark, Washington Community College System, who provided me with advice, mailing lists, and information that made the research possible.

Helen Berg and Pam Bodenroder from the Oregon State Survey Research Center and Suzie Maresh from the OSU Computer Center provided assistance with questionnaire and statistical design. Their help was very much appreciated.

John Keyser, Joe Malik, Mike Holland, Herb Hammond, Larry Coady, and Wayne Chambers helped with the questionnaire design by serving as advisors and pre-testers. I am very grateful for their assistance.

An individual who needs to be recognized for his special brand of encouragement and the latitude he allowed me to complete this program is Tom Gonzales. Tom is my friend, colleague, mentor, and supervisor and was always there pushing me to "Go for it!" I also want to thank all of the other friends and colleagues at Linn-Benton Community College who provided support and encouragement during the process.

Finally, ultimate appreciation goes to my wife, Barbra, and my two daughters, Heather and Cassandra, for enduring through it all. Without their love, affection, understanding, and sacrifices this study could never have been completed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Background	1
	Statement of Problem	8
	Purpose of the Study	9
	Research Questions	11
	Definitions	13
	Assumptions	14
	Limitations	15
II	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	17
	Introduction	17
	Community College Mission	17
	State vs. Local Control	20
	Oregon and Washington Community College Legislation	25
	Trustee Role	38
	Trustee Characteristics	46
III	METHODOLOGY	49
	Population	49
	Development of the Instrument	54
	Data Collection	58
	Data Analysis	60
IV	RESULTS	66
	Response Rate	66
	Role Perception Response	69
	Trustee Demographics	82
	Relationship Between Demographics and Role Perception	87
	Effect of Nonrespondents on Study Results	99
	Summary	108
V	SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	111
	Summary	111
	Findings	113
	Conclusions	131
	Recommendations for Further Study	138
	Administrative Recommendations	140
	Observations	140
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	144
	APPENDICES	159
	A. Community College Trustee Questionnaire	159
	B. Letter to Panel of Experts That Reviewed the Trustee Questionnaire	164

APPENDICES (Continued)

C. Letter to Questionnaire Pretesters	167
D. Summary of Study for Presentation to Community College Presidents	169
E. Survey Cover Letter to Community College Presidents from Dr. Tom Gonzales	171
F. Survey Cover Letter to Community College Presidents	173
G. Survey Cover Letter to Trustees	175
H. Followup Postcard to Trustees and Accompanying Note to Community College Presidents	177
I. Letter Sent to Nonresponding Trustees	179

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1. Response Rates From Individual Community Colleges	68
2. Mean Value Placed On Each Role Component Of The "Ideal Trustee Role" By Trustees In Oregon And Washington	71
3. Mean Level At Which Trustees Felt They Were Involved With Each Responsibility From 1 (Not Involved) to 4 (Very Involved)	73
4. Mean Level Of Agreement With Trustee Responsibility Statements From 1 (Strongly Disagree) To 4 (Strongly Agree)	75
5. Mean Level Of Importance Trustees Placed On Listed Responsibilities From 1 (Not Important) To 4 (Very Important)	77
6. Oregon And Washington Trustee Responses To Most Important Trustee Responsibility	79
7. Oregon And Washington Trustee Responses To Second Most Important Trustee Responsibility	80
8. Oregon and Washington Trustee Responses To Least Important Trustee Responsibility	81
9. Number Of Years Washington And Oregon Trustees Served On Their Community College Board	84
10. Number Of Oregon And Washington Trustees Who Were Members Of A Community Service Organization	84
11. Oregon And Washington Trustee Political Affiliation	84
12. Oregon And Washington Trustee Occupations	86
13. Oregon And Washington Trustee Age Group	86
14. Level Of Education Completed By Oregon And Washington Trustees	88
15. Washington And Oregon Trustee Ethnic Origin	88

16.	Oregon And Washington Trustee Gender	89
17.	Washington And Oregon Trustee Individual Income Before Taxes	89
18.	Relationship Between Length Of Oregon And Washington Trustee Board Service And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"	91
19.	Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Membership In A Community Service Organization And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"	91
20.	Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Political Affiliation And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"	93
21.	Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Occupation And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"	93
22.	Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Age Group And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"	94
23.	Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Level Of Education And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"	95
24.	Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Ethnic Origin And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"	97
25.	Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Gender And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"	97
26.	Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Individual Income And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"	98
27.	Community College Ratings For Role Component One ("Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes.")	101

28.	Community College Ratings For Role Component Two ("Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer.")	103
29.	Community College Ratings For Role Component Three ("Interpret community interests and needs to the college and college interests and needs to the community.")	104
30.	Community College Ratings For Role Component Four ("Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities.")	106
31.	Comparison Between The Mean Value Placed On Each Role Component Of The "Ideal Trustee Role" By Trustees In Oregon And Washington When Responses From Each Community College In Each State Are Weighted (Wghtd) Evenly And The Unweighted (Unwghtd) Means In Table 2 (Page 71)	107

AN ANALYSIS OF TRUSTEE ROLE PERCEPTIONS IN THE STATE
CONTROLLED WASHINGTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM AND
THE LOCALLY CONTROLLED OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
SYSTEM AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRUSTEE PERSONNEL
CHARACTERISTICS AND THESE ROLE PERCEPTIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

Background

Public community colleges in America have borrowed heavily from the public high-schools, private junior colleges, and four-year colleges and universities. However, the community colleges have maintained an identity of their own while possessing characteristics found in all of the above institutions (Vaughan, 1985).

Many authorities believe that the origins of the community college came from the Morrill Act of 1862. The Morrill Act provided higher educational opportunities to greater numbers of individuals and the land-grant colleges, created as a result of this act, were often referred to as the "people's college." Today's community college supporters still believe strongly in the concept of higher education accessibility for everyone.

The first junior colleges were organized early in the twentieth century. These early colleges provided the first two years of a four year college degree as the name "junior college" implies. Other technical institutes and colleges were also initiated during this time period.

They provided two-year terminal degrees in various technical occupations.

The 1947 President's Commission on Higher Education for American Democracy stated that if the country were to fulfill its role as the world's leading advocate for democracy, the nation must provide increased educational opportunity at the post-secondary level. This statement, combined with the large influx of servicemen to the nation's colleges and universities under the post World War II GI Bill, resulted in the initial growth of the community college system and emphasized the point of view that community colleges should provide post-secondary education for all people.

Community colleges grew rapidly both in numbers and size from the post World War II years through the mid-1970's. During this time period, the term "comprehensive community college" was used to define a community college that offered academic transfer programs, occupational-technical programs, developmental education and adult community education programs.

During the last ten years, student enrollments have leveled-off or declined and operating revenues have been restricted causing community colleges to reassess their missions. However, they have consistently acknowledged that providing for the adult education needs of the

community is an important aspect of their mission statements. Vaughan believes that while the emphasis of community colleges has shifted since their beginnings, "the major tenets of their mission have remained intact as community colleges have continued to emphasize the teaching function, accessibility, low cost and comprehensive offerings"(Vaughan, 1985:20). "Nearly everyone who has written about community colleges alludes to this unique American institution as a democratizing force in higher education" (Roueche and Baker, 1987:3). Cohen and Brawer (1982) have stated that they (community colleges) maintain open channels for individuals, enhancing the social mobility that has so characterized America.

Fields (1962) stated that providing education for adults is of major concern to those engaged in higher education. Many adults are not able to leave their communities for extended periods so learning opportunities have been brought to them. Community-centered adult education in this country has become a reality in community after community. Although specific aspects of the individual missions of community colleges have changed over the years, providing for the educational needs of adults in their communities has always been a top priority.

Another distinguishing characteristic of the community college is its intimate relationship with the community it serves. Because the community college's primary role is to provide for local educational needs, it is imperative that close ties are maintained with the local community. However, during the past several decades, there has been a shift from local to state control of community colleges. Many critics have argued that this shift has eroded the close relationship community colleges have had with their communities. These same critics believe that state controlled community colleges cannot be as responsive to local needs as locally controlled community colleges.

These institutions have been built on the recognition of diversity as a positive value. The open-door policy, the recognition that each institution has a responsibility to serve its own community, the variety of structures in the fifty states, the differing emphases on curricula in each college, adaptations to local conditions - all these factors, as well as many others, do not lend themselves to bureaucratic decisions and centralized operation (Tillery and Wattenbarger, 1985:22).

On the other hand, some authorities feel that centralized control of community colleges is necessary to assure greater funding stability, more equitable funding between districts, and prevention of program duplication. They feel some kind of coordination by the state government is

desirable and institutional autonomy cannot be absolute (Millett, 1984).

In order to assure responsiveness to community educational needs, local boards of trustees are selected to maintain a direct connection to their community. Elected or appointed local boards of control are common in both state controlled and locally controlled community college systems. The historical purpose for lay governing boards has been to reflect the collective will and wisdom of the people. The board is a bridge between the college and the community, translating community needs for education into college policies and protecting the college from unreasonable external demands (Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

A review of the literature reveals that there are certain basic responsibilities that authorities agree are necessary to assure an effective board of trustees. These responsibilities continue to repeat themselves in the literature and, for purposes of this study, will be referred to as the "ideal trustee role." This "ideal role" of a community college board of trustees is to:

- 1) Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes.

2) Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer.

3) Interpret community interests to the college and college interests to the community.

4) Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities. (Ingram, 1979; Potter, 1979; Sutton, 1986; Martorana, 1963; Kauffman, 1980; Nason, 1980; Richardson, Bender and Blocker, 1972; Rauh, 1969; Zoglin, 1976). There are additional responsibilities cited by the above authors and others, but they are essentially an extension of those responsibilities listed above.

Competent trustees are essential to an effectively run community college. The governance of a community college is ultimately dependent on its board of trustees. If these trustees are not clear on their role and do not understand what is expected of them, their institution will suffer from this lack of knowledge. Authorities in the literature have clearly defined the ideal trustee role. An understanding of this role will help trustees govern community colleges more effectively.

Personal characteristics of trustees are another aspect of comparing state and locally controlled community college boards. A recent study by the Association of Governing Boards with support from the Carnegie

Corporation of New York states that diversity should characterize the composition of boards. A diverse board is composed of people of both sexes, has members from minority races and creeds, and people of different ages, occupations and backgrounds. Diversity adds to a boards' legitimacy and thus to its effectiveness (Kohn and Mortimer, 1983:35).

The personal characteristics of boards of trustees have not changed dramatically over the past several decades. These boards consist primarily of white upper middle class males between the ages of forty and sixty years of age. However, a study by Thompson in 1978 showed that there were larger percentages of women and minorities serving on community college boards of trustees than shown in previous studies.

Both the way trustees view their role and the personal characteristics of trustees can have an important impact on the effectiveness of individual boards of trustees. Most importantly, it is necessary that boards be comprised of trustees who fully understand and make every attempt to successfully carry out their responsibilities.

Statement of Problem

The problem was to determine whether locally controlled community colleges were more effective than state controlled community colleges in fullfilling the basic community college mission of being responsive to the adult educational needs of their constituents. Two year colleges, regardless of method of control, have established responsiveness to local needs as an important philosophical commitment. However, local priorities may appear quite different to the state capitol than they do to local boards of trustees. Since the inception of the community college movement, these institutions have slowly moved from a local control base to one of increasing state control. A 1983 study by the National Association of College and University Business Officers indicated that the national average of state contributions to community colleges has increased from 30% in 1958 to 55% in 1982. On the other hand, operating revenues from local sources decreased from 43% to less than 15% during the same time period. The remaining operating revenues are derived from tuition, federal contributions and other miscellaneous grants and investments. This shift in funding has resulted in a loss of control at the local level and an increase of control at the state level. Authorities continue to argue about the state versus local

control issue; however, little empirical or documented evidence exists on which system of control is most effective in fulfilling the basic mission of the community college.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine which community college governance system, state or locally controlled, was most effective in fostering the "ideal trustee role." Trustees play a key role in the governance of community colleges and are considered an important link to the local community.

Authorities in the literature were consulted to define the "ideal trustee role." Using this "ideal role" as described in the literature, trustees were surveyed to determine which system, if either, exhibited a climate in which the "ideal trustee role" was fostered. Trustee responses to what they perceived their role responsibilities to be were used to ascertain which group most nearly approximated the "ideal trustee role."

Trustees from the locally controlled Oregon community colleges and the state controlled Washington community colleges were used as the population for the study. The Oregon and Washington community college systems have some similarities in that they both have local boards of

trustees and a state board responsible for the coordination of community colleges. They both have a consistent governance system for all community colleges and not a mixture of state and local governance systems as exists in some states. However, this is where the similarity ends. The Washington community college system is one in which the primary control of community colleges originates at the state level with 91% of their budget allocated by the state, and state and local trustees appointed by the governor. On the other hand, Oregon legislative law grants considerably more autonomy to community colleges at the local level with the largest single portion of their funding coming from local property taxes and boards of trustees elected by voters of the local community college district.

This study also examined the personal characteristics of community college trustees to determine if there was a significant relationship between these characteristics and trustee attitudes toward their roles. Comparisons were also made to determine if differences existed between the personal characteristics of the locally elected trustees in Oregon and trustees appointed by the governor in Washington.

Research Questions

The following research questions provided the basis for the design and implementation of the study.

1. How does the literature define the "ideal trustee role?"

2. How do individual trustees from the state controlled Washington community college system perceive their role?

3. How do individual trustees from the locally controlled Oregon community college system perceive their role?

4. Do differences exist between the role perceptions of trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges and the locally controlled Oregon community colleges?

5. Considering the role perceptions of trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges and the locally controlled Oregon community colleges, which population most closely approximates the "ideal trustee role?"

6. What do trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges consider the most important trustee responsibilities?

7. What do trustees from the locally controlled

Oregon community colleges consider the most important trustee responsibilities?

8. What do trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges consider the least important trustee responsibilities?

9. What do trustees from the locally controlled Oregon community colleges consider the least important trustee responsibilities?

10. What are the personal characteristics of trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges?

11. What are the personal characteristics of trustees from the locally controlled Oregon community colleges?

12. Are there differences between the personal characteristics of trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges and the locally controlled Oregon community colleges?

13. What is the relationship between trustee personal characteristics and their perceptions related to the "ideal trustee role" in the state controlled Washington community college system?

14. What is the relationship between trustee personal characteristics and their perceptions related to

the "ideal trustee role" in the locally controlled Oregon community college system?

15. Are there differences in how personal characteristics relate to trustee role perceptions in the state controlled Washington community colleges and the locally controlled Oregon community colleges?

Definitions

The following definitions of terms were used for the purposes of this study:

A trustee is the appointed or elected official responsible for developing and establishing policy for effective management of a community college (also see "ideal trustee role" description on page 5).

A board of trustees is defined as the legally recognized governing body of an institution and is responsible for approving, initiating and often developing major objectives, programs, policies, capital expenditures, building plans, fund drives, and the institutions budget (Karol and Ginzburg, 1980).

College outcomes are defined as those items described in the community college missions, goals and objectives.

A public community college is any public institution accredited to award the associate of arts or science as its highest degree (Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

A state controlled community college is an institution that receives the largest portion of its funding from state revenues, has the majority of its policies and procedures set by the state legislature and/or a state-wide community college agency and has its local trustees appointed by the governor.

A locally controlled community college is an institution that receives the largest portion of its funding from local revenues, has the majority of its policies and procedures set by the local board of trustees and has its local trustees elected by the voters of the district it serves.

Governance is defined as "the means--both structural and procedural--by which all the interested individuals, groups, agencies, and governmental units participate in making policy for a community college" (Zoglin, 1976:6).

Roles are defined as an organized set of behaviors belonging to an identifiable office or position (Sarabin and Allen, 1968).

Responsibilities are defined as duties or obligations for which one is legally accountable.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were made concerning this study:

1. The "ideal trustee role" as defined by the literature and outlined in this study accurately describes the trustee who would be most effective in governing a community college.

2. The "ideal trustee role" as defined in the literature and outlined in this study describes trustees who would be most effective in maintaining communication links with their local community.

3. Trustees described by the "ideal trustee role" would be most effective in assisting their community college to provide for the adult education needs of its constituents.

Limitations

Since trustees were asked to describe their own perceptions, the same problems of self-reports that surface in psychological studies may surface here, that is, withholding perceptions or responding according to perceived expectancy. No control over the truthfulness of the responses was exercised by the researcher.

No attempt was made to collect the perceptions of any other people involved with the trustees (i.e. administrators, faculty, staff, students, legislators, or community groups).

This study did not infer a cause and effect relationship between trustee personal characteristics and

their perceptions related to the "ideal trustee role" but only a condition that existed in the Washington and Oregon community college systems during the time period of this study.

Their were thirteen community college districts and two community college service districts in the Oregon community college system at the time of this study. Community college service districts were established to provide community college education programs through the contracting of educational services from other accredited state educational institutions. An examination of the powers of community college boards as described in the Oregon Revised Statutes and the Oregon Administrative Rules show that the responsibilities of community college district and community college service district boards are equivalent as they relate to the components of the "ideal trustee role." Therefore, Oregon community college service district boards were considered the same as Oregon community college district boards for the purposes of this study.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In this review of related literature, the writer will examine the literature in five content areas. The first section provides a brief review of the community college mission. The second section examines the viewpoints of various authorities concerning state and local control of community colleges. The third section is a review of the Oregon and Washington legislation relevant to their community college systems. The fourth section surveys the views of authorities relating to the role of the community college trustee. The last section reviews the current literature relating to trustee characteristics.

Community College Mission

The missions of today's public community colleges include the transfer function geared to the academic interests of the students they enroll, occupational programs for those people seeking to upgrade job skills or enter the workforce, developmental programs for individuals wanting but not yet ready for post-secondary education, and continuing and community education programs for adults wanting to improve or acquire skills or pursue interests outside their vocation (Nespoli and Martorana,

1984). However, a general overriding theme to these mission statements is to provide for the adult education needs of the local community.

Serving local educational needs is a theme that community college advocates continue to emphasize. A California research firm, Berman and Weiler Associates of Berkley, asked more than three hundred people to respond to a questionnaire concerning community colleges. One of their first questions asked people to list the main strengths of the community, technical, and junior colleges. A key response to this question was, "Their institutional diversity, local community orientation, and responsiveness to local needs" (Fryer, 1986:19).

In the Community, Technical, and Junior College Fact Book published by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, the five elements of the community college philosophy are listed. The first of these elements is as follows:

1. Community colleges are community based. They are in partnership with the communities they serve. They are often locally controlled. They have become modern versions of the land-grant universities, providing accessible education opportunities for all citizens in service districts, as well as direct assistance to local employers and public agencies operating in the communities. The colleges also provide strong ties to high schools in the area (Savage and Mahoney, 1987).

Time and again authorities stress the importance of the local orientation of the community college mission. "What distinguishes the missions of community colleges are their community orientation or local character and their accessibility" (Farley, 1980:217). Their curricula is tailored to local employment needs and a range of services and programs designed for local residents.

Access to education and local orientation of curricular offerings are complementary concepts that have long characterized the community college movement. If access is important to the local community college, then its offerings of programs and services must satisfy local needs. In the Neglected Majority, Parnell stresses the concept of access.

They may look and act like other institutions of learning, but they have their own mission, built around the general theme of providing a host of Americans opportunity with excellence in pursuing a higher education (Parnell, 1985:87).

To assure access to local community colleges, trustees, administrators and faculty must provide curricula that are both meaningful and useful to local constituents. Without this assurance, local residents will have no more access to higher education than if the local community college were not there.

State vs. Local Control

There are many variations of community college governance systems between the states. Some state governments exercise a great deal of control at the state level and others have delegated almost total control to local boards of trustees. Other states have variations on community college governance that fall between these two extremes.

There are arguments for and against both systems of control. Some authorities believe the state controlled system is better because college officials do not have to expend the time and energy necessary to pass annual local tax levies. This allows these officials more time to devote to institutional problems and concerns and provides the college greater funding stability. Funding can also be more equitable between districts and duplication of costly programs is often prevented. Some state controlled systems have developed sophisticated management and student information networks, wherein all colleges provide data in a uniform fashion. This data may be cross tabulated for the benefit of planners at individual institutions (Cohen and Brawer, 1982).

On the other hand, local control advocates argue that community colleges which are subject to the control of local constituents are more responsive to community needs

and can be more innovative and creative because of less state bureaucracy.

There has been a definite shift from local to state funding in the United States during the past fifty years. In 1934, the local share of the funding for community colleges was 83.4% of the total, while states funded less than 2.5% (Taylor, 1985). Today, states provide 55% and local districts 15% of the total operating budget with tuition, federal and other miscellaneous revenue sources providing the remainder. With this shift in community college funding support, there has come a corresponding shift in the control of these institutions. One conclusion reached by Breneman and Nelson (1981) was that financing does control mission.

Although the trend toward state control goes on, very little evidence exists as to which system is more effective and the arguments on both sides of the issue continue. Controversy over the funding of community colleges has caused concern in many people.

State budget officials with authority to determine the volume and distribution of appropriations to community colleges may exercise power on the institutional budget process through the issuance of "budget guidelines" (technical instructions) that clearly specify the nature and scope of personnel decisions that can be made by the institution, allowable increases in costs to offset inflation, and enrollment levels that will be "supported" by the state. In effect, state budget officials have become a force for

governance because they exercise power, authority, and influence in the development of decisions that determine the shape of the institutional budget. At the same time, these officials may alter the structure and outcomes of the decision process by adjusting the format and content of the budget guidelines (Alfred and Smydra, 1985:201).

The above concern is voiced by many authorities who believe that local control is not only lost to legislators but also budget officials and other organizations that monitor state expenditures.

However, the provision of funds by the state has many positive aspects. "State coordination is also important in trying to equalize state support among districts if there is great variation in the wealth per student among the community college districts" (Wellman, 1978:39). Equitability between districts is not the only advantage of state support. The fact that funding is more stable and college officials do not have to expend energy in running annual tax levy campaigns are other good reasons for encouraging increased state funding for community colleges.

Local districts, while sacrificing total independence in making these accommodations, in effect, trade off degrees of local autonomy for stability and predictability from the forces about them (Mundt, 1978:59).

One of the complaints heard most often against state control is the lack of responsiveness to local needs when too much state bureaucracy is in place.

The move toward greater state-level power comes at the same time as a rising demand at the local level for the college to be more quickly responsive to community needs as well as to broaden opportunities for participation by faculty, students, and community representatives in goal setting and program development (Gleazer, 1972:128).

If the college cannot respond to a community need in a timely manner, the need may develop into a greater problem before the response is formulated.

The argument over the legitimacy of community education and/or adult-enrichment programs is another "thorn in the side" of the local control advocates. Many legislators view these programs as "soft" and are quick to eliminate them from the budget if resources are limited.

...when the colleges move beyond these three basic missions (transfer function, vocational-technical and developmental education) to the area of life-long learning and related community-based learning activities, then serious questions are raised about what kinds of institutions should be providing these services and who should pay for them (Nespoli and Martorana, 1983-84:5).

On the other hand, state coordination prevents the duplication of costly programs between adjacent districts and conserves resources that can be used for additional curriculum development. "...state coordination is necessary to eliminate unnecessary duplication among community colleges and between community colleges and other educational agencies" (Wellman, 1978:36). It also

stabilizes the educational system so that system wide problems and needs can be handled in an orderly manner.

The issue that may be voiced most often by both parties in this state vs. local control controversy is whether the efficiencies gained by increased state coordination are worth the problems created by having to deal with a growing state bureaucracy and regulation system. Local control advocates are adamant about the threat of too much state regulation.

One of the most serious problems facing many colleges today is the increasing prevasiveness of state regulation and control. The trend is toward more and more detailed regulation in many states (Grunewald, 1981:64).

The fear of loss of local autonomy has especially been strong among community college supporters. "Local control has been a hallmark of the community college, and an enduring source of strength in their conception and growth" (Campbell, 1978:48). Local control advocates feel that in order to continue to respond effectively to the needs of their constituents, they must keep the base of control at the local level.

State control supporters believe strongly that state level coordination is necessary for the efficient operation of a community college system. They also believe that in a state controlled system, community colleges still play an important part in the overall

decision making process. "The reality of control of the public two-year institutions is that control is a balance between decision making at the state level and decision making at the institutional level" (Moody, 1978:70). Those advocating state control feel that the efficiencies gained through state coordination more than balance any problems caused by an increased bureaucracy.

Oregon and Washington Community College Legislation

Because this study will deal specifically with the Oregon and Washington community college systems, a review of the legislative law and administrative rules governing these two systems is appropriate. These systems do have similarities in that they both have boards at the local level with a state board providing a coordinating function for their system. The primary difference is the amount of power delegated to each of these boards in the two states.

In Oregon, the local boards are primarily responsible for the governance of their local community college. These boards are elected by voters within the district and serve four-year terms. The State Board of Education coordinates the functions of both community colleges and the K-12 systems within Oregon. In Washington, the governor appoints local trustees as well as members of the State Board for Community College Education which was

established solely for the purpose of governing community colleges. The state board staff have a clearly defined controlling responsibility over the local community colleges. They also act as a liaison between the state and the community colleges. Oregon legislation combines community colleges with the public schools (K-12), while Washington legislation combines community colleges with the Washington system of higher education but provides a separate state board for higher education and community colleges.

Oregon

The Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) devote no sections of Chapter 341, "Community Colleges," to the State Board of Education. Chapter 326 of the ORS describes the State Board of Education, but the title of this chapter is "State Administration of Elementary and Secondary Education." In Oregon, community college governance appears to be a "stepchild" of the state board, which has as its primary function the governance of the public schools. The state board is appointed by the governor and confirmed by the senate as described in ORS 326.021.

Subsection (4) of ORS 341.009, "Policy," states, "The community college is a post-high school institution under the general supervision of the State Board of Education."

Subsection (11) of the same law continues with state board responsibilities:

The State Board of Education should be responsible for coordinating the community college program of the state and should have general supervisory responsibilities for this program. The State Board of Education should prepare estimates and make requests for legislative appropriations for a reasonable and consistent basis of support and establish standards for distribution of that support.

A key word in both subsections (4) and (11), when describing supervisory responsibilities, is "general." In Oregon, specific community college governance responsibilities of the state board are not outlined. It appears that the state board's governance authority over individual community colleges is limited. However, the second sentence of subsection (11) does give authority for the state funding of community colleges to the state board.

ORS 341.625, "Apportionment of State Aid," outlines the amount of state aid to be received by the community colleges. The responsibility for disbursement of these funds is given to the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the formula for distribution is clearly specified. Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) 581-43-265, "Community College Accounting," also outlines the method by which community colleges must classify their revenue and expenditures. Basically, it states that the state

board adopts the Community College Accounting Manual which is published by the Oregon Department of Education. This requirement for classification of revenue and expenditure is stated in ORS 294.356, "Preparation of Estimates by School and Community College District and by Municipal Corporations Operating a Public Utility or Hospital." So the state board is quite specific about how tax money is distributed and expended.

Subsection (12) of ORS 341.009 states that the initiative to establish a new community college should come from the local district, and the local district must be willing to assume responsibility for the institution and provide resources needed for an adequate educational program. OAR 581-43-200, "Feasibility Criterion for the Formation of a Community College District," outlines those specific criteria needed for the local district to qualify for a community college and states that the State Board of Education will make the determination if a college is warranted. ORS 341.025, "Petition for the Formation of a District," specifies how local constituents go about preparing for the formation of the district. However, the criteria and the process are both the responsibility of the state board. From subsection (12), it is clear that the initiative for the formation of the district and a

major portion of the funding must come from the local constituents.

Subsection (13) of ORS 341.009 is very significant in that it assigns the policy-making functions of the community college to the local board. However, the local board is required to cooperate with the state board in identifying the educational needs of the local district and in bringing together the resources necessary to meet these needs.

In summary, the state board has responsibility for determining criteria for the formation of a community college district, for appropriating state funds to community colleges, for coordinating the general educational programs of community colleges and for community college district boundaries.

ORS 341.290, "General Powers," describes the authority of the local Board of Education of a community college district. These powers are much more specific than those of the state board and give the local board significant control over the affairs of their community college. Following is a summary of selected subsections of ORS 341.290 to illustrate the control of the local board. The local board may (number preceding the statement refers to the subsection):

- (1) hire community college personnel, define

the terms of employment, and prescribe compensation.

(2) enact rules for the government of the community college.

(3) prescribe the educational program (OAR 581-42-015, "General Course and Curriculum Approval Procedures," states that the primary responsibility for obtaining and maintaining required course and curriculum approvals is with the local institution.)

(4) control access to district property.

(6) purchase real property.

(7) fix standards of admission and prescribe and collect tuition.

(15) apply for federal funds and accept and enter into contracts for the receipt of such funds.

(16) exercise any other power, duty or responsibility necessary to carry out the functions under this section or required by law.

The above is only a summary of selected subsections of ORS 341.290; however, the powers of the local Board of Education are very comprehensive, and it is apparent that the primary responsibility for the governance of an individual community college rests with its local board.

ORS 341.305, "Tax Levy," states that the local district shall prepare an annual estimate of funds necessary to carry out the purpose of the district and may levy a tax upon all assessable district property. So the local board has the authority to ask for approval of local property tax levies. ORS 341.675, "Authority to Incur

Bonded Indebtedness," gives the local board the power to sell bonds for college building construction and repair, and improvement of college property. This bond sale also needs approval of the district voters. ORS 341.703, "Custodian of Funds; Depositories; Signature on Checks; Warrants as Checks," outlines the powers of the local board related to the custody and expenditure of funds. Finally, ORS 341.709, "Annual Audit Required," requires that the local board contract with an independent auditor for an annual audit of all college funds. It is apparent from the above statutes that the local board exercises considerable control over community college revenue and expenditures.

The constituents of the local community college district are the people who ultimately control the college. They elect the board as outlined in ORS 341.125 and they also approve all community college property tax levies and bond sales. Although the State Board of Education does control the expenditure of state funds, the state of Oregon currently contributes approximately 32% of community college operating expenses while the local property taxes provide an average of about 45%.

Washington

The primary chapter of the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) dealing with community colleges is 28B.50,

"Community Colleges." The RCW is much more explicit about the powers and duties of the state board than the ORS. Chapter 28B.50.050 of the RCW specifically creates a "state board for community college education." This board is composed of eight members appointed by the governor, with the consent of the state senate. So the first clear difference between the Oregon and Washington systems is the creation of a Washington state board solely for the governance of community colleges.

RCW 28B.50.060 describes the duties of the state community college system director. This position is appointed by the state community college board and serves at the pleasure of this board. The director serves as the executive officer and secretary of the state community college board and is the chief administrator for the Washington community college system. The director executes contracts for the community college board and is responsible for employing the necessary staff for the support of the state office for community colleges. This section represents another major difference between the Oregon and Washington systems. In Oregon, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, who has as his/her primary responsibility the direction of the public school system, appoints an Associate Superintendent to administer the offices connected to the community college system.

However, the Associate Superintendent's authority is limited and not mentioned in either the ORS or the OAR.

RCW 28B.50.085 describes the community college system treasurer who is appointed by the community college board. This person is the chief financial officer of the state system. The office makes vendor and salary payments for the entire community college system. Since Oregon has no such office, this is another difference between the two systems.

RCW 28B.50.090 is one of the most significant sections of the code, as it describes the powers and duties of the state community college board. Following is a general summary of selected subsections under powers and duties of the college board (number in parentheses is the number of the subsection):

- (1) review the budgets prepared by the community college boards of trustees (local boards) and prepare a single budget for the state system.
- (2) establish guidelines for the disbursement of funds and receive and disburse community college funds.
- (3) ensure that each community college district offers a comprehensive educational program and maintains an open-door policy.
- (4) prepare a comprehensive master plan for the development of community college education and training.
- (5) define the criteria for the establishment of new community colleges.

(6) establish procedures for modifying district boundary lines.

(7) establish minimum standards for instructional and administrative personnel credentials, interval accounting, curriculum content, admission policies and state funding eligibility.

(8) establish criteria for capital construction.

(9) encourage innovation in the development of new educational programs.

(10) exercise any other powers or duties necessary to govern the community college system.

This is most significant because there is nothing like it in the Oregon statutes or administrative rules. It clearly defines the authority of the community college board and gives the board very broad powers over all community colleges in the state of Washington.

In the RCW, the local boards are referred to as the community college board of trustees. These boards of trustees have five members and are also appointed by the governor as described in RCW 28B.50.100. The boards of trustees govern a particular geographical district and are responsible for all community colleges in that district. The board adopts the bylaws, rules, and regulations necessary for its own government.

RCW 28B.50.140 describes the powers and duties of the community college boards of trustees. Once again, a

summary of selected subsections is provided (number in parentheses is the number of the subsection):

(1) operate all community colleges and vocational/technical schools in the district.

(2) create comprehensive community college education programs and maintain an open-door policy. (This subsection defers to RCW 28B.50.090(3) which is the state community college board's regulation. So ultimate power rests with the state.)

(3) employ the college president.

(4) establish, under the approval of the state community college board, new facilities. (Defers to the state.)

(6) with the approval of the state community college board, borrow money, issue and sell revenue bonds for construction. (Defers to the state.)

(7) establish fees and charges for facilities-- not inconsistent with the rules and regulations of the state community college board. (Defers to the state.)

(11) with faculty assistance, prescribe the course of study in the various departments.

(12) grant diplomas to graduates.

(13) enforce the rules and regulations of the state board for community college education for the governance of the community. (State is the ultimate authority.)

(14) delegate powers and duties to the president.

(15) perform other activities consistent with this chapter (RCW 28B.50) but not in conflict with the state board for community college education.

(16) offer contracted educational services other than the regular tuition and fee basis.

(Tuition and fees for all community colleges are set by the state legislature; community college tuition and fees are outlined in RCW 28B.15.502. In Oregon, the local board sets tuition and fees.)

(19) perform any other duties imposed by regulations of the state board for community colleges. (Defers to the state.)

It is clear after reading through the previous section on the powers and duties of the local board of trustees that the ultimate authority for control of the community colleges rests with the state of Washington and not at the local level. Many of the subsections defer to the state board for community college education for the final decision.

RCW 28B.50.850 through 28B.50.869 establishes a faculty tenure system. This is significant because a complete set of guidelines on how faculty are to receive tenure and how and when they are to be dismissed has been developed by the state legislature. Oregon has no such provision in the ORS; instead those regulations are for local community college boards of trustees to decide.

The Washington Administrative Code (WAC) Title 131, "State Board for Community College Education," contains more detailed information about the state board and is more specific about its authority. Chapters within this title contain a general description of state board organization, the method citizens use to present

information to the board, student and employee relations, tuition and fee charges, rules for employee participation in political activities, etc. Where Oregon does not have a state board solely for the purpose of governing community colleges, Washington has a board with very specific authority as outlined in both their administrative code and legislative law.

Another major difference in the Oregon and Washington systems is found in titles 132A through 132Y of the WAC. Each one of these titles is a set of specific rules and regulations for each separate community college district within the state. Although the content of these titles varies somewhat from district to district, they all contain rules and regulations pertaining to the board of trustee meetings, reduction in force and tenure, admission and registration, traffic rules, student conduct, use of college facilities, library, and grievance procedures. These are all policy matters that are determined at the local board level in the state of Oregon. There are only references to this local board responsibility in both the ORS and the OAR.

It is clear from the legislative law and the administrative code that the state community college board in Washington is the primary governing body for community colleges. Local trustees clearly operate within the rules

and regulations prescribed by the State Board for Community College Education and the state legislature. Local boards are appointed by the governor and do not have taxing authority. The state provides approximately 91% of the operating revenues for community colleges. Although tuition is collected by individual community colleges, it is deposited in the state general fund and then reallocated to the community colleges by the state. Only the services and activities fee is collected and retained by the local community college.

The Oregon Revised Statutes and the Revised Code of Washington describe two very different community college systems, especially from a governance standpoint. In Oregon, power lies in the hands of the local boards, and in Washington, primary authority is at the state level. Most importantly, the majority of the Washington community college funding comes from the state, while in Oregon, primary funding comes from local property taxes.

Trustee Role

Although the origins of lay governing boards came from Europe, the usually passive role of these European governing boards was not followed in America except in a few institutions (Burns, 1966). Because of church sponsorship, clergymen dominated the governing boards of

many of the early colleges. However, close legal ties to the sponsoring denominations led to later conflict over their academic independence. When state universities began to receive charters in the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth century, they followed the example of existing colleges and provided for lay governing boards (Zwingle, 1980).

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, boards changed under the influence of a growing and dynamic American society. Clergy, who had dominated governing boards for more than two centuries, began to be replaced by businessmen and alumni whose connections meant prestige, philanthropy and popular support for the colleges (Taylor, 1986:3). With the rise of faculty power in the early part of this century, trustee influence over colleges has diminished. Today, trustees exercise formal authority over colleges through a president who serves as the chief executive officer. However, the trustees of a community college are still accountable for all aspects of the college's operations (Gleazer, 1985:41) and this includes the hiring and firing of the college president. In Oregon, the local board of trustees has total authority for the operation of the community college while in Washington, the local board has authority over the majority of the college operations; however, it defers to

the state board in matters of finance, budget and facilities.

Authorities on trustee roles list a wide variety of board responsibilities but there are certain of these responsibilities that continue to repeat themselves throughout the literature. These responsibilities were defined as the "ideal trustee role" in chapter one and will be repeated here to add clarity to the literature review in this area. The "ideal role" of a community college board of trustees is to:

- 1) Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes.

- 2) Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer.

- 3) Interpret community interests to the college and college interests to the community.

- 4) Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities.

Of course, the literature does not always describe these responsibilities with exactly the same words and, for that matter, may separate each item in the above list into several different responsibilities. However, these are clearly the key responsibilities of an effective board. There are also responsibilities referred to by various authors in addition to those above but none that

repeat themselves in the literature with the consistency of those on the above list.

Nason's (1980) description of the role of the board of trustees includes the following important elements (the numbers in parentheses refer to the author's list above): (1) clarifying the institution's mission, approving long range plans and overseeing the educational program; (2) appointing and supporting the president and monitoring the president's performance; (3) preserving institutional independence, enhancing the public image and interpreting the community to the campus; (4) ensuring financial solvency. The above list is ordered differently than Nason's original description and the list of responsibilities have been grouped to follow the author's description above.

Glenn Dumke describes the governing board as follows:

Governing boards have served in many ways. They select the chief executives, set basic policy, and assure adequate funding. They protect the university from unwarranted attacks by an uninformed society via the press. They defend it from misuse by the political process, which often is influenced by vested and special interests for their own purposes. They explain the mission of the university to the public and to its political leaders. And, on the other hand, they bring to the campus and its sometimes insulated attitudes the concerns of a society which, although it does not fully understand the university, still regards it as important (Dumke, 1980:3).

Dumke's brief description of the trustee role is very similar to the above list of responsibilities.

George Potter's Handbook for Community College and Technical Institute Trustees also includes the trustee responsibilities described above. Defining the role and mission of the college, engaging in planning, and evaluating institutional performance coincide with the author's first responsibility. Selecting, evaluating, and terminating the president coincides with the second, and engaging in public relations and preserving institutional independence is essentially the third responsibility described above. Although Potter does not specifically mention financial management of the college in one of his main headings, he does state under "insuring professional management of the institution" that "The board is responsible for adopting a budget which realistically projects the college's income and restricts the expenditures to that income" (Potter, 1979:2). He also lists purchasing, constructing and maintaining facilities as one of a trustees important responsibilities. So Potter's description also supports the author's.

Richardson, Blocker and Bender (1972) cite the New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership for a description of trustee role. The first responsibility in this description is assuring that the

college fulfills the role for which it was established. Selecting, counseling with, and supporting the president is also important. The final two responsibilities mentioned were promoting understanding and cooperation between society and the college, and overseeing the acquisition and investment of funds and management of facilities.

Zoglin (1976) admits that the role of the board of trustees varies depending upon location and governance system; however, she believes that "trustees still are responsible for taking all steps necessary to assure the smooth operation of their community college..."(Zoglin, 1976:72). She also includes all of the responsibilities listed by the author in her description of the board of trustees. She emphasizes goal-setting and future planning as two roles that coincide with the author's first responsibility for trustees. She feels that "perhaps the only truly executive function remaining firmly in the hands of the board is the hiring of the president of the college" (Zoglin, 1976:76). College-community relations, or serving as a bridge between town and gown, is another trustee function she includes. Allocating funds via the annual budget and housing for the college program are also listed.

Cohen and Brawer (1982) refer to the Association of Community College Trustees (ACCT) for a listing of trustee responsibilities. The ACCT cites Potter (1977) for his description of trustee role which is listed above by the author. Additional authorities who include the traits listed by the author in their description of the role of trustees are Martorana (1963), Houle (1960), De Vore (1971), Monroe (1972), Kauffman (1980), Riley (1977), Moore (1973), Corson (1975) and Ingram (1980).

The Trustee Quarterly, a publication of the ACCT, contains many articles written by trustees and presidents relating to trustee role. Christensen (1981) describes the board as follows:

The functions: (a) develop a philosophy and goals based on the needs of the community; (b) employ a chief administrative officer who will work with the students, faculty, staff, community and the board; (c) create and initiate policies which give specific meaning to the philosophy and goals; (d) study, review and approve the annual budget; and, (e) dismiss the chief administrative officer if he, or she, is unable or unwilling to execute and administer the policies. In addition, to these functions the board, collectively and individually, must be aware of the feelings and reactions of the citizens.

Although the above functions are not listed in the same fashion as the author has described them, they essentially cover the same general categories.

McDonald (1986) reviews the results of a survey of Pennsylvania community college trustee perceptions of

their roles and duties. The roles that received the highest ratings were community liaison, goodwill ambassador, image builder, policy maker, and promoter. The duties that were perceived as most important were approving capital purchases, establishing policy, managing finances, planning, and selecting the president. Once again, this study reveals that trustees see the important parts of their role much the same as the author has listed them above.

Sutton (1986) also reviews a survey of North Carolina trustees in regard to their roles. The responsibilities listed by the author are described in Sutton's article.

As mentioned above, there are other responsibilities that are referred to in the literature, but none that repeat themselves with the consistency as those that are listed by the author. Many of these additional responsibilities can be inferred from the first responsibility on the list: "Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes." As an example, one of these additional responsibilities that is found occasionally in the literature is to "create a climate for change." If a college is going to "fulfill the purpose for which it was established," it must continually change to meet the needs of its community and a changing society.

Trustee Characteristics

It has not been until the mid-1960s that the composition of community college boards of trustees has become a subject of growing research interest (Young and Thompson, 1982:122). A study by Hartnett (1969) obtained information on trustee characteristics from a national sample of public community college trustees. Two subsequent national studies (Grafe, 1976 and Drake, 1977) reconfirmed that little had changed from the profile determined by Hartnett. This profile showed that community college boards were composed of primarily white upper and upper middle-class males between the ages of 40 and 60 years of age with at least some college education. They held professional and managerial jobs and earned salaries above the national average. These trustees were also conservative in their political outlook, were primarily of the Protestant faith, and were likely to belong to one or more community service clubs or professional organizations.

A study done by Rauh (1969:57-65) of 261 trustees in 67 public community colleges indicated that the majority of the trustees were white (95%) males (84%), 59 years of age or younger (74%), who had acquired some college

education (23%) and/or completed degree programs (57%). These trustees had an annual income between \$10,000 and \$30,000 (55%), held executive (36%) or professional (33%) jobs, and were of the Protestant faith (77%).

Sharrock (1974) in a study of North Carolina community college boards of trustees, found that the typical board member was a white male about 55 years old who had earned at least a bachelor's degree and had a median family income between \$25,000 and \$32,000. He was active in a professional or managerial occupation and over 90% of the respondents reported having more than three years experience on a community college board.

A study of Illinois public community college board members (Petty and Piland, 1985) concluded that trustees represent a well-educated, financially secure, moderately conservative and increasingly more politically active presence on boards. They felt that greater diversity in outlooks and background among members may be expected for the remainder of this century. They also found that Illinois board members were a very geographically stable cross-section of their respective communities who devoted substantial time to their roles. Many of these trustees worked in the field of education and had family ties to community college education.

For many years, there seems to have existed an under-representation of women, minorities, and non-professionals elected or appointed to community college boards. In 1979, Thompson found that there was a larger percentage of women, minorities, persons with doctorate degrees, professionals, and persons who professed to be politically conservative serving on community college boards than in the past. Additionally, a larger percentage of trustees were younger than 40 years of age and had income levels above \$40,000 annually. Bers (1980) found that trustees in suburban districts were slightly more liberal and Democratic than rural trustees. The rural trustees tended to be more Republican, conservative, male, and professional than the suburban trustee. Although these changes have been observed in some areas and in some recent studies, the profile of public community college boards of trustees remains essentially the same as described at the beginning of this section.

III. METHODOLOGY

Chapter three provides a description of the research methodology used in this dissertation. A discussion of the population surveyed, the development and distribution of the research instrument and the method used to analyze the data will be included.

Population

Members of all Washington and Oregon community college boards of trustees served as the population for this study. Washington has twenty-seven community colleges but only twenty-three community college districts and thus only twenty-three boards of trustees. Each board is composed of five members for a total of one-hundred and fifteen trustees in the Washington population. Oregon has thirteen community colleges and two community college service districts which equates to a total of fifteen boards of trustees. Each board is composed of seven members for a total of one-hundred and five trustees in the Oregon population.

The community colleges (plus their location, their size and their campus environment) included in the Oregon system are as follows:

1. Blue Mountain Community College, Pendleton, small, rural.
2. Central Oregon Community College, Bend, small, rural.
3. Chemeketa Community College, Salem, large, suburban.
4. Clackamas Community College, Oregon City, medium, suburban.
5. Clatsop Community College, Astoria, small, rural.
6. Lane Community College, Eugene, large, suburban.
7. Linn-Benton Community College, Albany, medium, suburban.
8. Mount Hood Community College, Gresham, medium, suburban.
9. Portland Community College, Portland, large, urban.
10. Rogue Community College, Grants Pass, small, rural.
11. Southwestern Oregon Community College, Coos Bay, small, rural.
12. Tillamook Bay Community College Service District, Tillamook, small, rural.
13. Treasure Valley Community College, Ontario, small, rural.
14. Treaty Oak Community College Service District, The Dalles, small, rural.
15. Umpqua Community College, Roseburg, small, rural.

The community colleges (plus their location, their size, and their campus environment) included in the Washington system are as follows:

1. Bellevue Community College, Bellevue, medium, suburban.
2. Big Bend Community College, Moses Lake, small, rural.
3. Clark College, Vancouver, medium, urban.
4. Columbia Basin Community College, Pasco, medium, suburban.
- *Community College District XII
5. Centralia College, Centralia, small, suburban.
6. South Puget Sound Community College, Olympia, small, suburban.

*Community Colleges of Spokane

7. Spokane Community College, Spokane, large, urban.
 8. Spokane Falls Community College, Spokane, medium, suburban.
 9. Edmonds Community College, Lynnwood, medium, suburban.
 10. Everett Community College, Everett, medium, suburban.
 11. Grays Harbor College, Aberdeen, small, suburban.
 12. Green River Community College, Auburn, medium, rural.
 13. Highline Community College, Midway, medium, suburban.
 14. Lower Columbia College, Longview, medium, suburban.
 15. Olympic College, Bremerton, medium, suburban.
 16. Peninsula College, Port Angeles, small, rural.
 17. Pierce College, Tacoma, large, suburban.
- *Seattle Community College District VI
18. North Seattle Community College, Seattle, medium, urban.
 19. Seattle Central Community College, Seattle, large, urban.
 20. South Seattle Community College, Seattle, medium, suburban.
 21. Shoreline Community College, Seattle, large, suburban.
 22. Skagit Valley College, Mount Vernon, medium, rural.
 23. Tacoma Community College, Tacoma, medium, urban.
 24. Walla Walla Community College, Walla Walla, medium, suburban.
 25. Wenatchee Valley College, Wenatchee, small, rural.
 26. Whatcom Community College, Bellingham, small, rural.
 27. Yakima Valley Community College, Yakima, medium, rural.

The size of the community colleges is taken from the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges' statistical analysis (AACJC, 1986). A small community

college is designated as having less than 1500 FTE, a medium sized community college has between 1500 and 3000 FTE and a large community college has more than 3000 FTE per quarter. The campus environment (rural, suburban and urban) is taken from The College Handbook (1985). In summary, the Oregon system is approximately half the size of the Washington system and both systems have about the same composition of urban, suburban and rural community colleges.

The geographical make-up of the two states is very similar. The rural community colleges are located primarily in the coastal regions and the large arid eastern sections of the states. The urban community colleges are located in the western interior of both states with the major exception of the Spokane community colleges which are located in eastern Washington. There is a mix of urban, suburban and rural community colleges in both states. Washington has a larger population and thus more community colleges and generally larger community colleges.

The economies of the two states are also similar with a heavy dependence on the agriculture and the wood products industries. However, more emphasis has been placed on the development of technology, manufacturing and the service industries in recent years. Washington's

economy is also somewhat more diversified than Oregon's. Both states were faced with an economic downturn at the beginning of the 1980's and community colleges suffered a cutback in resources as a result of this downturn. Both community college systems appear to have entered a period of stability with small or no increases in enrollments and, essentially, cost-of-living increases in annual operating budgets.

The Oregon and Washington community college governance systems have some similarities in that they both have local boards of trustees and a state board responsible for the coordination of community colleges. However, this is where the similarity ends. The Washington community college system is one in which the primary control of community colleges originates at the state level with 91% of their budget allocated by the state and state and local trustees appointed by the governor. The Washington State Board for Community College Education exercises extensive control over local community college districts. On the other hand, Oregon legislative law grants considerably more autonomy to community colleges at the local level. The largest single portion of the Oregon community college funding comes from local property taxes and local boards of trustees are elected by voters of their community college district.

The primary control over Oregon community colleges is delegated to local trustees.

Development of the Instrument

A questionnaire developed by Dr. Collie Coleman for his doctoral dissertation (1981) that reflected changes in and expansion of the responsibilities of community college trustees during the period 1960-81, and a questionnaire developed by Dr. Belle Louise Smith Wheelan used in her doctoral study (1984) of trustees in the state of Texas served as a basis for the instrument used in this study. A trustee survey developed by Peter D. Rush (1984) for his doctoral dissertation (still in progress) to determine community college effectiveness was also used. The researcher designed questions to determine how trustees perceived their role as it related to the four role components of the "ideal trustee role" which was defined by authorities in the literature and described in chapters one and two.

The initial draft of the survey was taken to the Oregon State University Survey Research Center and examined by two consultants for form and content. As a result of information received from the consultants, the draft was revised. It was then reviewed by the researcher's major professor, Dr. Charles Carpenter, and

final corrections made before sending it out with a cover letter (Appendix B) to be examined by various community college authorities in Oregon and Washington for their input and feedback.

The authorities used by the researcher to provide a thorough examination of the instrument were Roger Bassett, Executive Secretary of the Oregon Community College Association; Michael Holland, Executive Director of Oregon Community Colleges; Robert Wark, Administrator of the Washington Trustee Association of Community Colleges; Thomas Gonzales, President of Linn-Benton Community College; John Keyser; President of Clackamas Community College and Joseph Malik, President of Grays Harbor College. These individuals suggested final changes to the survey before pretesting.

A final draft of this survey was then administered to former trustees for input based on their expertise and knowledge of the role of trustees in community colleges. Suggestions made by the former trustees regarding the form and content of the survey included modifications and clarifications of the directions and elimination of irrelevant questions. Unclear and confusing questions were identified and eliminated as were ambiguous questions and those presented in an awkward format.

After receiving this input, the survey was revised again. It then received a final review by the Oregon State University Survey Research Center and the researcher's major professor and was revised accordingly before typesetting and printing. The survey forms used in this study consisted of four sections. The first three of these sections attempted to gather information that would indicate which trustee population most closely approximated the "ideal trustee role." The fourth section provided the following demographic information on individual trustees: age, community service organization membership, gender, income, length of service on board, political affiliation, ethnic origin, education and occupation.

The researcher also met with the presidents of both the Washington and Oregon community colleges (Appendix D) to explain the survey to them and ask for their cooperation in encouraging their trustees to complete the surveys after they received them. A memo and a copy of the questionnaire was sent to the presidents (Appendix F) of all the community colleges in the population several days before the survey was mailed to the trustees.

Though many types of research methods are available, the mail survey was selected for several reasons. First, the mail survey avoids potential interviewer bias.

Second, the mail survey can be answered at the respondents' leisure, thereby removing pressure for their immediate response. Third, respondents may have greater confidence in their anonymity and therefore feel freer to express views that they fear may be criticized or cause repercussions. Fourth, the mail survey is less expensive to administer than some of the other methods (Kidder, 1981).

One of the possible problems that may arise when using the mail survey involves the use of attitude questions. It is possible that the respondent will not have a good feel for his/her attitude on a particular issue, having never confronted it before. There are also many different sides to an attitude as well as responses being affected by specific situations.

A more complete description of the four parts of the approved mail survey used for this study follows. Part One contained fourteen statements related to the role of local community college trustees. Respondents were asked to indicate to what degree they felt they were involved with these responsibilities.

Part Two asked respondents to read twelve statements concerning the roles of boards of trustees and then asked for a level of agreement with these twelve statements.

Part Three questioned the level of importance that respondents would place on ten trustee responsibilities. A second part to this question asked respondents to list the two most important responsibilities and the least important responsibilities in this group of ten.

Part Four consisted of nine items designed to ascertain personal demographic data from trustees. This part included questions on age, gender, occupation, length of service on the board, income, educational background, political affiliation, community service organization membership and ethnic origin.

Data Collection

A list of reasons for selecting the mail survey for the data collection instrument is presented in the previous section. Another reason is that the population is widely dispersed and it would have been extremely difficult to access with the personal interview technique and both difficult and expensive to access via the telephone. Although some authorities (Fowler, 1984) feel that the response rate has the potential to be too low when using mail surveys, the population surveyed, in this case (community college trustees), was considered to be potentially more responsive because of their personal

interest in the promotion and enhancement of community college systems.

The mail surveys were distributed in April 1987 to two hundred and twenty trustees of the public community colleges in the states of Oregon and Washington. A self-addressed, postage-paid return envelope, along with a cover letter (Appendix G) explaining the survey were provided with each mailing. A memo from the researcher (Appendix F) and a letter from the Linn-Benton Community College President, Thomas Gonzales, (Appendix E) along with a copy of the survey was sent to all community college presidents in both states several days prior to sending the survey to the trustees. These letters urged the presidents to encourage their trustees to complete and return the surveys.

One week after the distribution of the surveys, a follow-up postcard (Appendix H) was sent to each trustee who had not yet responded. The postcard thanked those who had already returned the instrument (in the case where the survey had been in the mail but had not yet reached the researcher) and urged those who had not returned their survey to do so. A copy of this postcard along a short note was also sent to each community college president.

Two weeks after the postcard was delivered, a follow-

up letter (Appendix I) and second copy of the survey was sent to each trustee who had not yet responded.

This method of data collection has been recommended by Dillman (1978) and used by the Oregon State University Survey Research Center and yielded an excellent response rate.

Data Analysis

Prior to the dissemination of the mail survey to the trustees, each questionnaire was coded with a number that represented the community college district from which it came and the trustee who returned it. The purpose of this coding was to facilitate follow-up of those respondents who did not return the survey, as well as to allow the researcher to keep track of how many surveys were returned from each district. This also provided demographic information on the non-respondents.

The mail survey was formatted to eliminate the chance of ambiguous responses and to provide a straightforward process for data entry. After formatting, the survey was coded for data entry and analysis. Upon receipt of the surveys, they were edited and data from them were transferred to a computer file for analysis.

Descriptive statistics were derived from the data and were used to analyze and compare the data. Mean scores,

frequency counts, modal scores and percentages were all useful in making comparisons and drawing distinctions.

This study was designed to compare, analyze and describe the role perceptions of community college trustees in all community college districts of the states of Oregon and Washington. Personal characteristics were also gathered to determine the correlation between these characteristics and the "ideal trustee role."

Since the entire population of trustees in both states was surveyed, no assumption could be made that the trustees were normally distributed in the population (assumption of normalcy) and no assumptions of random sampling were made. Of course, there was no bias caused by sampling error. However, Cochran (1977) states that bias can be caused by nonresponse. In fact when measuring total populations, the formula for the mean square error (MSE) of the estimate, is equal only to the bias. In this study, nonrespondents were a major factor affecting bias.

To understand the effect of surveying the total population on study results, the finite population correction (fpc) factor was considered (Yamane). The formula for the fpc is:

$$fpc = \frac{N - n}{N - 1}$$

where N = total population
n = sample size

The fpc is a factor that is used in statistics when dealing with finite populations. When $N = n$ (as is the case when sampling the total population), the fpc equals zero and since it is a factor used in the formula for the variance and standard deviation when dealing with finite populations, these statistics would also equal zero.

The dependent variables for this study were the levels of the attitude ratings toward statements related to the four role components of the "ideal trustee role." The data related to these role perceptions were interval in nature. The independent variables for this study were the two trustee populations, Oregon and Washington, and the nine personal characteristics of the two populations (length of time on the board, member of a community organization, political affiliation, occupation, age, educational background, ethnicity, gender and income). The data related to these independent variables were nominal in nature.

Question one, which asked for a definition of the "ideal trustee role," was answered in chapter two by a thorough search of the literature.

The data collected from responses to statements in sections 1, 2 and 3 of the questionnaire (Appendix A) which represented trustee responsibilities were used to answer research questions two, three and four. These

three questions asked how trustees in the two states perceived their roles. This same data plus the information gleaned from the literature was used to answer research question five, which compared the role perceptions of the two trustee populations to the "ideal trustee role."

Responses to the questions concerning the most and least important trustee responsibilities (section 3a of the questionnaire) were used to answer research questions six, seven, eight and nine, which were questions comparing the most and least important responsibilities between trustee populations.

Responses to questions regarding the personal characteristics of trustees (section 4 of the questionnaire) were used to answer research questions ten, eleven and twelve. These were questions regarding the profile of personal characteristics by trustee group.

The answers to research questions thirteen and fourteen, the relationship between personal characteristics and the "ideal trustee role," were calculated by determining the trustee role perception for each personal characteristic by state or a total of 320 role perception scores (40 personal characteristics * 4 role components * 2 states). The answer to research question fifteen, a comparison of the relationships of

personal characteristics and role perceptions, was determined by comparing the answers to research questions thirteen and fourteen.

Additional descriptive statistics were compiled on the demographic data from the two states. Average scores on each of the thirty-six attitude statements were calculated. Frequency counts on the most and least important trustee responsibilities as indicated by the Oregon and Washington trustees were tabulated.

Finally, average trustee role perception scores for each community college in both states were calculated for a total of 152 role perception scores (23 Washington community college districts plus 13 Oregon community college districts plus 2 Oregon community college service districts times 4 role components). These data provided the researcher with specific information on trustee role perceptions from the community colleges of nonrespondents and assisted the researcher in making an estimate of any bias that might have been caused by the nonrespondents. This enabled the researcher to draw more accurate conclusions about the population that responded to the questionnaire since the mean square error of the estimate is equal to the bias and a primary cause of bias is nonresponse.

The geographical and economical similarity of the two states, the fact that they both have local as well as state boards for community college governance, and their close proximity eliminated many of the intervening variables that could have been present if two other systems had been used. This study provided an opportunity to examine two community college governance systems which have several similarities, but the major difference is that Oregon is primarily locally controlled and Washington is primarily state controlled.

IV. RESULTS

Chapter four will report the responses of the Oregon and Washington trustees regarding their role perceptions. A report on the response rate of the trustees surveyed, the personal demographics of the trustees and the relationship between personal demographics and trustee role perceptions will also be included. In chapter V, these data will be analyzed and conclusions drawn.

Response Rate

This study was designed to analyze selected perceptions of community college trustees in all thirteen Oregon community college districts plus two community college service districts and all twenty-three Washington community college districts. Oregon community college boards of trustees are composed of seven members each for a total of 105 trustees and Washington community college boards of trustees are composed of five members each for a total of 115 trustees.

A questionnaire was developed and administered to the 220 trustees currently serving on the thirty-eight community college district boards in the two states. Of the 220 questionnaires mailed, 180 (81.8%) were returned. 89 (84.8%) of the 105 Oregon trustee questionnaires were

returned and 91 (79.1%) of the 115 Washington trustee questionnaires were returned.

Two were returned but not completed by people who had recently resigned their trustee position but whose names were still on the mailing lists provided by the state offices coordinating the community college trustees associations. No attempt was made to followup and obtain current board member names for these two questionnaires for the following reasons: 1) the error was discovered late in the data collection process and the number of completed questionnaires were sufficient for an accurate analysis of the data, 2) the number of inaccurate trustee names was extremely small, and 3) the trustee's replacement would be new and inexperienced and unable to complete the questionnaire with any degree of confidence.

The response rates from the individual community college districts are included in Table 1. The trustees from each community college district in Washington returned at least 2 out of 5 (40%) questionnaires. While in Oregon, they returned at least 4 out of 7 (57%) questionnaires. The lowest percentage return in Oregon were Portland and Treaty Oak Community Colleges and highest percentage return (100%) were Clackamas, Mt. Hood, Rogue, Southwestern Oregon and Treasure Valley Community Colleges. The lowest percentage returned in Washington

Table 1: Response Rates From Individual Community Colleges

<u>Community College District</u>	<u>Number Returned</u>	<u>Percentage Returned</u>
<u>OREGON</u>		
Blue Mountain Community College	5	71.4
Central Oregon Community College	6	85.7
Chemeketa Community College	6	85.7
Clackamas Community College	7	100.0
Clatsop Community College	6	85.7
Lane Community College	6	85.7
Linn-Benton Community College	5	71.4
Mt. Hood Community College	7	100.0
Portland Community College	4	57.1
Rogue Community College	7	100.0
Southwestern Community College	7	100.0
Tillamook Bay Community College SD*	6	85.7
Treasure Valley Community College	7	100.0
Treaty Oak Community College SD*	4	57.1
<u>Umpqua Community College</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>85.7</u>
Oregon Total	89	81.8
(*SD - Service District)		
<u>WASHINGTON</u>		
Peninsula College	2	40.0
Grays Harbor College	5	100.0
Olympic College	2	40.0
Skagit Valley College	4	80.0
Everett Community College	5	100.0
Seattle Community Colleges	4	80.0
Shoreline Community College	4	80.0
Bellevue Community College	4	80.0
Highline Community College	5	100.0
Green River Community College	2	40.0
Pierce College	4	80.0
Centralia/SPS Community College	5	100.0
Lower Columbia College	4	80.0
Clark College	5	100.0
Wenatchee Valley College	5	100.0
Yakima Valley Community College	3	60.0
Spokane Community Colleges	3	60.0
Big Bend Community College	4	80.0
Columbia Basin Community College	4	80.0
Walla Walla Community College	5	100.0
Whatcom Community College	5	100.0
Tacoma Community College	3	60.0
<u>Edmonds Community College</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>80.0</u>
Washington Total	91	79.1

were Peninsula, Olympic and Green River Community Colleges and the highest percentage return were Grays Harbor, Everett, Highline, Centralia/South Puget Sound, Clark, Wenatchee Valley, Walla Walla and Whatcom Community Colleges.

Role Perception Response

The questionnaire (Appendix A) contained thirty-six attitude statements concerning trustee responsibilities. Each of these attitude statements was related directly to one of the four major role components which describes the "ideal trustee role" as stated in chapters one and two. The scores from the trustee responsibility attitude statements relating to each of the "ideal trustee role" components were averaged to determine how trustees view their role in relation to the "ideal trustee role." The purpose of this study was to determine which community college governance system, state or locally controlled, was most effective in fostering the "ideal trustee role." The trustees with the highest scores held role perceptions that were closest to the "ideal trustee role."

As was explained in chapter III, the first part of the questionnaire contained fourteen attitude statements related to the responsibilities of local community college trustees. Trustees were asked to what degree they felt

they were involved with these responsibilities on a scale from one (not involved) to four (very involved).

The second part asked respondents to read twelve attitude statements concerning the roles of boards of trustees and then asked for a level of agreement with these twelve statements on a scale of one (strongly disagree) to four (strongly agree).

The third part questioned the level of importance that respondents would place on ten trustee responsibilities on a scale of one (not important) to four (very important).

Collectively, the responses to these three sections of the questionnaire were used by the researcher to determine which trustee population most closely approximated the "ideal trustee role." Separately, the responses indicated how trustees perceived their involvement with, agreement with and the importance of the various specific responsibilities that fall within each of the four role components of the "ideal trustee role."

Table 2 shows the mean value responding trustees rated each role component from each state. Role component 1, "Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes." received a mean value of 3.17 from the responding Oregon trustees and a mean value of 3.23 from the responding

Table 2: Mean Value Placed On Each Role Component Of The "Ideal Trustee Role" By Trustees In Oregon And Washington

Role Component	Oregon Mean(N=88)	Washington Mean (N=90)
#1 Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes.	3.17	3.23
#2 Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer.	3.75	3.78
#3 Interpret community interests to the college and college interests to the community.	3.10	3.25
#4 Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities.	3.31	3.08
Total of all four means.	13.33	13.34

Washington trustees so Washington trustees rated role component one 0.06 of a point higher than the Oregon trustees. Role component 2, "Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer." received a mean value of 3.75 from Oregon trustee respondents and a mean value of 3.78 from Washington trustee respondents again the Washington trustees rated role component two higher by 0.03 of a point. Role component 3, "Interpret community interests to the college and college interests to the community." received a mean value of 3.10 from the responding Oregon trustees and a mean value of 3.25 from the responding Washington trustees. The difference here is 0.15 of a point with Washington trustees higher than Oregon trustees. Role component 4, "Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities." received a mean value of 3.31 from Oregon trustee respondents and a mean value of 3.08 from Washington respondents trustee. Oregon trustees rated role component four 0.23 of a point higher than the Washington trustees.

Table 3 shows, by state, the mean level at which trustees felt they were involved with each of the 14 responsibilities contained in the first part of the questionnaire. The responding Oregon trustees rated

Table 3: Mean Level At Which Trustees Felt They Were Involved With Each Responsibility Statement From 1 (Not Involved) To 4 (Very Involved)

Responsibility	Oregon Mean(N=88)	Washington Mean (N=90)
1a. Setting district policy	3.59	3.61
1b. Working with the President	3.54	3.62
1c. Engaging in long-range planning	3.29	3.37
1d. Monitoring college expenditures	3.22	3.17
1e. Representing community needs and concerns to the college	3.31	3.47
1f. Representing college needs and concerns to the community	3.03	3.19
1g. Defining the college mission and goals	3.15	3.30
1h. Terminating the college president if necessary	3.67	3.72
1i. Approving the college budget	3.90	3.61
1j. Obtaining operating revenues for the college (from local community, legislature, etc.)	2.87	2.72
1k. Evaluating the president	3.74	3.82
1l. Assuring that college facilities are maintained	3.01	2.93
1m. Assessing institutional performance	2.84	2.92
1n. Engaging in legislative lobbying	2.39	2.84

statements 1d, 1i, 1j and 1l higher than the responding Washington trustees who rated statements 1a, 1b, 1c, 1e, 1f, 1g, 1h, 1k, 1m and 1n higher.

Table 4 shows, by state, the mean level of agreement trustees had with the 12 trustee role statements contained in the second part of the questionnaire. Oregon trustee respondents rated statements 2c, 2d, 2e, 2f, 2i, 2j and 2k higher than Washington trustee respondents and responding Washington trustees rated statements 2a, 2b, 2g, 2h and 2l higher than responding Oregon trustees.

Table 5 shows, by state, the mean level of importance trustees placed on each of the 10 responsibilities contained in the third part of the questionnaire. Oregon trustee respondents rated statements 3e, 3i and 3j higher than Washington trustee respondents and Washington trustee respondents rated statements 3a, 3b, 3c, 3d, 3f, 3g and 3h higher than Oregon trustee respondents.

A second section of the third part of the questionnaire asked trustees to list the most important responsibility, the second most important responsibility and the least important responsibility in this group of ten. Table 6 shows the frequency counts and the percentage responses for each of the ten responsibilities in the "most important" category. Table 7 shows the frequency counts and the percentage responses for the

Table 4: Mean Level Of Agreement With Trustee Responsibility Statements From 1 (Strongly Disagree) To 4 (Strongly Agree)

Responsibility	Oregon Mean (N=88)	Washington Mean (N=90)
2a. The governing board should formulate a statement of the basic philosophy of the college district	3.60	3.61
2b. An important role of the governing board should be the selection of the chief executive officer	3.93	3.94
2c. Budget matters of the college district should be a primary concern of the board	3.59	3.43
2d. Responsibility for the management of district property should rest with the board	2.90	2.67
2e. The board should consider the chief executive officer as its advisor regarding district operations	3.55	3.40
2f. The board should approve the educational program	3.13	3.08
2g. The board should work with the community to bring about better understanding of the college's aims and programs	3.49	3.50
2h. The board should formally evaluate the chief executive officer on a periodic basis	3.80	3.83

Table 4 (continued)

<u>Responsibility</u>	<u>Oregon Mean (n=88)</u>	<u>Washington Mean (N=90)</u>
2i. The board should devote time to promoting college programs and services to the community	3.03	3.02
2j. The board should have the responsibility for assuring adequate college operating revenues	3.18	2.63
2k. The board should inform the college of community needs and concerns	3.41	3.40
2l. The board should evaluate the work of the college	3.17	3.36

Table 5: Mean Level Of Importance Trustees Placed On Listed Responsibilities From 1 (Not Important) To 4 (Very Important)

Responsibility	Oregon Mean (N=88)	Washington Mean (N=90)
3a. Deciding on changes in the curriculum	2.38	2.44
3b. Communicating needs of the district to state officials	3.05	3.38
3c. Establishing district policies	3.67	3.69
3d. Evaluating the performance of the chief executive officer	3.84	3.92
3e. Selecting the chief executive officer	3.98	3.97
3f. Serving a public relations function for the college	2.89	3.01
3g. Insuring institutional compliance with state and federal laws and regulations	2.91	2.92
3h. Determining if the college district is meeting community needs	3.31	3.42
3i. Approving the annual budget	3.75	3.56
3j. Assuring that college facilities are maintained	3.34	3.03

"second most important" category. Table 8 shows the frequency counts and the percentage responses for the "least important" category. Responding Oregon trustees were almost evenly divided between statements 3c, "Establishing district policies," with 30 responses and 3e, "Selecting the chief executive officer," with 29 responses for the "most important" responsibility. Responding Washington trustees were overwhelmingly in favor of statement 3e with 57 responses or 62.6% for their "most important" responsibility. The runnerup for the Washington trustee respondents in the "most important" category was statement 3c; however, only 15.4% agreed with this choice.

In the "second most important" category, Oregon trustee responses were scattered between five different responsibilities with 3e, "Selecting the chief officer," the favorite, 21 responses (24.1%). However, 3c, 15 responses (17.2%), 3h, 14 responses (16.1%), 3d, 13 responses (14.9%) and 3i, 12 responses (13.8%) were also rated relatively high by the Oregon trustees. Washington trustees were very close in their responses to statements 3d, 31 responses (34.1%) and 3c, 27 responses (29.7%).

The responding Oregon and Washington trustees were in agreement on the "least important" responsibility. They both rated 3a, "Deciding on changes in the curriculum" as

Table 6: Oregon And Washington Trustee Responses To **Most Important Responsibility**

Responsibility	Oregon		Washington	
	Responses	%	Responses	%
3a. Deciding on changes in the curriculum	3	3.4%	0	0.0%
3b. Communicating needs of the district to state officials	0	0.0%	2	2.2%
3c. Establishing district policies	30	34.5%	14	15.4%
3d. Evaluating the performance of the chief executive officer	7	8.0%	8	8.8%
3e. Selecting the chief executive officer	29	33.3%	57	62.6%
3f. Serving a public relations function for the college	1	1.1%	1	1.1%
3g. Insuring institutional compliance with state and federal laws and regulations	0	0.0%	1	1.1%
3h. Determining if the college district is meeting community needs	14	16.1%	6	6.6%
3i. Approving the annual budget	2	2.3%	2	2.2%
3j. Assuring that college facilities are maintained	1	1.1%	0	0.0%

Table 7: Oregon And Washington Trustee Responses To Second Most Important Responsibility

Responsibility	Oregon		Washington	
	Responses	%	Responses	%
3a. Deciding on changes in the curriculum	3	3.4%	2	2.2%
3b. Communicating needs of the district to state officials	4	4.6%	4	4.4%
3c. Establishing district policies	15	17.2%	27	29.7%
3d. Evaluating the performance of the chief executive officer	13	14.9%	31	34.1%
3e. Selecting the chief executive officer	21	24.1%	11	12.1%
3f. Serving a public relations function for the college	2	2.3%	1	1.1%
3g. Insuring institutional compliance with state and federal laws and regulations	1	1.1%	5	5.5%
3h. Determining if the college district is meeting community needs	14	16.1%	4	4.4%
3i. Approving the annual budget	12	13.8%	4	4.4%
3j. Assuring that college facilities are maintained	2	2.3%	2	2.2%

Table 8: Oregon and Washington Trustee Responses To Least Important Responsibility

Responsibility	Oregon Responses %		Washington Responses %	
3a. Deciding on changes in the curriculum	30	35.3%	27	30.3%
3b. Communicating needs of the district to state officials	10	11.8%	8	9.0%
3c. Establishing district policies	3	3.5%	8	9.0%
3d. Evaluating the performance of the chief executive officer	2	2.4%	3	3.4%
3e. Selecting the chief executive officer	2	2.4%	1	1.1%
3f. Serving a public relations function for the college	9	10.6%	12	13.5%
3g. Insuring institutional compliance with state and federal laws and regulations	15	17.6%	13	14.6%
3h. Determining if the college district is meeting community needs	6	7.1%	2	2.2%
3i. Approving the annual budget	2	2.4%	5	5.6%
3j. Assuring that college facilities are maintained	6	7.1%	10	11.2%

their last choice with Oregon trustees giving it 30 responses (35.3%) and Washington trustees giving it 27 responses (30.3%). Although it only received half as many responses as their first choice for "least important" responsibility, 3g, "Insuring institutional compliance with state and federal laws and regulations," was the second choice of both Oregon and Washington trustees for this category.

Trustee Demographics

Part four of the questionnaire asked trustees to respond to nine items concerning personal demographic data. This included questions on length of board service, community service organization membership, political affiliation, occupation, age, education, ethnic origin, gender and income.

Table 9 shows a comparison of the number of years of service on the board of trustees for Oregon and Washington trustees. 49.4% of the responding Oregon trustees have more than four years of service on their board of trustees while 35.2% of the responding Washington trustees have more than four years of service. 20.2% of the responding Oregon trustees have been members of their boards for two to four years and 29.7% of the responding Washington trustees have been board members for two to four years.

Table 10 gives a display of the number of trustees that are members of community organizations. 83.0% of responding Oregon trustees and 80.9% of responding Washington trustees are members of community organizations. Oregon and Washington trustees are almost identical to one another on this demographic.

Table 11 shows the political affiliation of trustees. The greatest number of responding Oregon trustees are Republicans (50.6%) and the greatest number of responding Washington trustees are Democrats (52.3%). However in Oregon, the number of Democratic trustees is very close to the Republican trustees with 44.9% classifying themselves as Democrats. There are many more trustees that consider themselves Independent politically in Washington (28.4%) than in Oregon (4.5%).

Table 12 deals with job classification. A large percentage of the responding trustees indicated that they were not currently working for pay, 21.3% in Oregon and 32.2% in Washington. The majority of those that were working for pay fell into the professional/managerial occupational category, 73.0% in Oregon and 58.9% in Washington. The jobs listed in this category consisted of jobs such as medical doctor, attorney, business owner, corporate executive, educator and accountant. A small percentage of the responding trustees indicated that they

Table 9: Number Of Years Washington And Oregon Trustees Served On Their Community College Board

Years Of Service	Oregon		Washington	
	Responses	%	Responses	%
Less than two years	27	30.3%	32	35.2%
Two to four years	18	20.2%	27	29.7%
More than four years	44	49.4%	32	35.2%

Table 10: Number Of Oregon And Washington Trustees Who Were Members Of A Community Service Organization

Yes Or No	Oregon		Washington	
	Responses	%	Responses	%
No, I am not a member	15	17.0%	17	19.1%
Yes, I am a member	73	83.0%	72	80.9%

Table 11: Oregon And Washington Trustee Political Affiliation

Political Affiliation	Oregon		Washington	
	Responses	%	Responses	%
Republican	45	50.6%	15	17.0%
Democrat	40	44.9%	46	52.3%
Independent	4	4.5%	25	28.4%
Other	0	0.0%	2	2.3%

held white collar (clerical, office manager, etc.) jobs, 4.5% in Oregon and 7.8% in Washington and blue collar (longshoreman, carpenter, etc.) jobs, 1.1% in Oregon and 1.1% in Washington.

Table 13 shows the age groups the trustees in each state fall into. 56.2% of Oregon trustee respondents are 50 years of age and older and 55.0% of Washington trustee respondents fall into this same category. 27.0% of responding Oregon trustees and 28.1% of responding Washington trustees fall into the 40 to 49 year old age group while 13.5% of Oregon trustees and 16.9% of Washington trustees fall into the 30 to 39 year old age group. Only 3.4% of responding Oregon trustees and no responding Washington trustees fall into the 29 year old or under age group.

Table 14 contains a display of the various levels of education of the respondents. A large majority of the trustees from both states have attained the bachelor's degree or above 66.2% in Oregon and 75.9% in Washington. More trustees in Washington have completed at least some graduate work 53.9% while in Oregon only 50.5% have reached that same level. Washington trustees hold the edge in Master's degrees with 25.3% to Oregon's 13.5% while the reverse is true for Doctorate and Professional degrees with 24.7% in Oregon and 14.3% in Washington.

Table 12: Oregon and Washington Trustee Occupations

Occupation	Oregon Responses	%	Washington Responses	%
Not currently working for pay	19	21.3%	29	32.2%
Professional/Managerial	65	73.0%	53	58.9%
White Collar	4	4.5%	7	7.8%
Blue Collar	1	1.1%	1	1.1%

Table 13: Oregon And Washington Trustee Age Group

Age Group (Years)	Oregon Responses	%	Washington Responses	%
29 or under	3	3.4%	0	0.0%
30 - 39	12	13.5%	15	16.9%
40 - 49	24	27.0%	25	28.1%
50 - 59	24	27.0%	26	29.2%
60 and above	26	29.2%	23	25.8%

Table 15 shows the ethnic origin of responding trustees. By far the greatest majority of trustees are caucasian, 94.4% in Oregon and 82.8% in Washington. There is a greater cross-section of minority trustees in Washington (17.1%) than in Oregon (5.5%).

Table 16 displays the gender of the responding trustees. The large percentage of female trustees in Washington (48.9%) compared to Oregon (31.5%) is notable. This high percentage of female trustees is not only high in comparison to Oregon but is also high in comparison to national data (Hartnett, 1969; Grafe, 1976; Drake, 1977 and Capek 1984).

Table 17 shows the various income levels of responding trustees. This particular question had the lowest response of any of the demographic questions. 44.8% of Oregon trustees and 58.1% of Washington trustees had incomes above the \$40,000 level. There were also, clearly, more trustees at lower income levels in Oregon than in Washington.

Relationship Between Demographics and Role Perception

This section shows the average value that responding trustees placed on each of the four role components of the "ideal trustee role" by personal characteristic and by state.

Table 14: Level Of Education Completed By Oregon And Washington Trustees

Level Of Education	Oregon Responses	%	Washington Responses	%
High School Diploma	1	1.1%	3	3.3%
College attendance but no degree	18	20.2%	15	16.5%
Associate Degree	11	12.4%	4	4.4%
Bachelor's Degree	14	15.7%	20	22.0%
Graduate work but no degree	10	11.2%	13	14.3%
Master's Degree	12	13.5%	23	25.3%
Doctorate/Professional Degree (MD, JD, etc.)	22	24.7%	13	14.7%
Other	1	1.1%	0	0.0%

Table 15: Washington and Oregon Trustee Ethnic Origin

Ethnic Origin	Oregon Responses	%	Washington Responses	%
Caucasian	84	94.4%	72	82.8%
Hispanic	0	0.0%	1	1.1%
Black	0	0.0%	5	5.7%
Asian	2	2.2%	5	5.7%
American Indian	2	2.2%	4	4.6%
Other	1	1.1%	0	0.0%

Table 16: Oregon and Washington Trustee Gender

Gender	Oregon		Washington	
	Responses	%	Responses	%
Male	61	68.5%	46	51.1%
Female	28	31.5%	44	48.9%

Table 17: Washington and Oregon Trustee Individual Income Before Taxes

Income	Oregon		Washington	
	Responses	%	Responses	%
Less than \$20,000	11	12.6%	6	7.0%
\$20,000 to \$29,999	20	23.0%	13	15.1%
\$30,000 to \$39,999	17	19.5%	17	19.8%
\$40,000 to \$49,999	14	16.1%	15	17.4%
\$50,000 to \$59,999	6	6.9%	9	10.5%
\$60,000 or more	19	21.8%	26	30.2%

Table 18 shows the role perceptions of responding trustees in relation to length of service on the board. In Oregon, the value placed on the four role components by the trustees that have four or more years on the board is higher than or equal the values of the trustees in the two other groups. Washington trustees with four or more years of service on the board rated all four role components higher than the other two groups.

Table 19 shows the relationship between membership in a local community service organization and role perceptions of responding trustees. In Washington, trustees that indicated they were members of community service organizations rated the four role components higher than or equal to the group that indicated they were not members of community organizations. Oregon trustees that indicated they were members of community organizations rated role components one and three higher and the non-member trustees rated role components two and four higher.

Table 20 is a display of the relationship between political affiliation and board role perception. The trustees in both Oregon and Washington who indicated that they were political Independents rated all four role components higher than any of the trustees in the other political classifications. In general, the trustees in

Table 18: Relationship Between Length Of Oregon and Washington Trustee Board Service And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"

Years of Service	State (N)	Role Component *			
		#1	#2	#3	#4
Less than two years	Oregon(26)	3.11	3.68	3.12	3.32
	Washington(31)	3.17	3.67	3.12	3.10
Two to four years	Oregon(18)	3.09	3.71	3.04	3.27
	Washington(27)	3.15	3.80	3.27	2.90
More than four years	Oregon(44)	3.24	3.81	3.12	3.32
	Washington(32)	3.36	3.87	3.35	3.22

 Table 19: Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Membership In A Community Service Organization And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"

Member?	State (N)	Role Component *			
		#1	#2	#3	#4
No	Oregon(14)	3.09	3.78	2.96	3.32
	Washington(17)	3.22	3.76	3.05	3.08
Yes	Oregon(73)	3.18	3.75	3.13	3.31
	Washington(71)	3.22	3.78	3.28	3.08

* NOTE: Refer to Table 2 (page 71) for a description of the "ideal trustee role" components.

both states that indicated they were Democrats rated the four role components slightly higher than the trustees that indicated they were Republicans.

Table 21 shows the role perceptions of trustees in relation to the kind of work the trustee does. Both the White Collar and the Blue Collar job classification responses were extremely low so the primary comparison is between the "Do not currently work for pay" and the Professional/ Managerial category. In Oregon, the trustees that indicated they were not currently working for pay rated all four role components higher than the trustees in the professional/ managerial job classification. In Washington, the reverse of this situation was true.

Table 22 shows the relationship between age and trustee role perception. The less than 29 years of age category response was so low that the primary comparison was between the other four age groups. In Oregon, the age group that generally rated the role perceptions the highest was 50 to 59 year old, while in Washington there did not seem to be any age group that stood out over the others.

Table 23 is a display of the role perceptions of responding trustees in relation to the level of education the trustee has completed. Those trustees in Oregon with

Table: 20 Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Political Affiliation And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"

Political Affiliation	State (N)	Role Component *			
		#1	#2	#3	#4
Republican	Oregon(45)	3.18	3.74	3.08	3.29
	Washington(15)	3.15	3.77	3.16	3.04
Democrat	Oregon(39)	3.14	3.76	3.11	3.31
	Washington(46)	3.21	3.76	3.22	3.08
Independent	Oregon(4)	3.38	3.84	3.25	3.56
	Washington(24)	3.27	3.81	3.37	3.12
Other	Oregon(0)	-	-	-	-
	Washington(2)	3.40	3.75	3.11	3.00

Table 21: Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Occupation And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"

Occupation	State (N)	Role Component *			
		#1	#2	#3	#4
Not current-ly working for pay	Oregon(18)	3.36	3.82	3.17	3.42
	Washington(29)	3.21	3.77	3.25	2.98
Professional Managerial	Oregon(65)	3.12	3.72	3.09	3.29
	Washington(52)	3.25	3.80	3.25	3.14
White Collar	Oregon(4)	3.08	3.93	3.06	2.97
	Washington(7)	3.04	3.66	3.08	3.03
Blue Collar	Oregon(1)	3.00	3.75	3.00	3.56
	Washington(1)	3.80	3.88	3.89	3.89

* NOTE: Refer to Table 2 (page 71) for a description of the "ideal trustee role" components.

Table 22: Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Age Group And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"

Age	State (N)	Role Component *			
		#1	#2	#3	#4
29 or under	Oregon(3)	3.30	3.96	3.15	3.33
	Washington(0)	-	-	-	-
30 to 39	Oregon(12)	3.05	3.69	3.05	3.37
	Washington(15)	3.41	3.76	3.33	3.24
40 to 49	Oregon(24)	3.08	3.73	3.02	3.24
	Washington(25)	3.17	3.70	3.16	2.97
50 to 59	Oregon(24)	3.31	3.82	3.23	3.33
	Washington(26)	3.18	3.83	3.23	3.02
60 and over	Oregon(25)	3.16	3.71	3.08	3.33
	Washington(22)	3.23	3.85	3.32	3.15

* NOTE: Refer to Table 2 (page 71) for a description of the "ideal trustee role" components.

Table 23: Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Level Of Education And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"

Education	State (N)	Role Component *			
		#1	#2	#3	#4
High School Diploma	Oregon(1)	2.80	3.25	2.00	3.22
	Washington(3)	3.23	3.71	3.33	3.07
College work no degree	Oregon(18)	3.17	3.73	3.25	3.35
	Washington(15)	3.13	3.85	3.39	3.09
Associate's Degree	Oregon(11)	3.17	3.76	3.21	3.28
	Washington(4)	3.02	3.84	3.22	3.20
Bachelor's Degree	Oregon(14)	3.01	3.76	2.87	3.27
	Washington(20)	3.34	3.78	3.25	3.14
Graduate work no degree	Oregon(10)	3.19	3.73	3.29	3.43
	Washington(13)	3.28	3.71	3.25	3.16
Master's Degree	Oregon(12)	3.26	3.84	3.06	3.26
	Washington(22)	3.31	3.83	3.30	3.12
Doctorate/ Professional Degree	Oregon(21)	3.24	3.74	3.08	3.27
	Washington(13)	3.05	3.69	2.98	2.82
Other	Oregon(1)	2.90	3.86	2.67	3.67
	Washington(0)	-	-	-	-

* NOTE: Refer to Table 2 (page 71) for a description of the "ideal trustee role" components.

some graduate work or a Master's degree rated all four role components the highest while trustees in Washington with some college work an Associate's degree or a Bachelor's degree rated all four role components the highest. Because the response rate for the "Other" and "High-School Diploma" categories was so low the primary comparisons were between the remaining six categories.

Table 24 shows the relationship between ethnic origin and role perception. Because caucasian is by far the predominant ethnic group, it is difficult to accurately predict the effect of minority ethnic groups on role perception. In Washington, the mean average role component responses of the Black, Asian and American Indian trustees were generally higher than the caucasian trustee respondents.

Table 25 shows the relationship between trustee gender and role perception. Oregon female trustee respondents rated the four role components higher than the male respondents. In Washington, the male trustees rated role components one and two higher and the female trustees rated role components three and four higher.

Table 26 is a display of the relationship between income level and role perceptions of responding trustees. In Oregon, those trustees with incomes in the \$50,000 to \$59,999 range rated role components one and two the

Table 24: Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Ethnic Origin And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"

Ethnic Origin	State (N)	Role Component *			
		#1	#2	#3	#4
Caucasian	Oregon(83)	3.16	3.75	3.09	3.31
	Washington(71)	3.20	3.79	3.24	3.07
Hispanic	Oregon(0)	-	-	-	-
	Washington(1)	3.10	3.25	2.67	2.56
Black	Oregon(0)	-	-	-	-
	Washington(5)	3.34	3.68	3.33	3.31
Asian	Oregon(2)	3.65	3.81	3.44	3.61
	Washington(5)	3.28	3.80	3.22	3.07
American Indian	Oregon(2)	3.10	3.69	3.28	3.17
	Washington(4)	3.43	3.69	3.44	3.19
Other	Oregon(1)	3.10	3.75	3.44	2.89
	Washington(0)	-	-	-	-

Table 25: Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Gender And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"

Gender	State (N)	Role Component *			
		#1	#2	#3	#4
Male	Oregon(60)	3.16	3.74	3.04	3.31
	Washington(45)	3.25	3.80	3.17	3.04
Female	Oregon(28)	3.20	3.78	3.25	3.32
	Washington(44)	3.20	3.76	3.33	3.15

* NOTE: Refer to Table 2 (page 71) for a description of the "ideal trustee role" components.

Table 26: Relationship Between Oregon And Washington Trustee Individual Income And Their Perceptions Related To The "Ideal Trustee Role"

Income	State (N)	Role Component *			
		#1	#2	#3	#4
Less than \$20,000	Oregon(11)	3.30	3.86	3.23	3.39
	Washington(6)	3.32	3.69	3.15	3.15
\$20,000 to \$29,999	Oregon(20)	3.19	3.71	3.09	3.34
	Washington(12)	3.14	3.77	3.25	3.18
\$30,000 to \$39,999	Oregon(17)	3.15	3.74	3.11	3.35
	Washington(17)	3.34	3.77	3.29	3.24
\$40,000 to \$49,999	Oregon(14)	3.17	3.82	3.13	3.24
	Washington(15)	3.15	3.79	3.27	2.97
\$50,000 to \$59,999	Oregon(6)	3.45	3.94	2.98	3.30
	Washington(9)	3.28	3.82	3.41	3.25
\$60,000 and over	Oregon(18)	3.02	3.66	3.10	3.25
	Washington(26)	3.14	3.78	3.16	2.93

* NOTE: Refer to Table 2 (page 71) for a description of the "ideal trustee role" components.

highest and trustees with incomes of less than \$20,000 rated role components three and four the highest. In Washington, those trustees with income levels in the \$50,000 to \$59,999 range rate role components two, three and four the highest and trustees with incomes in the \$30,000 to \$39,999 range rated role component one the highest.

Effect of the Nonrespondents on Study Results

The high rate of participation of both groups of trustees in this study (81.8% overall return rate) should diminish any bias caused by the nonrespondents. However in tables 27, 28, 29 and 30, the average "ideal trustee role" component scores for each community college were calculated. This was because trustees from the same community college would likely have received the same or similar orientations and have associated with the same fellow trustees and administrators from their community college and it could be assumed that they might hold similar views concerning trustee role.

In order to determine the effect of the nonrespondents on the study results, these mean average role component scores by community college were assumed to be the responses of that particular community college's nonrespondents. This was because the only data available

on the nonrespondents was their community college and as stated in the first paragraph, trustees from the same community college would be subject to similar influences regarding trustee role. Tables 27, 28, 29 and 30 show the average role component score by community college for role components 1 through 4 respectively. The researcher was particularly interested in those community colleges with low response rates since that is where the largest number of nonrespondents were located. The researcher was also interested in the range of community college responses and if the majority of the nonrespondents fell at the extremes of these ranges since this would have a greater effect on the mean average role component scores. As was stated in chapter III, the mean square error for a total population is equal to the bias and a primary source of bias in this study was the nonrespondents.

Table 27 shows the community college ratings for role component one, "Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes." Scores range from a low of 2.80 at Blue Mountain Community College in Oregon and Lower Columbia College in Washington to a high of 3.64 at Whatcom Community College in Washington. The Oregon community colleges with the lowest response rates were Portland with three responses and an average score 3.27 which is above

Table 27: Community College Ratings For Role Component One ("Assure that the college fulfills the purposes for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes.")

<u>Community College District</u>	<u>Number Responses</u>	<u>Role Cmpnt Score</u>
<u>OREGON</u>		
Blue Mountain Community College	5	2.80
Central Oregon Community College	6	3.32
Chemeketa Community College	6	3.33
Clackamas Community College	7	3.16
Clatsop Community College	6	3.05
Lane Community College	6	3.37
Linn-Benton Community College	5	3.36
Mt. Hood Community College	7	3.19
Portland Community College	3	3.27
Rogue Community College	7	3.13
Southwestern Community College	7	3.06
Tillamook Bay Community College SD*	6	3.21
Treasure Valley Community College	7	3.16
Treaty Oak Community College SD*	4	3.03
<u>Umpqua Community College</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3.17</u>
Oregon Average	88	3.17
(*SD - Service District)		
<u>WASHINGTON</u>		
Peninsula College	2	3.52
Grays Harbor College	5	2.84
Olympic College	2	3.15
Skagit Valley College	4	2.95
Everett Community College	5	3.52
Seattle Community Colleges	4	3.00
Shoreline Community College	4	3.10
Bellevue Community College	4	3.60
Highline Community College	4	2.93
Green River Community College	2	3.60
Pierce College	4	3.38
Centralia/SPS Community College	5	3.17
Lower Columbia College	4	2.80
Clark College	5	3.18
Wenatchee Valley College	5	3.10
Yakima Valley Community College	3	3.14
Spokane Community Colleges	3	3.50
Big Bend Community College	4	3.23
Columbia Basin Community College	4	3.23
Walla Walla Community College	5	3.38
Whatcom Community College	5	3.64
Tacoma Community College	3	3.27
<u>Edmonds Community College</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3.35</u>
Washington Average	90	3.08

the Oregon mean of 3.17 and Treaty Oak with four responses and an average response of 3.03 which is below the Oregon mean. The Washington community colleges with the lowest response rates were Peninsula, Olympic and Green River each with two responses. Peninsula College had an average score of 3.52 and Green River Community College had an average score of 3.60 which are both above the Washington mean of 3.23 and Olympic College had an average score of 3.15 which is below the Washington mean.

Table 28 shows the average community college ratings for role component two, "Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer. Scores range from a low of 3.28 at Highline Community College in Washington to a high of 4.00 at Green River Community College in Washington. Portland Community College rated this component 3.79 which is slightly above the Oregon average of 3.75 and Treaty Oak rated this component 3.68 which is slightly below the Oregon average. Peninsula, Olympic and Green River community colleges rated role component two 3.94, 3.81 and 4.00 respectively which are all above the Washington average of 3.78.

Table 29 shows the average community college ratings for role component three, "Interpret community interests to the college and college interests to the community." Average community college scores range from a low of 2.83

Table 28: Community College Ratings For Role Component Two ("Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer.")

Community College District	Number Responses	Role Cmpnt Score
OREGON		
Blue Mountain Community College	5	3.65
Central Oregon Community College	6	3.77
Chemeketa Community College	6	3.81
Clackamas Community College	7	3.68
Clatsop Community College	6	3.67
Lane Community College	6	3.82
Linn-Benton Community College	5	3.75
Mt. Hood Community College	7	3.61
Portland Community College	3	3.79
Rogue Community College	7	3.88
Southwestern Community College	7	3.95
Tillamook Bay Community College SD*	6	3.79
Treasure Valley Community College	7	3.67
Treaty Oak Community College SD*	4	3.68
Umpqua Community College	6	3.77
Oregon Average	88	3.75
(*SD - Service District)		
WASHINGTON		
Peninsula College	2	3.94
Grays Harbor College	5	3.85
Olympic College	2	3.81
Skagit Valley College	4	3.41
Everett Community College	5	3.93
Seattle Community Colleges	4	3.81
Shoreline Community College	4	3.84
Bellevue Community College	4	3.94
Highline Community College	4	3.28
Green River Community College	2	4.00
Pierce College	4	3.83
Centralia/SPS Community College	5	3.75
Lower Columbia College	4	3.78
Clark College	5	3.78
Wenatchee Valley College	5	3.85
Yakima Valley Community College	3	3.83
Spokane Community Colleges	3	3.96
Big Bend Community College	4	3.88
Columbia Basin Community College	4	3.59
Walla Walla Community College	5	3.72
Whatcom Community College	5	3.93
Tacoma Community College	3	3.67
Edmonds Community College	4	3.75
Washington Average	90	3.78

Table 29: Community College Ratings For Role Component Three ("Interpret community interests to the college and college interests to the community.")

Community College District	Number Responses	Role Cmpnt Score
<u>OREGON</u>		
Blue Mountain Community College	5	2.94
Central Oregon Community College	6	2.89
Chemeketa Community College	6	3.22
Clackamas Community College	7	3.14
Clatsop Community College	6	3.09
Lane Community College	6	3.28
Linn-Benton Community College	5	3.40
Mt. Hood Community College	7	3.33
Portland Community College	3	3.11
Rogue Community College	7	2.98
Southwestern Community College	7	2.89
Tillamook Bay Community College SD*	6	3.00
Treasure Valley Community College	7	3.15
Treaty Oak Community College SD*	4	2.83
<u>Umpqua Community College</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>3.26</u>
Oregon Average	88	3.10
(*SD - Service District)		
<u>WASHINGTON</u>		
Peninsula College	2	3.28
Grays Harbor College	5	3.13
Olympic College	2	3.11
Skagit Valley College	4	3.22
Everett Community College	5	3.73
Seattle Community Colleges	4	3.11
Shoreline Community College	4	3.03
Bellevue Community College	4	3.47
Highline Community College	4	2.97
Green River Community College	2	3.44
Pierce College	4	3.11
Centralia/SPS Community College	5	3.20
Lower Columbia College	4	3.94
Clark College	5	3.09
Wenatchee Valley College	5	3.38
Yakima Valley Community College	3	3.59
Spokane Community Colleges	3	3.11
Big Bend Community College	4	2.89
Columbia Basin Community College	4	3.19
Walla Walla Community College	5	3.13
Whatcom Community College	5	3.64
Tacoma Community College	3	3.56
<u>Edmonds Community College</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3.36</u>
Washington Average	90	3.25

at Treaty Oak in Oregon to a high of 3.73 at Everett in Washington. Portland Community College rated this role component 3.11 which is just above the Oregon mean of 3.10 and Treaty Oak rated it 2.83 which is below the Oregon mean. Peninsula and Green River community colleges rated role component three 3.73 and 3.44 respectively which are both above the Washington mean of 3.25 and Olympic College rated it 3.11 which is below the mean.

Table 30 shows the average community college ratings for role component four, "Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities." Scores range from a low of 2.72 at Lower Columbia College in Washington to a high of 3.53 at Linn-Benton Community College in Oregon. Portland and Treaty Oak community colleges rated this role component 3.41 and 3.50 respectively which are both above the Oregon mean of 3.31. Peninsula College rated this role component 3.47 which is above the Washington mean of 3.08 while Olympic and Green River community colleges both rated this role component at 2.94 which is below the mean.

Table 31 assumes that the average mean role component ratings from all fifteen Oregon community colleges and all twenty-three Washington community colleges are weighted evenly when calculating the mean averages of the four role components for the entire state. This assumption would

Table 30: Community College Ratings For Role Component Four ("Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities.")

Community College District	Number Responses	Role Cmpnt Score
OREGON		
Blue Mountain Community College	5	3.39
Central Oregon Community College	6	3.22
Chemeketa Community College	6	3.30
Clackamas Community College	7	3.22
Clatsop Community College	6	3.19
Lane Community College	6	3.48
Linn-Benton Community College	5	3.53
Mt. Hood Community College	7	3.26
Portland Community College	3	3.41
Rogue Community College	7	3.19
Southwestern Community College	7	3.16
Tillamook Bay Community College SD*	6	3.24
Treasure Valley Community College	7	3.34
Treaty Oak Community College SD*	4	3.50
Umpqua Community College	6	3.44
Oregon Average	88	3.31
(*SD - Service District)		
WASHINGTON		
Peninsula College	2	3.47
Grays Harbor College	5	3.11
Olympic College	2	2.94
Skagit Valley College	4	3.14
Everett Community College	5	3.36
Seattle Community Colleges	4	2.81
Shoreline Community College	4	3.17
Bellevue Community College	4	3.44
Highline Community College	4	2.83
Green River Community College	2	2.94
Pierce College	4	3.17
Centralia/SPS Community College	5	2.99
Lower Columbia College	4	2.72
Clark College	5	3.04
Wenatchee Valley College	5	2.69
Yakima Valley Community College	3	2.93
Spokane Community Colleges	3	3.26
Big Bend Community College	4	3.28
Columbia Basin Community College	4	2.94
Walla Walla Community College	5	3.00
Whatcom Community College	5	3.24
Tacoma Community College	3	3.37
Edmonds Community College	4	3.25
Washington Average	90	3.25

Table 31: Comparison Between The Mean Value Placed On Each Role Component Of The "Ideal Trustee Role" By Trustees In Oregon And Washington When Responses From Each Community College In Each State Are Weighted (Wghtd) Evenly And The Unweighted (Unwgtd) Means In Table 2 (Page 71)

Role Component	Oregon Means (N=88)		Washington Means (N=90)	
	Unwgtd	Wgtd	Unwgtd	Wgtd
#1 Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes.	3.17	3.17	3.23	3.24
#2 Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer.	3.75	3.75	3.78	3.79
#3 Interpret community interests to the college and college interests to the community.	3.10	3.10	3.25	3.29
#4 Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities.	3.31	3.32	3.08	3.09
Total of all four means.	13.33	13.34	13.34	13.41

provide an estimate of results if 100% of the trustees responded but, in doing so, did not alter the individual average mean role component ratings from each community college. In other words, nonresponding trustees would not alter the mean average scores of their community colleges.

For the Oregon trustees, this calculation would only change role component #4 by increasing it 0.01 of a point as can be seen in table 31. For Washington trustees, it would increase role components #1, #2 and #4 by 0.01 of a point and #3 by 0.04 of a point. So the overall effect on the role component scores, when weighting each community college average mean score equally, is minimal.

Summary

Data reported in this chapter resulted from responses to role perception questionnaires received from 180 Oregon and Washington community college trustees. Eighty-nine responses or 84.8% were from the state of Oregon and 91 responses or 79.1% were from the state of Washington.

These questionnaires were used to measure attitudes toward the four major role components of the "ideal trustee role." Washington trustees rated role components one, two and three higher than Oregon trustees and Oregon trustees rated role component four higher.

Of the fourteen specific responsibilities listed in the first part of the questionnaire, Washington trustees rated ten of them higher than Oregon trustees. In the second part of the questionnaire, Oregon trustees rated seven of the twelve specific responsibilities higher than Washington trustees. There were ten specific responsibilities listed in the last part of the questionnaire and Washington trustees rated seven of these higher than the Oregon trustees.

Responding trustees from both states felt that selecting the chief executive officer was "the most important" responsibility. However, an equivalent number of trustees from Oregon felt that establishing district policy was an equally important responsibility. The largest percentage of responding trustees from both states felt that deciding on changes in the curriculum was "the least important" responsibility.

Demographic data indicated that the majority of trustees in both states are caucasian, have completed, at least, some graduate work but not necessarily a graduate degree, hold professional or managerial positions, are 50 years of age or older, and enjoy incomes above the \$40,000 level. Responding Washington trustees were almost evenly split between male and female and Oregon trustees are about two-thirds male.

The final chapter will summarize the findings of this study as they relate to the fifteen research questions presented in Chapter I.

V. SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was undertaken to determine which community college governance system, the locally controlled Oregon system or the state controlled Washington system, was most effective in fostering the "ideal trustee role." Because, trustees play a key role in the governance of community colleges and are considered an important link to the local community, they also play an extremely important part in determining the overall effectiveness of community colleges.

All 105 trustees from the locally controlled Oregon community colleges and all 115 trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges were used as the population for the study. Oregon contains thirteen community college districts plus two community college service districts with seven elected trustees per district and Washington contains twenty-three districts with five appointed trustees per district.

A questionnaire was developed and disseminated to these 220 trustees. This questionnaire was a series of thirty-six trustee responsibility statements that related to the "ideal trustee role." Trustees were asked to respond to these statements by circling numbers on a

Likert scale. The higher the trustees rated their involvement or agreement with or importance of these responsibility statements, the closer they perceived themselves to the "ideal trustee role." Personal demographics of trustees were also gathered to analyze any relationship between them and role perception.

This dissertation was also undertaken to contribute additional information to the literature regarding the effect of state and locally controlled community college systems on the role of the community college trustee. Only a few empirical studies can be found which discuss the role of the board as perceived by the board members themselves and fewer still regarding the effect of state and locally controlled community college systems on trustee role perceptions.

Many studies have shown that there has been and continues to be a trend toward more state control of community colleges (Taylor, 1985; Nespoli and Martorana, 1983). Although the trend toward state control goes on, very little evidence exists as to which system is more effective and the arguments on both sides of the issue continue.

This study has attempted to answer the question of how trustees perceived their role in the state controlled Washington and locally controlled Oregon community college

systems. Due to the influence trustees have over the governance of community colleges, the results of this study will also add to the body of knowledge concerning the effectiveness of state and locally controlled community college systems.

The process used to collect data in this study was described in Chapter III. Chapter IV presented the results obtained from the analysis of responses to the questionnaires completed and returned by the Oregon and Washington trustees.

The discussion offered in this final chapter will summarize the findings of the study as they relate to the fifteen research questions presented in Chapter I. A brief discussion of the conclusions and recommendations for further research will also be presented.

Findings

Research Question #1. How does the literature define the "ideal trustee role?"

This question was answered in Chapter II and will be repeated here for clarity. Authorities on trustee roles list a wide variety of board responsibilities but there are certain of these responsibilities, that continue to repeat themselves throughout the literature. The "ideal trustee role" of a community college board of trustees is to:

1) Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes.

2) Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer.

3) Interpret community interests to the college and college interests to the community.

4) Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities.

Research Question #2. How do individual trustees from the state controlled Washington community college system perceive their role?

Tables 3, 4 and 5 on pages 73, 75 and 77 show the mean average responses of Washington trustees to the various responsibility statements contained in the questionnaire. In analyzing the responses of the Washington trustees to the thirty-six responsibility statements, it is apparent that the most responsibility is felt in the area of selecting and working with the college president. All of the responsibility statements related to the college president (1b, 1h, 2b, 2h, 3d and 3e) received higher ratings than any of the other statements in every one of the three sections of the questionnaire.

Setting or establishing district policy (1a and 3c) and formulating a statement of philosophy is the second area of importance on which trustees placed emphasis.

Approving budgets was also important to Washington trustees.

Although approving budgets was important to Washington trustees, obtaining or assuring adequate operating revenues for the college (1j and 2j) received some of their lower ratings. Even so, they still indicated an above average level of involvement with this responsibility. Representing community needs and concerns to the college received a higher rating than representing college needs and concerns to the community. Overall, college - community relations received higher ratings than many of the other responsibilities.

Deciding on changes in the curriculum received the Washington trustees' lowest rating. This could be because they felt staff had more expertise in this area and Washington legislative law specifically states that trustees should work with faculty on curriculum development. Maintenance of college facilities (1l and 3j) also received a lower rating in comparison to other responsibilities.

The Washington trustees were consistent in the responses to responsibility statements between the three sections of the questionnaire except in the area of college evaluation. "Assessing institutional performance," statement 1m, received a mean rating of 2.92

while "The board should evaluate the work of the college," statement 21, received a mean rating of 3.36. In the first section of the questionnaire, the trustee was asked to indicate level of involvement while in the second section, they were asked if the board should evaluate. Apparently, the trustees believe they should be more involved with institutional evaluation than they currently are.

Research Question #3. How do individual trustees from the locally controlled Oregon community college system perceive their role?

Tables 3, 4 and 5 on pages 73, 75 and 77 show the responses of Oregon trustees to the various responsibility statements contained in the questionnaire. The responding Oregon trustees rated the area of selecting and working with the president very high in comparison to other statements in the questionnaire. However, "approving the college budget" received the highest rating in section one which asked for level of involvement with certain responsibilities. Statement "i" in section three which asked for level of importance, "Approving the annual budget," also received a high rating by the Oregon trustees. As with Washington trustees, the Oregon trustees did not place as much emphasis on obtaining or

assuring adequate operating revenues for the college (1j and 2j) as they did on budget approval.

Setting or establishing district policy (1a and 3c) and formulating a statement of philosophy is another area of importance on which Oregon trustees placed emphasis.

Representing community needs and concerns to the college received a higher rating than representing college needs and concerns to the community. However, the Oregon trustees did rate "The board should work with the community to bring about a better understanding of the college's aims and programs" as one of their more important responsibilities. This could be because they felt they should increase their efforts in this area.

Engaging in legislative lobbying received their lowest rating. Because primary funding comes from local property taxes, Oregon trustees do not feel as great a need as Washington trustees to work with state legislative bodies. Deciding on changes in the curriculum was a close second in the low rating category. This could be because they felt staff had more expertise in this area.

As with the Washington trustees, Oregon trustees were inconsistent in their response to the area of college evaluation. "Assessing institutional performance," statement 1m, received a mean rating of 2.84 while "The board should evaluate the work of the college," statement

21, received a mean rating of 3.17. Again, the difference in the two statements was between what is and what should be. Apparently, the Oregon trustees believe they should be more involved with institutional evaluation than they currently are.

Research Question #4. Do differences exist between the role perceptions of trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges and the locally controlled Oregon community colleges?

Tables 3, 4 and 5 on pages 73, 76 and 77 show a comparison between Washington and Oregon trustees of the mean responses to the various responsibility statements. In general, there was consistency in the responses to the various responsibility statements between the two groups of trustees. The researcher chose an arbitrary difference in ratings between the two groups of 0.15 of a point and examined those specific responsibility statements where the difference between the mean ratings of the two trustee populations was greater than or equal to this arbitrary amount.

Washington trustees rated both statement 1e, "Representing community needs and concerns to the college," and statement 1f, "Representing college needs and concerns to the community," 0.16 of a point higher than the Oregon trustees. Because Washington trustees are

appointed by the governor and Oregon trustees are elected by their local constituents, and because Washington community colleges are primarily dependent on state funding and Oregon community colleges derived the major portion of their funds from local property taxes, this difference was unexpected by the researcher. The responses to statements 1e and 1f would indicate that Washington trustees placed a greater emphasis on college-community relations than Oregon trustees.

Washington trustees also rated "Defining the college mission and goals" 0.15 of a point higher than Oregon trustees. However, other mean ratings of the two trustee groups given to statements related to college philosophy and policies were very close to each other. It appears that the Oregon and Washington trustees are similar in the importance that they place on the area of college philosophy, mission and policy.

An area where Oregon trustees consistently rated questionnaire statements higher than Washington trustees was in budget related responsibilities. Oregon trustees rated statements 1i (0.29 higher), 1j (0.15 higher), 2c (0.16 higher), 2j (0.53 higher) and 3i (0.19 higher) higher than Washington trustees (see tables 3, 4 and 5 on pages 73, 75 and 77). Oregon trustees not only felt a greater responsibility in approving college budgets but

also in obtaining operating revenues for the college. An area closely related to budget is the management and maintenance of district property. Again, Oregon trustees placed more emphasis on this area than Washington trustees. Statements related to property management and maintenance, 2d (0.23 higher) and 3j (0.31 higher), are rated higher by the Oregon trustees. This was expected by the author because the Revised Code of Washington clearly states that final authority for district property rests with the state board and community college budgets must receive final approval by the state board. In Oregon, state statute gives both final budget authority and responsibility for district property to the local board of trustees. Oregon trustees also devote a great deal of energy to district elections for property tax levies in support of community colleges.

Another expected response difference was in the area of contact with state officials and legislative lobbying. Washington trustees rated these areas (statements 1n [0.45 higher] and 3b [0.33 higher]) higher than Oregon trustees. Because the Washington community college system is state controlled and receives its funding from the state, it would be expected that Washington trustees would rate these higher than Oregon trustees.

Oregon trustees rated statement 2e, "The board should consider the chief executive officer as its advisor regarding district operations," 0.15 of a point higher than the Washington trustees. This could be because more direction for the operation of the community colleges comes from the state level in Washington than in Oregon. However, other statements concerning the president were closer in mean rating between the two states.

Washington trustees rated statement 2l, "The board should evaluate the work of the college," 0.19 of a point higher than Oregon trustees. So responses to this statement would indicate that Washington trustees placed more emphasis on institutional evaluation than Oregon trustees.

Research Question #5. Considering the role perceptions of trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges and the locally controlled Oregon community colleges, which population most closely approximates the "ideal trustee role?"

To calculate the mean ratings for the four role components of the "ideal trustee role," the thirty-six responsibility statements contained in the questionnaire were placed into four groups with each one relating to one of the four major role components. An average mean rating for each major role component was then calculated. The

trustees with the highest mean values held role perceptions that were closest to the "ideal trustee role."

Table 2 (page 71) in chapter IV gives the mean values placed on each role component of the "ideal trustee role" by trustees in Oregon and Washington. Role component #1, "Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes." was rated 0.06 of a point higher by the Washington trustees than the Oregon trustees. The mean values of the two groups of trustees were very close to each other for role component #1.

Role component #2, "Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer." was rated 0.03 of a point higher by the Washington trustees than by the Oregon trustees. Again, the mean values of the two trustee groups were very close to each other for role component #2.

Role component #3, "Interpret community interests to the college and college interests to the community." was rated 0.15 of a point higher by the Washington trustees than by the Oregon trustees. As was discussed in the previous question, this was unexpected by the researcher since the Oregon community colleges are locally controlled and are more dependent on local tax revenues than Washington community colleges.

Role component #4, "Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities." was rated 0.23 of a point higher by the Oregon trustees than by the Washington trustees. As was discussed in the previous question, this outcome would be expected because the Revised Code of Washington assigns final budget authority and responsibility for district property to the state board and Oregon community colleges are dependent on local property taxes for the major portion of their funding.

To determine which trustee population was closest to the "ideal trustee role," the researcher examined both the statewide mean averages in table 2 and the weighted statewide mean averages in table 31 (page 107). In both cases, Washington trustees rated three out of the four role components higher than the Oregon trustees. Adding the four scores together in both tables also resulted in the Washington trustees having a slightly higher score than the Oregon trustees. An analysis of these data resulted in the researcher concluding that the Washington trustees perceived that their roles were slightly closer to the "ideal trustee role" than the Oregon trustees perceived their role. However, the differences were so small, especially for role components #1 and #2 and the overall totals, that any large differences in the

nonrespondent's ratings from their fellow trustees could alter the outcome.

The important result here is not the differences in the role perceptions of the two trustee populations but the similarities. Both groups of trustees indicated that all four of the role components were important with role component #2 being in the "very important" range.

Research Question #6. What do trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges consider the most important trustee responsibilities?

Tables 6 and 7 on pages 79 and 80 show the Washington trustee response rates for the most and second most important trustee responsibilities. Of the ten responsibilities listed in the third section of the questionnaire, Washington trustees selected "Selecting the chief executive officer" as their most important responsibility. In the second most important category, Washington trustees were very close in their responses to "Evaluating the performance of the chief executive officer" and "Establishing district policies."

Research Question #7. What do trustees from the locally controlled Oregon community colleges consider the most important trustee responsibilities?

Tables 6 and 7 on pages 79 and 80 show the Oregon trustee response rates for the most and second most

important trustee responsibilities. Of the ten responsibilities listed in the third section of the questionnaire, Oregon trustees were almost tied between "Establishing district policies" with 30 responses and "Selecting the chief executive officer" with 29 responses. In the second most important category, Oregon trustees again chose "Selecting the chief executive officer."

Research Question #8. What do trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges consider the least important trustee responsibilities?

Table 8 (page 81) shows the responses for the least important responsibility. "Deciding on changes in the curriculum" was chosen as the least important responsibility by the Washington trustees. A second choice in this category was "Insuring institutional compliance with state and federal laws and regulations."

Research Question #9. What do trustees from the locally controlled Oregon community colleges consider the least important trustee responsibilities?

"Deciding on changes in the curriculum" was also chosen as the least important responsibility by the Oregon trustees. Oregon trustees also chose "Insuring institutional compliance with state and federal laws and regulations" as their second choice in this category.

Research Question #10. What are the personal characteristics of trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges?

Tables 9 (page 84) through 17 (page 89) give a very specific description of the personal characteristics of responding Washington trustees. In summary, the majority of Washington trustees responding to the questionnaire were caucasian, had completed two or more years of service on the board, were members of community service organizations, held professional or managerial positions, were 50 years of age or older, had completed, at least, some graduate work, and had incomes in excess of \$40,000. They were almost evenly split between male and female and the largest percentage (46%) were Democrats.

Research Question #11. What are the personal characteristics of trustees from the locally controlled Oregon community colleges?

Again, refer to tables 9 (page 84) through 17 (page 89) for a complete description of responding Oregon trustee personal characteristics. In summary, Oregon trustees were caucasian, had two or more years of service on the board, were members of community organizations, were Republicans, held professional or managerial positions, were 50 years of age or older, had completed,

at least, some graduate work, were male and had incomes of \$30,000 or more.

Research Question #12. Are there differences between the personal characteristics of trustees from the state controlled Washington community colleges and the locally controlled Oregon community colleges?

In general, the personal characteristics of the two trustee groups were similar. The most significant differences were in the areas of gender and political affiliation. Washington trustees were almost equally divided between male and female (Table 16, page 88) which is a departure from previous studies regarding trustee personal characteristics as was pointed out in chapter III. Responding Oregon trustees were 68.5% male which was much closer to the trustee studies that have been done in the past.

The majority of responding Oregon trustees were Republicans (Table 11, page 83) which also was in line with past trustee studies, but an almost equal number were Democrats. Washington trustees were primarily Democratic with the second greatest number being Independent; almost no Oregon trustees are Independents. Oregon trustees may feel a greater need to affiliate with a major political party because of the trustee election process while the appointment process in Washington may make Independent

candidates more appealing to bipartisan appointing committees.

Responding Washington trustees showed higher incomes than responding Oregon trustees. More Washington trustees were not currently working for pay. This could have been partly due to the higher number of female trustees in Washington and many of these could have been homemakers. There were also more minority trustees in Washington than in Oregon. This would follow from the large number of community colleges in the greater Seattle area where larger concentrations of minorities live.

There were more master's degrees among Washington trustees and more doctorate and professional degrees among Oregon trustees. More Oregon trustees had four or more years of board service. This was probably due to the appointment versus the election process of selecting trustees. Incumbent elected trustees in Oregon seldom have much competition on the election ballot.

Research Question #13. What is the relationship between trustee personal characteristics and their perceptions related to the "ideal trustee role" in the state controlled Washington community college system?

The data contained in Tables 18 (page 91) through 26 (page 98), show the relationships between personal

characteristics and role perception among Washington trustees. In general, Washington trustees who fell into the following demographic categories perceived themselves closer to the "ideal trustee role" than Washington trustees who fell into other demographic categories. These groups included trustees with more than four years service on the board, trustees who were members of community service organizations, trustees who were politically independent, trustees who held professional/managerial jobs, trustees whose ages fell between 30 and 39 years, trustees with some college work or an associate's or a bachelor's degree and trustees whose annual incomes fell into the \$50,000 to \$59,999 range. Although the minority population was relatively small, the minority trustees definitely perceived themselves closer to the "ideal trustee role" than the caucasian trustees. Female trustees also perceived themselves slightly closer to the "ideal role" than male trustees.

Research Question #14. What is the relationship between trustee personal characteristics and their perceptions related to the "ideal trustee role" in the locally controlled Oregon community college system?

Tables 18 (page 91) through 26 page (98) also show relationships between the personal characteristics of

Oregon trustees and their role perceptions. In general, Oregon trustees who fell into the following demographic categories perceived themselves closer to the "ideal trustee role" than Oregon trustees who fell into other demographic categories. These groups included trustees with four or more years of service on the board, trustees who were members of community service organizations, trustees who were independent politically (Democrats were also closer in their perceptions than Republicans since there were only a few Independent trustees), trustees who were not currently working for pay, trustees who indicated they were in the 50 to 59 year old age category, trustees with some graduate work or a master's degree and trustees who were female. The minority trustee population in Oregon was extremely small but the Asian trustees definitely perceived themselves closer to the "ideal trustee role" in all categories. Oregon trustees with an annual income of \$50,000 to \$59,999 perceived themselves closest to "ideal role" components #1 and #2 and trustees with annual incomes under \$20,000 perceived themselves closer to "ideal role" components #3 and #4.

Research Question #15. Are there differences in how

personal characteristics relate to trustee role perceptions in the state controlled Washington

community colleges and the locally controlled Oregon community colleges?

Responding Oregon trustees not currently working for pay perceived themselves closest to the "ideal trustee role" of all the groups in the occupations' categories; while in Washington, trustees who held professional/managerial positions perceived themselves closest. In Oregon, trustees between the ages of 50 and 59 perceived themselves closest to the "ideal trustee role" and in Washington, trustees between the ages of 30 and 39 perceived themselves closest. Trustees with undergraduate education perceived themselves closest to the "ideal trustee role" in Washington while in Oregon, trustees with, at least, some graduate education perceived themselves closest.

Conclusions

The analysis of questionnaire responses showed that both groups of trustees indicated a good understanding of the role of the community college trustee. However, it is hoped that the information contained in this dissertation will further improve trustees' understanding of their role and assist in improving overall trustee effectiveness.

The findings of this study indicated areas where increased efforts need to be made when opportunities for

educating trustees about their role arise. When analyzing the responses to the individual responsibility statements that relate to role component #1 (Assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes.), it was apparent that more education needs to take place concerning the importance of institutional planning and goal setting. Trustees need to be involved in the global issues related to the future of the community college. Their input is valuable because it reflects the general concerns and needs of the community. Evaluating the work of the college is also an important trustee activity because they can often be more objective when evaluating college outcomes. Other areas related to trustee role component #1 that need more emphasis are assuring compliance with state and federal regulations and approving changes in the curriculum. Although many curriculum changes should be left primarily to the faculty and instructional leaders, trustees can offer invaluable input into community needs related to the college curriculum.

Trustee responses to individual responsibility statements related to role component #2 (Select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer.) were all extremely high. Trustees were in agreement that selecting and evaluating the

president was an important responsibility. The researcher felt that trustees needed the least amount of education concerning this role component.

Trustees from both community college systems need more education concerning role component #3 (Interpret community interests to the college and college interests to the community.). However, trustee responses from the locally controlled Oregon system did not demonstrate as great an understanding of the need to increase college awareness of community needs and concerns. Responses to individual responsibility statements indicated an overall need for more trustee education concerning college-community relations and, in general, public relations. Community and college needs assessments are also an important function of marketing and public relations. Both groups of trustees need further education in this area also.

Responses from both groups of trustees indicate more education is needed concerning role component #4 (Oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities). This is especially true of the trustees from the state controlled Washington community college system. An understanding of college repair and maintenance needs is also important to the budget decision-making process. Monitoring college

expenditures and assisting in obtaining operating revenues for the district are necessary to the effective governance of the community college. State controlled systems may want to examine the possibility of granting more budget authority and responsibility for district property to their local boards. Breneman and Nelson (1981) indicated that the budget drives the mission of the college. In order for the college to develop missions that will satisfy local educational needs, it may be necessary to grant additional budget responsibility to the local level.

An important finding of this study was the similarity in the role perceptions of the two trustee populations. The questionnaire was designed so that mean trustee responsibility statement scores in the 1.00 to 1.49 range would be equivalent to a response of "not involved," "strongly disagree" or "not important;" mean scores in the 1.50 to 2.49 range would be equivalent to a response of "not too involved," "disagree" or "somewhat important;" mean scores in the 2.50 to 3.49 range would be equivalent to a response of "moderately involved," "agree" or "important;" and mean scores in the 3.50 to 4.00 range would be equivalent to a response of "very involved," "strongly agree" or "very important." In examining both statewide mean average role component scores, table 31 (page 71), it can be seen that the responses of both

populations to role components #1, #3 and #4 were in the 2.50 to 3.49 range, in fact, the 3.00 to 3.49 range, which would place both populations on the high side of the "moderately involved," "agree" and "important" categories in the perceptions of these role components. Role component #2 was rated in the 3.50 to 4.00 range by both populations placing it in the "very involved," "strongly agree" and "very important" categories in the perception of this role component. Therefore, the overall role perceptions of the trustees from the state controlled Washington community college system and the trustees from the locally controlled Oregon community college system were very similar.

Another finding of this study was the change in personal demographics of trustees in comparison to previous trustee research especially in relation to the gender of the state controlled Washington system trustees. Past data indicated a predominance of male trustees (Capek, 1984). This increase in female representation on boards of trustees provides a more accurate reflection of the surrounding community and the student populations attending community colleges.

The personal characteristics of the two trustee populations were similar. In general, the two groups were composed of middle to upper-middle class citizens. With

the exception of the male to female ratio on boards of trustees and individual trustee political affiliation, trustees from the state and locally controlled community college governance systems did not differ greatly in personal characteristics.

Governance structure differences between the locally controlled Oregon community colleges and the state controlled Washington community colleges are extensive. Local trustees in Oregon are elected by local constituents and have primary authority over their community college, while Washington trustees are appointed by the governor and defer many local decisions to the state board. Washington has a state board for community colleges devoted only to community college matters and with far reaching powers over local districts, while Oregon has a state board of education which has responsibility for both public schools and community colleges and minimal authority over local community college districts. State funding in Washington is 91% with virtually no local funding, while in Oregon, local property taxes supporting community colleges average 45% and locally collected tuition averages 18% with only an average of 33% of the funding coming from the state. Finally, the legislative law and administrative rules governing community colleges

in Washington is much more extensive and detailed than that which exists in Oregon.

Although the governance structures of the two states differs widely, there was little difference in the two groups of community college trustee role perceptions as related to the "ideal trustee role." In addition, data related to personal characteristics had many similarities. Because of these findings, other studies to measure the effectiveness of state and locally controlled community college systems are recommended by the researcher. (Please see the next section for these recommendations.)

The study also showed the relationship between the personal characteristics and the role perceptions of Washington and Oregon trustees. It is hoped that this demographic information coupled with the above results related to the individual role component responses will assist in improving trustee orientation and professional development programs related to their role and responsibilities.

Finally, the cumulative information in this dissertation was meant to increase the overall effectiveness of trustees and ultimately enable community colleges to better serve their various constituents.

Recommendations for Further Study

The recommendations that follow are intended to encourage further research in the area of trusteeship and assist in decision making concerning state versus locally controlled community college systems.

1. A study which examines the actual behavior of community college trustees in state and locally controlled systems should be done. This study would provide information on what trustees in the two systems actually do rather than just the perceptions of their roles.

2. A comparison of other factors that determine community college effectiveness should be made between the two systems. These effectiveness factors should include but not be limited to student retention rates, success of graduates, comprehensiveness of course offerings, faculty and staff evaluations, and responsiveness to local educational and community service needs.

3. A study that examines the effect of funding structure on a community college's ability to respond to local needs should be done. This study would assist in making decisions concerning the development of the most effective funding formulas for community colleges.

4. A national survey sampling the role perceptions of both state and locally controlled community college trustees should be undertaken. The advantage of the

researcher's study was that the similarities of the two states eliminated many of the intervening variables. However, statistical information from a national survey would allow the researcher to make inferences concerning all locally and state controlled community college systems.

5. The local level and state level pressure groups affecting trustee decisions should be studied. An understanding of who and what influences community college trustee decisions will assist in increasing decision making effectiveness as they relate to local and statewide educational needs.

6. The role perceptions of community college trustees in urban areas with those of trustees in rural areas should be compared. This research should also include the people and groups that influence the decisions of community college trustees in rural and urban areas.

7. The role perceptions of elected and appointed community college trustees should be studied. This study would help in determining the effectiveness of the election versus the appointment process in selecting community college trustees.

8. A study of why trustees hold their particular role perceptions should be undertaken. This study would assist in providing better orientation and training for

community college trustees and help to diminish misconceptions trustees have about their role.

Administrative Recommendations

The following recommendations will assist community college trustees and administrators in defining the role of the trustee and will help to provide a general comprehensive orientation and training process for trustees.

1. A standard orientation process regarding the role of a community college trustee should be developed. The orientation process will help to clarify trustee roles and increase community college trustee effectiveness.

2. An effective self-evaluation tool for trustees to measure role perception and board effectiveness should be developed. This tool will help trustees better understand their role and increase their effectiveness as trustees.

Observations

The following statements are not based upon the researcher's specific findings in the study but rather observations as a result of discussions with various college trustees and presidents and readings in the related literature.

1. A continual effort needs to be made to provide quality orientation and training for all community college trustees. This training should not only take place when trustees assume office but should continue throughout their term of office. As lay people, trustees can contribute a great deal toward providing direction for community colleges; however, they cannot make effective decisions without sufficient orientation and training concerning the philosophy, mission, goals, and objectives of community colleges and the trustees' role in the operation of community colleges.

2. Although Washington trustees perceived their role as more community connected than Oregon trustees (role component #3), the Oregon community colleges seemed more flexible and better able to provide a timely response to community needs than Washington community colleges. This is probably due to the differences in funding structure. As stated in the previous section on recommendations for further study, research on the effects that funding structure have on responsiveness to local needs would be helpful. A large portion of the Oregon community colleges' funding comes from local sources and is not tied to FTE (full-time equivalent students) where 91% of Washington community college funding comes from the state and is based on a complicated formula connected to FTE and

budget histories. Also local trustees in Oregon exercise complete authority over budget decisions where local Washington trustees defer to the state board for final budget decisions. Breneman and Nelson (1981) have stated that the budget drives the mission. This would indicate that the missions of Oregon community colleges would be more locally based.

3. With the exception of the differences in the percentages of male and female trustees between Oregon and Washington, the researcher was struck more by the similarities in the two groups of trustees rather than the differences. These similarities were present in the demographics of the two groups as well as their role perceptions. Both are groups of involved and concerned citizens dedicated to the community college concept and are working to assure that their particular community college provides the best possible educational services to their local district.

Local lay governing boards and advisory committees provide valuable input to the direction and operation of community organizations. If community colleges are to truly remain community focused, it will be necessary to continue to encourage local citizens to participate on community college boards of trustees and to provide the

orientation and training necessary for these trustees to be effective decision makers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alfred, Richard L. "Maximizing Institutional Responsiveness to Changing Environmental Conditions." New Directions for Community Colleges, 46 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, June 1984: 7-19.
- Alfred, Richard L. and Peter D. Rush. Emerging Trustee Roles in Community College Governance. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees, 1985.
- Alfred, Richard L. and David F. Snyder. "Reforming Governance." In William L. Deegan and Dale Tillery eds. Renewing the American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985: 201-13.
- Anderson, G. Philip. "Self-Defense for Trustees." AGB Reports, 20 November/December 1978: 16-19.
- Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. The Two-Year College Trustee: National Issues and Perspectives. Washington, D.C.: AGBUC Publications, December, 1972.
- Bailey, S. "Coping with the Crises of Funding, Standards, and Purpose: An Expanded Role for Trustees." Change, 14 May/June, 1982: 24-28.
- Baldridge, J. Victor et al. Policy Making and Effective Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980: 118-45.
- Bender, Louis W. The States, Communities, and Control of the Community College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975.
- Berry, William. "Community College Governance." Paper presented at the FOCI Conference, Gresham, OR, March 1, 1986.
- Bers, Trudy Haffron. "Trustee Characteristics and Decision Making Among Suburban and Rural Community College Trustees." Community/Junior College Research Quarterly, 4 1980: 249-62.

- Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr. The Two Year College: A Social Synthesis. Englewood Cliffs: Prentis-Hall, 1965.
- Bortz, Libby L., Robert E. Garrison, Muriel Kay Heimer, and Raymond A. Stone. "What is the Role of the Board of Trustees in Ensuring Academic Quality?" AACJC Journal, 56 February/March, 1986: 40-4.
- Boyle, Fred. "Governance of Oregon Community Colleges: Alternatives for the Future." Paper presented at the FOCI Conference, Gresham, OR, March 1, 1986.
- Boyer, Ernest. "Four Points of Educational Leadership." AACJC Journal, 57 August/September, 1986: 14-7.
- Breneman, David W. and Susan C. Nelson. Financing Community Colleges. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1981.
- Brubacher, John S. and Willis Rudy. Higher Education in Transition. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Bryant, Donald. "Board/President Relations: Conversing with the Board." Trustee Quarterly, 6 Winter, 1982: 9-12.
- Budd, John F. "Are College Trustees Obsolete?" Saturday Review, March 9, 1974: 48-9.
- Burns, Gerald P. Trustees in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination. New York: Independent College Funds of America, 1966: 1-16.
- "A Call to Trustees." AGB Reports, 20 March/April 1978: 3-9.
- Cameron, Donald W. and Robbie Lee Needman. "Policy for Instruction." AACJC Journal, 55 October, 1984: 38-9.
- Campbell, Dale F. and Associates, eds. Leadership Strategies for Community College Effectiveness. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1985.
- Campbell, Ronald. "Local Control, Myth or Reality?" Community and Junior College Journal, 48 May 1978: 48-50.

- Caparosa, Carol. "Building Better Boards." AACJC Journal, 55 October, 1984: 42-6.
- Caparosa, Carol. "Building Better Boards for Community Organizations: Third Year Final Report." Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, June 30, 1984.
- Capek, Mary Ellen S. "The Last Word." AGB Reports, 26 November/December, 1984: 46-8.
- Catalano, J. A. "Boards and Presidents:--How to Work Together." Trustee Quarterly, 3 Spring, 1979: 1-3.
- The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Governance of Higher Education - Six Priority Problems. New-York: McGraw-Hill, April, 1973: 31-8.
- Christensen, Alphas R. "Trustee Responsibilities." Trustees Quarterly, 5 Summer 1981: 1-2.
- Cleary, Robert E. "Trustee-President Authority Relations." Educational Record, 60 Spring, 1979: 146-58.
- Cleary, Robert E. "Who's in Charge Here?" AGB Reports, 21 November/December, 1979: 21-6.
- Cochran, William G. Sampling Techniques. Third Edition, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977: 1-35.
- Cohen, Arthur M. and Florence B. Brawer. The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- Coleman, Collie. "A Study of the Perceptions of Community College Trustees and Presidents Concerning Trustee Responsibility and Effectiveness." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1981.
- College Entrance Examination Board. The College Handbook 1985-86. 23rd ed. New York: College Entrance Exam Board 1985.

- Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (California). Background Papers: The Challenge of Change - A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges. Sacramento, March, 1986.
- Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (California). The Challenge of Change - A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges. Sacramento, March, 1986.
- Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975: 202-30.
- Courtney, E. Wayne. Analysis. Corvallis, OR, 1984: 153-222.
- Cunninggim, M. "Institutional Mission and the Role of Trustees." Liberal Education, Summer, 1980: 215-6.
- De Vore, Cameron P. "The Role and Responsibilities of Community College Boards of Trustees." In B. Lamar Johnson, ed. The Junior College Board of Trustees. Sacramento: Regents of the University of California, 1971: 7.
- Dillman, Don A. Mail and Telephone Surveys. New York: Wiley and Sons, 1978: 138-42.
- Drake, Sandra L. A Study of Community and Junior College Boards of Trustees. Washington, D.C.: AACJC Publications, 1977.
- Dressel, Paul L. Administrative Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Dumke, Glenn S. "Decline and Fall of the Governing Board?" AGB Reports, 22 January/February, 1980: 3-8.
- Dziuba, Victoria and William Meardy, eds. Enhancing Trustee Effectiveness. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.
- Dziuba-Malick, Victoria and William Meardy, eds. New Trustee Communicator-1. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees, June, 1976.

- Dziuba-Malick, Victoria and William Meardy, eds. New Trustee Communicator-2. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees, June, 1976.
- Educational Coordinating Council (Oregon). Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Community College Governance. Salem, January, 1968.
- Elliot, Peggy Gordon. "Are Coordinating Boards Needed Anymore?" Chronicle of Higher Education, March 12, 1984: 60.
- Engdahl, Lilla E. "The Role of the Public Community College Board Of Trustees in the Institutional Planning Process." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1977.
- Engel, Robert E. and Paul P. W. Achola "Boards of Trustees and Academic Decision Making: A Review of the Literature and Research." Review of Educational Research, 53 Spring, 1983: 55-74.
- Engleman, Finis E. "Wither Governance of Public Education?" Educational Digest, 43 January, 1978: 21-3.
- Enos, Carol, George David Kieffer and Richard C. Richardson Jr. "Improving Understanding Between State and Local Governing Boards: A Report on the California Governance Project." Paper presented at the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, San Diego, CA, April 15, 1985.
- Falk, Richard C. "An Analysis of the Role of the Community College Board of Trustees in the State of Washington." Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Washington State University, 1970.
- Fields, Ralph R. The Community College Movement. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962: 3-51.
- Fitzwater, Pat, ed. "Board/Superintendent Relationships." Keys to Boardmanship, Oregon School Boards Association, December, 1982.
- Fowler, Floyd J. Jr. Survey Research Methods. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1984.

- Fryer, Thomas W. Jr. "Community Colleges: The Issue is Not \$50." ACC News, February, 1984: 1.
- Fryer, Thomas W. Jr. "Some Tough Questions About Community Colleges." AACJC Journal, 57 June/July, 1986: 18-21.
- Garrison, Don. "War Without Guns - Workplace Training and Retraining." AACJC Journal, 57 December/January, 1987: 20-3.
- Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. The Community College: Values Vision and Vitality. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980.
- Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. "Governance and the Shifting Role of the Board of Trustees." New Directions for Community Colleges, 49 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985: 41-51.
- Gleazer, Edmund J. Jr. Project Focus: A Forecast Study of Community Colleges. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.
- Gollattscheck, James F. "The Governing Board: Critical Policy Support." New Directions for Community Colleges, 21 Spring, 1980: 71-7.
- Gollattscheck, James F. et al. College Leadership for Community Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976.
- Grafe, G. The Trustee Profile of 1976. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees, 1976.
- Grunewald, Donald. "State Regulation of Colleges: More Onerous than Federal Rules." The Chronicle of Higher Education, February 2, 1981: 64.
- Haire, Evelyn C. "A Trustee's Suggestions--Board Responsibility: A Threefold Task." Community College Review, 2 Fall, 1974: 28-32.
- Hakanson, John. "State-Wide Community College Systems: Governance or Coordination? A Local Control Perspective." Paper presented at the AACJC Convention, St. Louis, MO, April, 1984.
- Harper, William A. Trustee Papers-1. Washington, D.C.: AACJC Publications, 1973.

- Harper, William A. Trustee Papers-2. Washington, D.C.: AACJC Publications, 1974.
- Harris, Marm M. "The Bottom Line--Board Self Evaluation." Trustee Quarterly, 5 Spring, 1981: 6-11.
- Hartnett, R. T. College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles and Educational Attitudes. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969.
- Hasting, Sandra. "Evaluation of the Board of Trustees." Trustee Quarterly, 3 Fall, 1979: 15-9.
- Hobson, Anthony Ray and Naetaly S. Glasman. "The Community College and State-Wide Administration: A Study of Evaluation Based Mandates." Community/Junior College Quarterly. 1985: 303-16
- Holderman, James B. "Trustees: Moving to Center Stage." Educational Record, 62 Winter, 1981: 34-5.
- Hollmann, Robert E. "Role Expectations of the Boards of Trustees of Texas Public Community Colleges as Perceived by Faculties, Chief Executive Officers. and Members of Boards of Trustees." Unpublished Ed.D. Dissertation, Texas Tech University, 1976.
- Houle, Cyril. The Effective Board. New York: Association Press, 1960.
- Ingram, Richard T. "The Governing Board in Institutional Planning." AGB Reports, 25 July/August, 1983: 35-8.
- Ingram, Richard T. Handbook of College and University Trusteeship. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980: 27-46.
- Ingram, Richard T. "The Marriage of Presidents and Boards." New Directions for Community Colleges, No. 28 1979: 73-82.
- Ingram, Richard T. "Trustees--Power and Sanity in the 1980s." Educational Record, 61 Winter, 1980: 24-9.

- Johnson, B. Lamar, ed. The Junior College Board of Trustees. Occasional Report No. 16. Los Angeles: Junior College Leadership Program, U.C.L.A., 1977.
- Kahn, Robert L., et al. Organizational Stress: Studies in Role Conflict and Ambiguity. New York: Wiley and Sons Inc., 1964.
- Kaplan, William A. The Law of Higher Education. San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1979.
- Karol, N.H. and S. G. Ginsburg. Managing the Higher Education Enterprize. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1980: 102-7.
- Kauffman, Joseph F. At the Pleasure of the Board. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1980.
- Keller, George. Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1983.
- Kennedy, Marion. "Walking the Academic Tightrope: Defining Board/President Territories." Trustee Quarterly, 5 Fall, 1981: 15-7.
- Kidder, L. H. Selltiz, Wrightsman and Cook's Research Methods in Social Relations (4th Edition). Dallas: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1981.
- King, Maxwell C. "Evaluation of the Boards of Trustees: A President's Perspective." Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, St. Louis, MO, April 5, 1982.
- King, Maxwell C. and Robert L. Breuder. President-Trustee Relationships: Meeting the Challenge of Leadership. Washington, D.C.: AACJC Publications, 1977.
- Kohn, Patricia F. and Kenneth P. Mortimer. "The National Commission on College and University Trustee Selection: Selecting Effective Trustees." Change, 15 July/August, 1983: 30-7.
- Korhammer Sheila M. "Characteristics of Female Trustees." New Directions for Community Colleges, 51 San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass, September, 1985: 42-8.

- Lacey, Jerry. "Characteristics of Minority Group Trustees." New Directions for Community Colleges, 51 San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass, September, 1985: 37-41.
- Ladewig, Dennis. "Comparison of Governance Effectiveness of Appointed and Elected Boards of Education/Trustees." Unpublished Doctoral Practicum, Nova University, 1981.
- Lewis, Robert L. "Building Effective Trustee Leadership, or How to Exploit Your Trustees." Educational Record, 61 Fall, 1980: 18-21.
- Lombardi, John. "The Trustee's Role in the Evaluation of the President." Trustee Quarterly, Winter, 1981: 15-21.
- Mahoney, James R. ed. 1986 Community, Technical, and Junior College Directory - A Statistical Analysis. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1986.
- Mahoney, James and Daniel D. Savage. Community, Technical, and Junior College Fact Book. Washington D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, January, 1987.
- Martorana, S. V. College Boards of Trustees. Washington, D. C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.
- Martorana, S. V. and Patricia C. Corbett. "State Legislation Affecting Community, Junior, and Two-Year Technical Colleges, 1982." University Park, PA: Center for the Study of Higher Education, June, 1983: 109-15.
- Martorana, S. V. and Eileen Kuhns. "Designing New Structures for State and Local Collaboration." In William L. Deegan and Dale Tillery, eds. Renewing the American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985: 230-9.
- Martorana, S. V. and W. Gary Mcguire. "State Control." Community and Junior College Journal, 48 September, 1976: 8,9,16,17.

- Martorana, S. V. and Wayne D. Smutz. "Twists and Turns of Legislative Intent." Community and Junior College Journal, 50 December/January, 1979-80: 18-21.
- Martorana, S. V. and Wayne D. Smutz. "State Legislation: The Transition to the 80's." 51 March, 1981: 32-6.
- Mayhew, Lewis B. ed. The Carnegie Council on Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973: 98-155.
- McCabe, Robert A. and Suzanne B. Skidmore. "New Concepts for Community Colleges." In George B. Vaughan and Associates, eds. Issues for Community College Leaders in a New Era. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1983: 230-48.
- McKinnon, Anne M. "Keeping Current in Education/Community Needs: A Trustee's View." Trustee Quarterly, 5 Summer, 1981: 21-4.
- McLeod, Marshall W. Patterns of Responsibility: Statutory Requirements of Community Colleges Local Boards of Trustees. Washington, D. C.: Association of Community College Trustees, 1979.
- Millett, John D., et al. Conflict in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1984: 215-60.
- Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Moore, Warren Newton. "Role Perceptions of Public Two-Year College Trustees and Their Perceived Influence in the Internal Affairs of the Colleges Which They Govern." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1977.
- Moore, William Jr. "The Community College Board of Trustees: A Question of Competency." Journal of Higher Education, 44 March, 1973: 171-90.
- Mortimer, Kenneth P. and T. R. McConnell. Sharing Authority Effectively. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- Mt. Hood Community College District Board Position Paper. "Governance for Community Colleges." Gresham, OR, February 4, 1986.

- Mundt, John C. "State vs. Local Control: Reality and Myth Over Concern for Local Autonomy." New Directions for Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978: 49-61.
- National Commission on Trustee Selection. "Trustee Selection Procedures (Public)." AGB Reports, 23 January/February, 1981: 49-52.
- Nelson, Charles A. "The Lay Trustee--Up or Out?" AGB Reports, 14 April, 1972: 6-14.
- Nelson, Charles A. and Frederick Turk, Jr. "Some Facts About Trusteeship." AGB Reports, 16 April, 1974: 3-9.
- Nespoli, N. A. and S. V. Martorana. "Tensions in Defining Community College Missions: Problem or Opportunity?" Community College Review, 2 Spring, 1983-84: 3-11.
- Oregon Administrative Rules. Department of Education, Chapter 581, Divisions 41-43, 1984.
- Oregon Revised Statutes. Volume 2 (passed by the 62nd Legislative Assembly), Legislative Counsel Committee, Chapters 294, 326, 347, 348, October 15, 1983.
- Parnell, Dale. "Community Colleges Care About People." AACJC Letter, December 16, 1986: 3-4.
- Parnell, Dale. The Neglected Majority. Washington, D. C.: Community College Press, 1985: 8-90.
- Pennypacker, Malcolm. "The Role of Board Chairperson." Trustee Quarterly, 1 Winter, 1977: 25-8.
- Perkins, Jeanie. "Board Self Evaluation." Trustee Quarterly, 6 Summer, 1982: 17-9.
- Petty, Gary Frank and William E. Piland. "The Illinois Public Community College Board Members." New Directions for Community Colleges, 51 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, September, 1985: 5-13.
- Potter, George E. Trusteeship: Handbook for Community and Technical Institute Trustees. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees, 1979.

- Pray, Francis C. A New Look At Community College Boards of Trustees and Presidents and Their Relationships. Washington, D.C.: AACJC Publications, 1975.
- Prescott, Robert B. "The Role of the Board of Trustees, the Board Chairman and the Superintendent/President." Trustee Quarterly, 4 Summer, 1980: 21-3.
- Radke, Helen. "Whose Dispute?" Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Washington Trustees Association of Community Colleges, Pasco, Washington, May 6-8, 1982.
- Rauh, Morton A. The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969: 5-9.
- Revised Code of Washington. Title 28B, Higher Education, West Publishing Co., 1984.
- Richardson, Richard C. Jr. "California Community College Governance Project." Paper prepared for the Joint Commission on California Community College Governance, Tempe, Arizona, 1985.
- Richardson, Richard C. Jr., ed. Reforming College Governance. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- Richardson, Richard C., Clyde E. Blocker and Louis W. Bender. Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs: Prentis-Hall, 1972: 36-54.
- Riley, Gary L. and J. Victor Baldrige, eds. Governing Academic Organizations. Berkley: McCutchan Publishing, 1977.
- Roberts, Barbara. "The Political Trustee--A Must." Trustee Quarterly, 6 Spring, 1982: 31-3.
- Roberts, Barbara. "The Power and Politics of State Education Policy." Trustee Quarterly, 5 Spring, 1981: 16-9
- Roderer, Lawrence C. "The Role of the Board of Trustees as Perceived by Presidents and Trustees of Community Colleges in the North Central Region." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Kansas State University, 1976.

- Rush, Peter D. "A Consideration of Trustee Role and a Proposed Trustee In-Service Model." Preliminary Examination, The University of Michigan, 1984.
- Rouche, John E. and George A. Baker. Access and Excellence-The Open Door College. Washington, D.C.: The Community College Press, 1987: 3-9.
- Russock, R. "Community College Trustees." Community College Review, 2 1974: 57-62.
- Sarabin, T. R. and V. L. Allen. "Role Theory." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson, eds. The Handbook of Social Psychology. (2nd ed.). Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1968: 488-562.
- Scheid, Carol. "Our Board Was Caught Short." AGB Reports, 23 November/December, 1981: 31-3.
- Searle, Charles F. ed. Balancing State and Local Control. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Smith, Joshua L. "The Will to Change." AACJC Journal, 57 April/May, 1986: 18-9.
- Smith, G. Milton. A Simplified Guide to Statistics for Psychology and Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. 1970.
- Stauffer, Robert H. "The President's Perspective on Board Evaluation." Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, St. Louis, MO, April 4-7, 1982.
- Stephens, Harrison. "Howard Bowen: A Stateman of Higher Education." AGB Reports, 27 November/December, 1985.
- Tatum, James B. "Active Trusteeship for a Changing Era." New Direction for Community Colleges, 51 San-Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985: 15-9.
- Taylor, Barbara. "Upfront." AGB Reports, 28 July/August, 1986: 2-5.
- Taylor, Terry. "The State Role in Financing Community Colleges: A Model for Improvement." Community College Review, 13 Fall, 1985: 43-50.

- Terry, John N. "The Legislature Doesn't Have Glass Eye." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Washington Trustees Association of Community Colleges, Pasco, WA, May 6-8, 1982.
- Tillery, Dale and James L. Wattenbarger. "State Power in a New Era: Threats to Local Authority." New Directions for Community Colleges, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1985: 5-23.
- Vaughan, George B. The Community College in America: A Short History. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1985.
- Washington Administrative Code. Volume 2, Titles 131-132Y, The Statute Law Committee, 1983.
- Weathersby, George. "Countervailing Forces Affecting Coordination." Change, October, 1980: 18-24.
- Wellman, Fred I. "State Coordination of Locally Controlled Community Colleges." New Directions for Community Colleges. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978: 33-42.
- Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, Boulder, CO. Organization and Governance of Community Colleges. 1985.
- Wheelan, Belle Louise Smith. "An Analysis of the Role Perceptions of Chief Executive Officers and Trustees in Texas Community College Districts." Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Texas, 1984.
- Yamane, Taro. Statistics: An Introductory Analysis. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1964: 139-62.
- Young, Raymond J. and M. Jean Thompson. "A Study of Relationships Between Characteristics of Elected and Appointed Trustees and Their Beliefs." Community/Junior College Quarterly, 8 1982:121-8.
- Zoglin, Mary Lou. Power and Politics in the Community College. Palm Springs, CA: ETC, 1976: 71-95.
- Zoglin, Mary Lou. "Thwarting the Big Bad Wolf." Community and Junior College Journal, 49 October, 1979: 24-5

Zwemer, Diane. "Sources and Information: The Community College Trustee." New Direction for Community Colleges. 51 San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, September, 1985: 14-26.

Zwingle, J. L. "Evolution of Lay Governing Boards." In Richard T. Ingram, ed. Handbook of College and University Trusteeship. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980: 14-26.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE QUESTIONNAIRE

COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE QUESTIONNAIRE

Board Role

1. Listed below are statements related to the role of local community college trustees. Please indicate to what degree you feel you are involved in fulfilling these responsibilities. (Circle one number for each responsibility listed.)

	NOT INVOLVED	NOT TOO INVOLVED	MODERATELY INVOLVED	VERY INVOLVED
a. Setting district policy	1	2	3	4
b. Working with the President	1	2	3	4
c. Engaging in long-range planning	1	2	3	4
d. Monitoring college expenditures	1	2	3	4
<hr/>				
e. Representing community interests and concerns to the college	1	2	3	4
f. Representing college needs and concerns to the community	1	2	3	4
g. Defining the college mission and goals	1	2	3	4
h. Terminating the college president if necessary	1	2	3	4
<hr/>				
i. Approving the college budget	1	2	3	4
j. Obtaining operating revenues for the college (from local community, legislature, etc.)	1	2	3	4
k. Evaluating the president . .	1	2	3	4
l. Assuring that college facilities are maintained . . .	1	2	3	4
<hr/>				
m. Assessing institutional performance	1	2	3	4
n. Engaging in legislative lobbying	1	2	3	4

2. Below are statements that have been made about the role of boards of trustees. Please read the statements and indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of them. (Circle one number for each role listed.)

	STRONGLY DISAGREE	DISAGREE	AGREE	STRONGLY AGREE
a. The governing board should formulate a statement of the basic philosophy for the college district	1	2	3	4
b. An important role of the governing board should be the selection of the chief executive officer	1	2	3	4
c. Budget matters of the college district should be a primary concern of the board	1	2	3	4
d. Responsibility for the management of district property should rest with the board	1	2	3	4
<hr/>				
e. The board should consider the chief executive officer as its advisor regarding district operations	1	2	3	4
f. The board should approve the educational program ..	1	2	3	4
g. The board should work with the community to bring about better understanding of the college's aims and programs	1	2	3	4
h. The board should formally evaluate the chief executive officer on a periodic basis	1	2	3	4
<hr/>				
i. The board should devote time to promoting college programs and services to the community	1	2	3	4
j. The board should have the responsibility for assuring adequate college operating revenues	1	2	3	4
k. The board should inform the college of community needs and concerns	1	2	3	4
l. The board should evaluate the work of the college ...	1	2	3	4

3. Indicate what level of importance you would place on each of the following trustee responsibilities. (Circle one number for each responsibility listed.)

	NOT IMPORTANT	SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT	IMPORTANT	VERY IMPORTANT
a. Deciding on changes in the curriculum	1	2	3	4
b. Communicating needs of the district to state officials	1	2	3	4
c. Establishing district policies	1	2	3	4
d. Evaluating the performance of the chief executive officer	1	2	3	4
<hr/>				
e. Selecting the chief executive officer	1	2	3	4
f. Serving a public relations function for the college ...	1	2	3	4
g. Insuring institutional compliance with state and federal laws and regulations	1	2	3	4
h. Determining if the college district is meeting community needs	1	2	3	4
<hr/>				
i. Approving the annual budget	1	2	3	4
j. Assuring that college facilities are maintained ...	1	2	3	4

3A. Please indicate which one of the trustee responsibilities listed in question 3 (above) is most important, second most important and least important to you? (Put the letter of the responsibilities in the appropriate box.)

MOST IMPORTANT

SECOND MOST IMPORTANT

LEAST IMPORTANT

Personal Demographics

4. How many years have you been a member of your board? (Circle one number)
- 1 LESS THAN TWO YEARS
 - 2 TWO TO FOUR YEARS
 - 3 MORE THAN FOUR YEARS
5. Are you a member of any local community service organization? (Circle one number)
- 1 NO, I AM NOT A MEMBER
 - 2 YES, I AM A MEMBER
6. What is your political affiliation? (Circle one number)
- 1 REPUBLICAN
 - 2 DEMOCRAT
 - 3 INDEPENDENT
 - 4 OTHER _____
7. Are you currently working for pay? (Circle one number)
- 1 NO
 - 2 YES
- 7a. Please indicate the specific kind of work you do: _____
8. In what age group are you? (Circle one number)
- 1 29 OR UNDER
 - 2 30 TO 39
 - 3 40 to 49
 - 4 50 to 59
 - 5 OVER 60
9. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Circle one number)
- 1 HIGH SCHOOL DIPLOMA
 - 2 COLLEGE ATTENDANCE BUT NO DEGREE
 - 3 ASSOCIATE DEGREE
 - 4 BACHELOR'S DEGREE
 - 5 GRADUATE WORK BUT NO DEGREE
 - 6 MASTER'S DEGREE
 - 7 DOCTORATE/PROFESSIONAL DEGREE (MD, JD, ETC.)
 - 8 OTHER
10. What is your ethnic origin? (Circle one number)
- 1 CAUCASIAN
 - 2 HISPANIC
 - 3 BLACK
 - 4 ASIAN
 - 5 AMERICAN INDIAN
 - 6 OTHER _____
11. Are you: (Circle one number)
- 1 MALE
 - 2 FEMALE
12. Which of the following best represents your individual income before taxes in 1986? (Circle one number)
- 1 LESS THAN \$20,000
 - 2 \$20,000 TO \$29,999
 - 3 \$30,000 TO \$39,999
 - 4 \$40,000 TO \$49,999
 - 5 \$50,000 TO \$59,999
 - 6 \$60,000 OR MORE

Please return this completed survey in the enclosed postage paid envelope or mail to:
 Peter D. Boyse, Assistant to the President, Linn-Benton Community College,
 6500 SW Pacific Blvd., Albany, OR 97321.

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PANEL OF EXPERTS THAT
REVIEWED THE TRUSTEE QUESTIONNAIRE

1025 S. Gale
Albany, OR 97321
February 27, 1987

Dr. John Keyser, President
19600 S. Molalla Ave.
Clackamas Community College
Oregon City, OR 97045

Dear John:

Enclosed is a draft copy of the community college trustee survey that I plan to use for my doctoral study. I will be using it to survey all trustees in Oregon and Washington. The purpose of the study is to determine how trustees in locally controlled community college systems (Oregon) and state controlled community college systems (Washington) perceive their roles and how these role perceptions are related to the definition of an effective trustee as defined in the literature. A comparison of these role perceptions will also be made between the two states. The personal characteristics of trustees will be used to determine if they have an effect on role perceptions.

I have reviewed the literature extensively to determine the role components that authorities feel are most essential to the role of an effective trustee. These components are: 1) assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes, 2) select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer, 3) interpret the community interests to the college and college interests to the community, 4) oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities.

There are additional responsibilities cited by the literature but they are essentially an extension of those listed above and do not repeat themselves with the frequency of the above list. The first three sections of the survey are concerned with how trustees view their role and the role of their board in relation to the above list of role components.

Please review this survey for clarity, form and content. Please note any statements and/or questions that are unclear or ambiguous. Make any suggestions for improving the survey. I should note that the final copy will be typeset and should be only four pages long.

Keyser - page 2

I have enclosed a self addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience in returning the survey to me. A timely response would be appreciated. Thank you for serving on my panel of "experts" to review this survey. If you are interested, I will be happy to share the results of this study with you.

Sincerely,

Peter D. Boyse

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO SURVEY PRETESTERS

1025 S. Gale
Albany, OR 97321
March 19, 1987

Mr. Wayne Chambers
32755 Dever-Conner Dr. N.E.
Albany, OR 97321

Dear Wayne:

Enclosed is a copy of the community college trustee survey and cover letter that I plan to use for my doctoral study. I will be surveying all community college trustees in Oregon and Washington. Thank you for agreeing to pre-test this instrument for me.

Please read through the cover letter and survey as though you were actually one of the trustees included in the study. Review the survey for clarity, form and content. Please note any statements and/or questions that are unclear or ambiguous. Make any suggestions for improving the survey. I should note that the final copy will be type-set and should be only four pages long after typesetting.

I have enclosed a self addressed, stamped envelope for your convenience in returning the survey to me. A timely response would be appreciated. Thank you again for pre-testing this survey for me.

Sincerely,

Pete Boyse

APPENDIX D

SUMMARY OF STUDY FOR PRESENTATION TO
COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

PETER D. BOYSE
COMMUNITY COLLEGE TRUSTEE ROLE PERCEPTION STUDY

The purpose of the study is to determine how trustees in locally controlled community college systems (Oregon) and state controlled community college systems (Washington) perceive their roles and how these role perceptions are related to the definition of an effective trustee as defined in the literature. A comparison of these role perceptions will be made between the two states. The personal characteristics of trustees will also be used to determine if they have an effect on role perceptions.

The literature was reviewed extensively in order to define the role components that authorities feel are most essential to the role of an effective trustee. These components are: 1) assure that the college fulfills the purpose for which it was established and evaluate college outcomes, 2) select, evaluate, counsel with, and, if necessary, terminate the chief executive officer, 3) interpret the community interests to the college and college interests to the community, 4) oversee the acquisition, expenditure and investment of funds and management of college facilities. There are additional responsibilities cited by the literature but they are essentially an extension of those listed above and do not repeat themselves with the frequency of the above list.

The first three sections of the survey are concerned with how trustees view their role and the role of their board in relation to the above list of role components. The fourth section provides demographic information on individual trustees.

The survey will be sent to all community college trustees in Oregon and Washington. It should take approximately 10-15 minutes to complete.

APPENDIX E

SURVEY COVER LETTER TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

FROM DR. TOM GONZALES

Office of the President

April 23, 1987

To Oregon and Washington Community
College Presidents

Pete asked me if I would include a note to all Oregon and Washington community college presidents and encourage your cooperation in his effort to analyze another aspect of community college governance. This study will add to the body of knowledge related to trustee effectiveness and help to answer questions on the subject of state vs. local control.

Please encourage your trustees to complete this questionnaire and return it as soon as possible.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Thomas Gonzales
President

TG:mjo

Linn-Benton Community College
6500 S.W. Pacific Blvd., Albany, OR. 97321

APPENDIX F

SURVEY COVER LETTER TO
COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

M E M O

To: Oregon and Washington Community College Presidents

From: Peter D. Boyse, Assistant to the President

Subject: Community College Trustee Questionnaire

Date: April 22, 1987

As I promised earlier, I am sending this memo to inform you that I will be mailing the community college trustee questionnaire to all trustees in the states of Oregon and Washington in a few days. Your trustees should receive the questionnaire two or three days after you receive this letter. I have also enclosed a copy of the questionnaire for your information.

Anything you can do to encourage your trustees to complete the questionnaire and return it to me as soon as possible would be greatly appreciated. I am very grateful for all of the encouragement and assistance that I have received from the Oregon and Washington community college presidents.

If you need further information or have questions regarding this questionnaire, please call me at (503) 967-6100.

encl.

APPENDIX G

SURVEY COVER LETTER TO TRUSTEES



LINN-BENTON
COMMUNITY
COLLEGE

April 21, 1987

To Oregon and Washington Community College Trustees:

Trustees play an extremely important role in assuring the effective governance of community colleges. Understanding the effect of state and locally controlled community college systems on trustee responsibilities continues to be a concern of community college officials.

To assess the impact of community college governance systems on the trustee role, I am surveying all community college trustees in the states of Oregon and Washington. In order that the results will truly represent the attitudes of all Washington and Oregon community college trustees, it is extremely important that each survey be completed and returned. I have discussed this study with all of the community college presidents in Oregon and Washington. Their comments have been both helpful and supportive.

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

The survey should take less than 15 minutes to complete. The results of the research will be made available to community college officials in both Washington and Oregon. If you wish a copy of the results, contact the Oregon Community College Association in Salem or the Washington Trustee Association of Community Colleges in Olympia.

I would be most happy to answer any questions you might have. Please write or call. My telephone number is (503) 967-6100.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Peter D. Boyse
Assistant to the President

PB:nm

Encl.

6500 SW Pacific Blvd. Albany, Oregon 97321-3779 (503)928-2361

APPENDIX H
FOLLOWUP POSTCARD TO TRUSTEES
AND
ACCOMPANYING NOTE TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

April 29, 1987

Last week a questionnaire seeking your attitude about community college trustee responsibilities was mailed to you. This survey was mailed to all community college trustees in the states of Oregon and Washington.

If you have already completed and returned it to me, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because I am relying on a complete response from all Washington and Oregon trustees, it is extremely important that your response also be included in the study.

If by some chance you did not receive the survey, or it got misplaced, please call me right now at (503) 967-6100 and I will get another one to you today.

Sincerely,

Peter D. Boyse
Assistant to the President



Attached is a "reminder" postcard that I recently sent to all trustees who have not returned the survey that was mailed to them on April 21.

If you have not yet had an opportunity to encourage your board to respond, I would appreciate your assistance.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

From the desk of Pete Boyse

APPENDIX I

LETTER SENT TO NONRESPONDING TRUSTEES



LINN-BENTON
COMMUNITY
COLLEGE

PRESIDENT'S OFFICE

May 11, 1987

Mr. John Doe
Generic Community College Board

Three weeks ago I wrote to you seeking your attitude about the responsibilities of community college trustees. As of today I have not received your completed questionnaire.

This research study is being conducted because understanding the effects of state and locally controlled community college systems on trustee responsibilities continues to be a concern of community college officials.

I am writing to you again because each completed questionnaire is extremely important to the usefulness of this study. The Oregon and Washington community college systems were specifically chosen for the study because of the unique similarities and differences of their governance structures. Each community college trustee in both Oregon and Washington has been asked to respond. In order for the results of this study to be truly representative of the attitudes of all Washington and Oregon trustees, it is essential that all trustees return their questionnaire.

In the event that your questionnaire has been misplaced, a replacement is enclosed.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Peter D. Boyse
Assistant to the President

P.S. State officials in both Olympia and Salem have inquired about the results of the study. I hope to have them out within the month.