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Problem

The university board of trustees is the single most important group of the university to guide an institution in fulfilling its goals and objectives. While it may seem that trustees have a grasp of their responsibilities to the institution they serve, it appears that many do not.

This study surveys all who have ever served as trustees of Andrews University in order to: (1) identify characteristics of trustees; (2) determine how trustees of Andrews University perceive/ perceived their role as trustee in relationship to the twelve trustee responsibilities as listed by John Mason; (3) compare the responses

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
of church administrators with those of laymen; and (4) compare the responses of trustees who served from 1961-1970 with those who served from 1971-1980.

Method

The study was based upon data collected from 121 (88 percent) living trustees of Andrews University. A comprehensive two-part questionnaire was sent to each trustee: Part I, biographical and personal information; Part II, responses to 94 items of trustee responsibility and their importance.

Results

Significant findings showed a need for:
1. A means of continuing identification, appraisal, and recommendations for trustee appointments
2. A handbook clearly identifying the role and responsibilities of trustees
3. A program of orientation for all new appointees and a continuing educational program for all trustees
4. Trustees to read material and attend workshops and seminars on trusteeship
5. The formulation of trustee sub-committees
6. Tentative agendas to be sent to trustees prior to meetings
7. Trustees to give more personal support to the University and to help identify and cultivate potential supporters
8. The appointment of fewer ex-officio trustees and more professional laymen
9. Trustees having a better acquaintance with the campus, students, and faculty

10. A document for trustee signatures stating they have no conflict of interest.

Conclusions

While some trustees have a more complete knowledge of trustee responsibilities others are greatly lacking in understanding of trusteeship. An ongoing educational program must be developed to orient trustees to their role and responsibilities. Only then can they serve the University efficiently and effectively.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background Information

Entrance into the uncertain decade of the 80s has meant for university authorities and those interested in university governance a fresh look at the way universities function and make their decisions. One of the areas receiving special attention is that of the board of trustees and its membership. This in itself is no new development but is the continuation of an old conviction from the inception of the board of trustee concept at Harvard University in 1642. In recent years the emphasis on the importance of the trustee and his/her role has grown and investigations have become more specific. In fact, Ingram (1980, p. xiii) states that more has been written on the topic of trustees within the last ten years than was written during the thirty-four previous decades in American higher education!

Since the board of trustees is perceived to be so important, and since it is the individual trustee that gives life and quality to the board of trustees, trusteeship may be best understood and evaluated by looking at the individual trustee's preparation, perceptions, and attitudes.
Many questions determining the effectiveness of boards have arisen. How can one plan for effectiveness? How can one improve effectiveness? How can one turn an ineffective board into an effective one? How can a board that does not have direct administrative control exert such a telling influence on university administrative decision making as men like Herron (1969, p. xv) give one to understand? If one can speak of successful trustees, what are their characteristics? How can one best go about selecting university trustees? Are the responsibilities of trustees of small institutions the same or as important as those in large institutions? With such questions in mind, investigators have approached the search for a better grasp of what trusteeship really involves and how one can better evaluate it.

In order to assess the effectiveness of trustees and boards of trustees, men such as Axelrod, 1977; Blue, 1963; Elliot, 1968; Frantzreb, 1970; Godfrey, 1971; Greenleaf, 1974; Gummere, 1972; Herron, 1969; Hull, 1974; Ingram, 1980; Mage, 1973; Pocock, 1974; Sellinger, 1975; Wicke, 1962; Zwingle, 1975; and others have studied the role of boards of trustees, the characteristics of effective trustees, the responsibilities of trustees and the factors that influence board decisions.

By summarizing the responsibilities of trustees, the following list has been compiled: (1) define purposes and objectives of the institution, (2) determine institutional programs, (3) appoint faculty and staff, (4) maintain physical plant, (5) approve purchase of equipment, (6) approve budget and provide necessary finance for
operation, (7) interpret institution to the public, (8) evaluate the institution, (9) elect the president, (10) terminate the president, (11) deal with major problems, (12) provide new facilities, (13) serve as court of last appeal, (14) stimulate change, (15) provide governance, (16) set salaries, (17) establish priorities, (18) delegate authority, (19) provide inspiration and spiritual love, and (20) negotiate major sales and purchases (Axelrod, 1977, p. 3; Burgess, 1958, pp. 399, 400; Elliot, 1908, pp. 6, 7, 30; Fraley, 1971, p. 1; Godfrey, 1971, p. 34; Hammill, 1971, pp. 1-4; Hull, 1974, pp. 534, 535; Rauh, 1969, pp. 2, 6-9; Sellinger, 1975, p. 73; Yenerich, n.d.; Zwingle, 1975, p. 9).

Those responsibilities most frequently mentioned were:
(1) define purposes and objectives of the institution, (2) determine institutional programs, (3) approve the budget and provide necessary finances for operation, and (4) elect the president.

Regarding the roles of trustees in different types of institutions, Nason (1974, p. 13) found that the precise role of governing boards varies from one type of institution to another requiring each board to work out its own formula and mandate.

Zwingle (1975, p. 4) also found that in higher education today there is not only a considerable range in types of institutions but also in size and composition of boards. There is also more diversity among trustees of different types of institutions than commonly supposed. However, according to Zwingle, the difference is more apparent than real. "The difference in scale may require a different approach, but the essential problems are more alike than many people are ready to admit" (Ibid.).
In light of the need for a clearer understanding of trustee responsibility, the Carnegie Corporation of New York made a grant in 1973 to the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), a major organization dedicated to trustee leadership and publication, to conduct an in-depth study of effective trusteeship.

Dr. Nason was invited to direct the study. The purpose of the study as stated by Nason (1974) in the preface

Convinced that the American pattern of lay trustees would continue, that many boards were not doing an adequate or effective job, and that the responsibilities of trustees would become more complex and more important, the AGB Commission on the Future "entered into this assignment with an open mind and a generous mandate tied neither to the past nor to present activities, but instructed to assess the roles trustees now play and will play in the future in both member and non-member institutions and to recommend a program of assistance."

Two independent lines of inquiry were begun.

One consisted of a systematic national survey of governing boards to determine as far as possible what actual factors had a favorable or unfavorable effect on arriving at board decisions, what characteristics trustees considered necessary for effective board operation, and what forms of assistance would enable trustees to be more effective. . . .

. . . A second line of inquiry focused on a series of essays in which thoughtful experienced representatives of the different categories of institutions were invited to explore and predict the future role and responsibilities of trustees. (Ibid.)

As a result of the study on trustee responsibility Nason published a document entitled Trustee Responsibility (1980). This document is generally accepted as an authoritative piece of research and has for many become a standard guideline on trustee responsibility. He lists twelve responsibilities that are common to all types of institutions and to all trustees (pp. 2-11).
1. To appoint the president
2. To support the president
3. To assess the president's performance
4. To clarify the mission
5. To approve long-range plans
6. To approve the educational program
7. To insure financial solvency
8. To maintain the physical plant
9. To preserve institutional autonomy
10. To enhance the public image
11. To serve as a court of appeal
12. To assess their own performance

These then can be reasonable parameters within which one can test for the effective of trustees.

As far as can be determined, no previous study on effective trusteeship at Andrews University has been made. Neither is there evidence of an orientation or educational program for trustees of Andrews University.

There is a very real need to know more about the members of the Andrews University board of trustees with the view to determine their perceptions of the responsibilities of trustees and how they fill their role. With this objective in mind this particular study was undertaken using the basic conclusions that the areas of trustee responsibility as developed by Nason are an acceptable criteria and therefore a valid norm for the study of Andrews University Trustees.

**Statement of the Problem**

Ideally all trustees should have a thorough grasp of their responsibilities and the institution they serve. Ideally trustees of Andrews University should have a clear-cut understanding of Andrews University as an educational institution of higher education and its mission, goals, plans and objectives. Realistically few
boards of trustees reach the ideal. It appears that the trustees of Andrews University do not have a clear-cut understanding of trusteeship or trustee responsibility as listed by John W. Nason (1980) an accepted authority on trustee responsibility when there is no planned program to provide trustee orientation or education.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study was to:

1. Identify the characteristics of Andrews University trustees including demographic information regarding age, education, profession, political views, trustee preparation, contribution record, and trustee participation.

2. Determine how trustees of Andrews University perceive/perceived their role in relationship to the twelve trustee responsibilities listed by Nason (1980).


4. Compare the responses of those whose primary profession was/is ecclesiastical or church administration with other trustees.

5. Gather and analyze data and suggest for review, consideration, and possible adaptation a plan of orientation for trustees to their responsibilities.

**Questions To Be Answered**

1. Is there a magnitude difference between the way church administration and non-church administration (laymen) view/viewed their trustee responsibilities as listed by Nason?
2. Is there a magnitude difference between the way trustees who served between 1961-1970 and those who served between 1971-1980 view/viewed their responsibilities as listed by Nason?

**Delimitation of the Study**

The institution that is known today as Andrews University was incorporated as Emmanuel Missionary College on July 28, 1910. The name was changed to Andrews University when three educational institutions merged on November 23, 1960: Emmanuel Missionary College, the School of Graduate Studies, and the Seventh-day Adventist Theological Seminary. Prior to that date each institution had its own board of trustees. With the establishment of Andrews University one board of trustees was elected.

This study is limited to the 154 trustees who have served Andrews University since the merger in 1960.

**Limitations**

There are five major limitations which are recognized in the design of this investigation. First, it is recognized that the use of a questionnaire limits the depth of questions that can be asked. Second, it is recognized that in the case of a questionnaire there is a possibility that a trustee queried gave responses which he/she deemed to be appropriate in lieu of his/her true opinions about the statements contained in the questionnaire. Third, it is recognized that in gathering data by a questionnaire there is the possibility of a misunderstanding of the questions or a trustee placing his/her own interpretation on the questions. Fourth, it is recognized that mailed
questionnaires are subject to less than 100 percent returns and that those not returned might have an effect on the study. However, there is reason to believe that this limitation was overcome due to the high percentage of returns from the 137 trustees (88 percent). Fifth, because no previous study on board trusteeship at Andrews University exists, the evaluation of the findings had to be done on face value, using the priorities of other investigators, especially Nason (1980).

**Definition of Terms**

**Administration.** Considered to mean the "executive administration" or the "executive management" of an institution.

**Board of Trustees.** A group of individuals in whom rests the legal responsibilities for determining policy and governance of an institution of higher education.

**Church Administrator.** An individual who is employed by the Seventh-day Adventist church whose main responsibility is church administration.

**Laymen.** Individuals who are not classified as church administrators, e.g., businessmen, educators, physicians, etc.

**Magnitude Difference.** A four or more numerical difference in the CATSCALE value when comparing church administrators and laymen or trustees from 1961-70 and trustees from 1971-80.

**Policy.** A general rule or principle or statement of intent or direction that provides guidance to administrators in reaching decisions with respect to matters entrusted to their care.

**President.** The chief executive officer of an institution of higher education entrusted with the overall guidance as well as the
implementation and administration of the institution's policies.

Private Institution. A university or college whose legal control is vested in a private corporation, group, or individual.

Role. A pattern or type of behavior which an individual exhibits in terms of what has been prescribed for his/her particular job; behavior which he/she perceives to be appropriate and correct; behavior which others expect of him/her.

Trustee. An individual member of a governing board or board of trustees whose authority may be exercised only as a voting member of the board in session or as specifically authorized by the Board of Trustees.

Assumptions of the Study

It was assumed that:

1. The persons responding to the research instruments were capable and willing to express their beliefs, opinions, and feelings.

2. The instrument as designed would be able to give a reasonable indication of the extent of a trustee's views of his/her responsibilities.

3. The way church administrators view their trustee responsibilities will be different from the way laity view their trustee responsibilities.

4. There will be a difference in the way trustees serving between 1961-1970 and trustees serving between 1971-1980 view their trustee responsibilities.
Design of the Study

Selection of the Population

One hundred fifty-four individuals have served as trustees of Andrews University since 1961. All 154 were used as a basis for the study. Eleven could not be contacted due to death (9) and unknown location (2).

Procedure

A questionnaire (see Appendix A) was developed and administered between the months of June and August 1981 to all living trustees that could be located (143). Letters of explanation and endorsement were sent with each questionnaire.

Treatment of the Data

The collected data were compared on the basis of:

1. The answers given by church administration and laity who served as trustees between 1961-1980.

2. The answer given by trustees who served between the years 1971-1980

A detailed description of the analysis of the data is given in Chapter III of this study.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I presents background information, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, questions to be answered, delimitation of the study, limitations, definition of terms, assumptions of the study, design of the study, and the organization of the study.

Chapter II contains the review of the literature.
Chapter III deals with the details of the population selection, the instrument, and the collection of data.

Chapter IV gives an analysis of the findings, and Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction
The nature of this investigation requires a basic understanding of the role and responsibility of trustees.

An endeavor has been made to survey the significant literature on this topic. The review of the literature is divided into thirteen sections.

The first part deals with an overview of trustee responsibility. The twelve subsequent sections are based on Mason's twelve trustee responsibilities. This seemed a natural organization inasmuch as this study deals specifically with his listing.

Responsibilities of Trustees

More has been written within the past ten years about the role and responsibilities of trustees, regents, curators, overseers, visitors, and governors of colleges and universities than was written during thirty-four previous decades in American higher education (Ingram, 1980, xiii).

Ingram states that "If trustees are to function as effective overseers of change during the 1980's, they will need to be alert to certain key trends and new dilemmas that will differentiate this decade from the 1960's and 1970's" (Ibid., p. 2).
The job of the trustee, according to Gummere, is no longer just another pleasant assignment to be taken on as a good-will gesture and nothing more. Trusteeship today "can be demanding, it can be perplexing," but it is also an opportunity to provide "vigorous, intelligent, and constant support to the administration of a college or university" (Gummere, 1972, p. 60). Gummere further states:

... the day has passed when any trustee goes from one meeting to the next without having performed some service to his school. It is a pleasure and an honor to serve a school as trustee, but these days it is a responsibility which is often time consuming and sometimes onerous. (Ibid., p. 59)

Others have also similarly described the new role of the trustee. "No longer is trusteeship just an honor. It is hard work or should be if the board is operational" (Frantzreb, 1970, p. 2).

Trusteeship is one of the most demanding and time consuming of avocations, but it is one of the most rewarding as well, for it repays the individual not in dollars but in even rarer stuff—the gratitude of the community and the inner peace that comes from voluntary public service given freely for the benefit of man. (Letourneau, The Volunteer Board Member in Philanthropy, 1968, p. 18)

Charles W. Elliot, former president of Harvard University, once described the role of the college and university trustee as "less that of a custodian than that of a builder" (Wicke, 1962, p. 18).

In higher education today there is not only a considerable range in types of institutions but also in size and composition of boards. In addition, there may seem to be a great diversity among trustees of different types of institutions. However, according to Zwingle, the difference is more apparent than real. "The difference in scale may require a different approach, but the essential problems
are more alike than many people are ready to admit" (Zwingle, 1975, p. 4).

Some definitions have been brief and few in number, e.g., "The ancient dictum of a Harvard president was that the trustees' job was to 'appoint the president and see that the bills are paid'" (Axelrod, 1977, p. 3). One of the most widely quoted responses to trustee responsibilities is that of Charles Coolidge: "In short [the trustee] should see that the university is run well by someone else and not to do it [himself]" (Rauh, 1969, p. 3). Since the board of trustees is a legislative body its main role, according to Yenerich, is to establish policy (n.d., p. 6). The basic duties of trustees of colleges and universities according to Burgess are three: (1) select the president, (2) together with the president declare the principal objectives and policies of the institution, and (3) be the repositories of funds and property of the university (Burgess, 1958, pp. 399, 400).

Fraley believes that no trustee should accept his position as trustee without the intention of carrying out his full responsibilities. These are: (1) formulation and control of institutional policy, (2) appointment of the president and providing him full cooperation in administration, (3) acquisition and investment of financial resources, (4) inspiration, motivation, and spiritual resources (Fraley, 1971, p. 1). Richard Hammill in discussing the functions of the board of trustees at a meeting of trustees and faculty presented four trustee functions: (1) "First and foremost the board of trustees is to establish the objectives of the university and to see that these objectives are met." (2) "A second major objective of the board of trustees is
to establish the priorities within the university, to see the direction of the university, to provide financing for its continued operation and for its growth." (3) "Another major function of the board of trustees is to represent the aspiration of the university to the supporting constituents and to serve as a protective buffer between the university and the constituents..." (4) Another function of the board is to "delegate authority for achieving the objectives of the university to other persons..." (Hammill, 1971, pp. 1, 2)

Lists have been formulated enumerating trustee responsibilities. For the purpose of this study a composite list of twenty responsibilities has been compiled from eleven authors: (1) define purposes and objectives, (2) determine institutional programs, (3) appoint faculty and staff, (4) maintain physical plant, (5) approve purchase of equipment, (6) approve budget and provide necessary finances for operation, (7) interpret institution to the public, (8) evaluate the institution, (9) elect the president, (10) terminate the president, (11) deal with major problems, (12) provide new facilities, (13) serve as court of last appeal, (14) stimulate change, (15) provide governance, (16) set salaries, (17) establish priorities, (18) delegate authority, (19) provide inspiration and spiritual love, and (20) negotiate major sales and purchases (Axelrod, 1977, p. 3; Burgess, 1958, pp. 399, 400; Elliot, 1908, pp. 6, 7, 30; Fraley, 1971, p. 1; Godfrey, 1971, p. 34; Hammill, 1971, pp. 1-4; Hull, 1974, pp. 534, 535; Rauh, 1969, pp. 2, 6-9; Sellinger, 1975, p. 73; Yenerich, n.d.; Zwingle, 1975, p. 9).

Those responsibilities most frequently mentioned were: (1) define purposes and objectives, (2) determine institutional
programs, (3) approve the budget and provide necessary finances for operation, and (4) elect the president.

In order to function effectively, a trustee must not only understand the responsibilities of a trustee but must also understand the role and function of higher education in society. Burns states that most educators would summarize that role or function in five parts.

1. Repository of knowledge (through its library, museum, professors, etc.)

2. Discoverer of new knowledge (through its research experimentation, codification, etc.)

3. Dispenser of knowledge (through its teaching, counseling, guiding, etc.)

4. Provider of community service (through its clinics, conferences, area studies, etc.)

5. Promoter of world understanding (through the above four functions, plus its exchange of students and faculty with foreign institutions). (Burns, 1966, pp. 133, 134)

To these the Christian institution must add a sixth role or function:

True education means more than the pursual of a certain course of study. It means more than a preparation for the life that now is. It has to do with the whole being and with the whole period of existence possible to man. It is the harmonious development of the physical, the mental and the spiritual powers. It prepares the students for the joy of service in this world, and for higher joy of wider service in the world to come. (White, 1903, p. 13)

Burns further states that "Armed with an understanding of the function of higher education generally and his institution particularly, the trustee can better comprehend what is expected of him and govern sympathetically, wisely and justly" (Burns, 1966, p. 134).
There is no greater experience that can be offered to a citizen of this country than to guide the destiny of higher education (Herron, 1969, p. xvi).

It has been previously stated that this study is based on the study commissioned by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges and that the twelve trustee responsibilities as listed by John W. Nason are used as the norm for this research.

To Appoint the President

According to Ruml and Morrison (1959) the president of a liberal college is the "chief executive" of the institution and at the same time is the "highest personal symbol of the college--to the public generally, and specifically to the alumni and parents, to the officers and trustees of other educational institutions, to legislative and other public bodies" (p. 4).

It is essential then that the right man be chosen as president. Selecting a president is often considered to be the most critical action of a board of trustees (Blue, 1963; Burgess, 1958; Burns, 1966; Godfrey, 1971; Herron, 1969; Mage, 1973; Rauh, 1964; Wicke, 1962). This choice is important for several reasons: (1) It is important that trustees see that the university is run well by someone else and not try to run it themselves (Wicke, 1962, p. 22). (2) The influence of the president upon his or her own institution and then the cumulative influence of all institutions of higher education make it imperative for the selection of the finest possible college or university president (Burns, 1966, p. 134). (3) The source of institutional energy is most probably in the central administration of any institution.
--if not in the person of the president, then in the combination of persons has chosen to comprise the administrative team (Zwingle, 1976, p. 33). (4) It is the president who must lead or provide for leadership (Zwingle, 1976, p. 33). (5) A strong president attracts a strong board. Nothing is more important to a president or to a college or university than a truly effective board (Zwingle, 1976, p. 33).

Regarding the importance of a university president Hesburgh (1979) quotes from the 1963 Godkin Lectures at Harvard presented by Clark Kerr. Hesburgh best described the difficulties facing a president.

The university president in the United States is expected to be a friend of the students, a colleague of the faculty, a good fellow with the alumni, a sound administrator with the trustees, a good speaker with the public, an astute bargainer with the foundations and the federal agencies, a politician with the state legislature, a friend of industry, labor, and agriculture, a persuasive diplomat with donors, a champion of education generally, a supporter of the professions (particularly law and medicine), a spokesman to the press, a scholar in his own right, a public servant at the state and national levels, a devotee of opera and football equally, a decent human being, a good husband and father, an active member of a church. Above all, he must enjoy traveling in airplanes, eating his meals in public, and attending public ceremonies. . . .

He should be firm, yet gentle; sensitive to others, insensitive to himself; look to the past and the future, yet be firmly planted in the present; both visionary and sound; affable, yet reflective; know the value of a dollar and realize that ideas cannot be bought; inspiring in his visions, yet cautious in what he does; a man of principle, yet able to make a deal; a man with broad perspective who will follow the details conscientiously; a good American, but ready to criticize the status quo fearlessly, a seeker of truth where the truth may not hurt too much; a source of public policy pronouncements when they do not reflect on his own institution. He should sound like a mouse at home and look like a lion abroad. He is one of the marginal men in a democratic society--of whom there are many others--on the margin of many groups, many ideas, many endeavors, many characteristics. He is a marginal man, but at the very center of the total process. (p. 4)
There is no formal or universally prescribed way in which presidents of institutions are chosen. The process usually depends upon the constitution and traditions of the particular institution (Burgess, 1958, p. 400). Since this is the most important responsibility of a board there should be a written policy with procedural guidelines and this should be done prior to the time the board is faced with the responsibility to select and hire a president (Mage, 1973, p. 15).

Mage (p. 16) further presents the following general principles for the process of selecting a college or university president.

1. Establish a presidential screening committee
2. Select a screening committee which represents all segments of the campus community and the college district
3. Limit the size of the screening committee. A minimum of seven members or a maximum of fifteen
4. Define the duties and responsibilities of the screening committee and the board of trustees. The committee and the board should operate in strict confidence
5. Train committee members for the task
6. Establish a budget
7. Provide a time schedule
8. Announce the position
9. Provide the candidates with the latest institution information
10. Research the candidates
11. Interview in depth the final candidates as an entire board
12. Establish evaluative criteria for use by the board and screening committee
13. Hold interviews with persons other than the candidates
14. Meet and interview the spouses

Many checklists have been devised to aid in the selection of a college or university president. The list according to Burns (1966, pp. 135, 136) is representative of most lists. He says the candidate must have (1) a sound education, preferably culminating in one or more earned doctor's degrees; (2) some training in a scholarly discipline, in pedagogy, and in administration; (3) experience as a faculty member and an administrator, hopefully in higher education; (4) done some travel, research, and writing; (5) a pleasing appearance, temperament, and personality and be vigorous and in sound health; (6) a well-rounded grasp of the world situation, education, generally, and higher education, specifically; (7) the leadership skills of being able to address, influence, and secure action from both large and small groups; (8) personal integrity, moral strength, good will, and an optimistic outlook; and (9) the ability to be a "man of management" as well as a "man of learning." In addition, (10) he should want the job.

Rauh (1960) adds another factor that should be considered—the candidate's wife.

The wife plays a vital role on the campus in the heavy schedule of entertaining, as well as the role she chooses to take in the activities of the surrounding community. She must also establish and maintain relationships with the faculty and their wives, with trustees, with prospective donors, and with students and their parents. In all of this she has an important influence in establishing the nature of the presidency. (p. 15)

Wicke (1957) adds that in choosing a president the committee "ought never to allow itself to be hurried into a nomination,—nor ought the committee allow itself to be pressured by any group to
nominate anyone's 'favorite' candidate" (pp. 28, 29). Wicke further states that the nature of the person to be sought as president should be determined to a degree by answering such questions as:

1. What is the present position of the college in relation to the constituency, clientele and the academic world in general?

2. What particular emphases are needed by the institution both for the immediate future and for long range development?

3. Where may the appropriate person be found to meet these demands--on the campus of the college itself, or another campus, or in some different field of endeavor?

All of this means that different types of presidents may be needed at difficult times in the life of the institution. (p. 28)

To Support the President

The board appoints and the board may dispose of the president but while in office the president deserves the full support of the board. There will be differences, shortcomings, and weaknesses, but this is "family interchange" and should be so held unless the performance of the president reaches a point where formal action by the board is required (Pocock, 1974, p. 4).

Pocock further states the board must remember their evaluation of the president's performance "must retain a broad long-range view. The president's job is multi-faceted, demanding, and runs 24 hours, seven days a week" (Pocock, 1974, p. 4). Everything simply cannot be done at once and priorities must be set.

Administrative leadership is subjected to great pressures from diverse forces--from faculty and staff, from the community, from professional groups, from unions, and many more. To withstand this pressure requires strong qualities
in the administrators selected and just as much support as can be mustered in their behalf by the trustees. (Robbins, 1974, p. 2)

In discussing the support of the president Mason (1980) states:

The president is pulled and buffeted by conflicting expectations and demands,—the president will need constant support and encouragement of the trustees, not just because he or she is their agent with the responsibility of carrying out their wishes, but also because they, like the president, have the well-being of the whole institution, and not just part of it, as their concern. (p. 2)

The president is in constant danger of becoming everybody's target. He or she is seen often as the adversary of faculty, students, alumni donors, and even trustees. Success of the president depends on maintaining a constructive relationship with all groups including the board. The academic president is essentially different from that of other corporate executives. It is more comparable to a political role than corporate administration. He or she persuades rather than executes (Zwingle, 1975, p. 23).

To provide effective support the board must give the president the necessary administrative backing needed to carry out the approved program (Mason, 1980, p. 2). It must also show concern for the health and effectiveness of the president, keeping a watchful eye on his or her physical and emotional well-being, keeping a watchful eye for signs of exhaustion, insisting on adequate vacations and holidays, and providing time for relaxation and reflection (Ingram, 1980, p. 30).

To Assess the President's Performance

Closely related to the role of the board in the appointment and support of a president is the responsibility of keeping a constant watch on the quality and performance of his or her administration
(Ingram, 1980, p. 30). The responsibility of the board cannot end with a presidential choice and appointment. There must be a constant re-evaluation of the president and the president's administration (Blue, 1963, p. 280). Nason adds that the board has not only the right but the "obligation to make sure that its policies are being faithfully carried out" (Nason, 1980, p. 3).

As chief executive officer of a university or college, the president is the "highest personal symbol of the college...." It is the president's responsibility, therefore, to carry out the decisions of the trustees and to "reflect in tangible and intangible ways the ambitions of the trustees for the performance and service of the college" (Ruml & Morrison, 1959, pp. 4, 5).

The president cannot make the trustees do anything; ... He can, however, cause these people to do a great deal, and if he is a good president, he does; but whether he does or not depends on their daily vote of confidence. (Kenney, 1959, p. 430)

The importance of evaluating the president is interestingly expressed by Rauh:

In the course of discussing the trustee's relationships with the president, a highly experienced regent of a large state university was asked what importance he placed upon the board's function in evaluating the president's performance. "Why," he replied, "the first item on every agenda should be whether to fire the president." By this colorful overstatement he was making plain his view that evaluation is not only an essential duty but a continuing one. (Rauh, 1969, p. 22)

Although the obligations of a board of trustees to evaluate the quality of management of a president may not differ in principle from the similar task of the corporate board of directors evaluating the chief executive officer, the job of the college trustees is much more difficult.
Corporate management has certain objectives: volume of sales, net profit, percent of market, technological development. Achievement can be measured in concrete terms— not so the college. The essential activity of the university takes place in the minds of men—the ideas produced by the scholar's intellect and their communication to the minds of students are not susceptible to comparison with fixed standards. (Ibid.)

Zwingle points out that in the 1970s the evaluation of presidents was becoming a matter of increasing interest and that efforts to evaluate be "reasonable and realistic" was important. This observation can be appropriately carried into the 1980s. Just as board members "cannot embody all the virtues," neither can presidents. Zwingle further states that there are

... two clear but elusive standards for evaluation of presidents: (1) whether the office is being conducted according to understanding reached at the time of appointment; (2) whether the balance of the institution is maintaining vitality. (1975, p. 24)

In evaluating the president, trustees must not expect perfection, "just competent effort and honest accounting of stewardship" (Hesburgh, 1979, p. 10). Hesburgh further states that trustees should expect of the president "Honesty and clarity of purpose, even when the trustees may not agree. Disagreement there often may be between a president and his trustees, but never deceit." Another point Hesburgh makes is that "the president must resist when trustees interfere in the administration, attempting to govern rather than insure good government. ... A spirit of confidence on the part of a president begets confidence on the part of trustees." Blue makes the same point: "Trustees should not manage the school, but they should be sure it is being satisfactorily managed" (1963, p. 280).
In evaluating the president, trustees need to be mindful that they are also evaluating themselves, both as to judgment in the original appointment and in their own performance during the tenure of the president (Zwingle, 1975, p. 24).

Evaluating the president must be taken seriously; it should be continual and not just at a time crises (Rauh, 1969, p. 23).

When a president can no longer measure up to what is expected he or she must be removed. This, too, is the responsibility of the trustees (Robbins, 1974, p. 2).

**To Clarify the Mission**

"...One of the disruptive forces in higher education today is confusion of purposes. Institutions cannot be all things to all people" (Nason, 1974, p. 17). It is essential for each institution to decide its mission. In failing to do so it will lose its sense of direction and will not be able to accomplish its maximum.

Every college was created for one or more specific purposes. Some were created to provide liberal education; others technical-vocational education. Some stress graduate education and research; others are basically undergraduate or teacher oriented. Some are regional, others national or international in scope. Some are religious oriented or private, others state operated or public.

The first thing an institution needs to do to start on a conspicuously higher course is to state clearly where it wants to go, whom it wants to serve, and how it expects those who serve directly, as well as society at large, to benefit from the service. Unless these are clearly stated, an institution cannot approach its optimum performance. (Greenleaf, 1974, p. 25)
"Francis C. Pray, management consultant, suggests that one way of taking a fresh look at the mission of an institution is to ask what difference it would make if the institution in existence ceased to exist" (cited in Nason, 1974, p. 17). In this day of dwindling resources each university and college should be able to justify its existence in terms of contributions to society (Nason, 1980, p. 4).

The formulation of a statement of mission and clarification of purpose should be a joint enterprise involving trustees, faculty, and administration. The major burden of articulating a statement of mission lies with the faculty and the administration, since they are the professionals and know what teaching and scholarship is all about. However,

For the most part faculty members are not much concerned with the broader aspects of educational purpose; their attention is understandably focused on their own field of teaching and research, and they become exercised over ultimate goals only when institutional purposes interfere with their work. Presidents and deans, who are concerned with the larger issues of education, are likely to be so preoccupied with the immediate problems of institutional life that they postpone consideration of what may be the more important but seemingly less urgent issues.

The board should not try

... to write such a statement of mission, but it should insist that administrative officers, faculty, and others do so. The board can then approve the statement, draft its own version for consideration by faculty and administration or send it back for revisions. (Ibid.)

In a time when there is so much flux in higher education, purposes of an institution ought to be reviewed and clarified periodically. It is the responsibility of the board of trustees to see that this is done, that there is a clear statement of purpose "in writing to which every trustee can honestly subscribe and that every
faculty member will recognize as setting the direction of the institution" (Nason, 1974, p. 18).

Speaking to a group of church administrators and college presidents of the Seventh-day Adventist church, Robert Gale, president of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (1977), stated:

I said in a speech . . . to all the public trustees in the State of Pennsylvania that I thought that the institution that did not have a well-defined, well-thought-out, well-stated mission is not going to survive in the nineteen eighties. You all have this advantage of knowing what your mission is, and you ought to be sure you state it and state it well.

The mission or purpose of Andrews University as stated in the Andrews University Working Policy and Faculty Handbook is to

1. Establish and provide quality education in the arts, sciences, vocational, pre-profession, and professional education for the youth of the Seventh-day Adventist church.

2. Maintain a campus environment favorable for the spiritual, intellectual, social and physical development of students.

3. Encourage students to dedicate themselves to the service of God and humanity and to prepare themselves for such service in the church.

4. Inculcate moral principles and ethical behavior patterns of the Christian faith as understood by the Seventh-day Adventist church.

5. Serve as a center where teachers and students can engage in the "joint pursuit, discovery, evaluation, organization and dissemination of knowledge . . . ."
6. Help students live creatively, responsibly, and achieve personal fulfillment in contributing to society and to the church.

7. Serve as a training and research center for the world-wide activities of the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

To Approve Long-Range Plans

Long-range plans are the strategies for achieving the missions of the institution. There is no question of the importance of such planning. However, "... pressure of immediate problems has deflected many administrative teams from drawing up long-range plans. ... In a period of declining resources, however, the need for long-term projections becomes all the more urgent" (Nason, 1980, pp. 4, 5).

One of the most serious oversights in higher education has been the lack of adequate planning for the future. Until there is such planning, and until it is translated into a "blue print for tomorrow," even the best development plans are severely limited. (Burns, 1966, p. 125)

Any effort by a board of trustees toward self-study, renewal, goal setting, and change without a direct relationship to institutional self-study, renewal and long-range planning, is an exercise in "perpetual motion." Self-study and long-range planning today is an art of administration (Frantzreb, 1970, pp. 3, 4).

Long-range planning for colleges and universities is a complex and important area but is very difficult to deal with both in concept and in actual practice. It is little wonder then that it is seldom done or is done poorly. Too often colleges and universities have reacted to internal and external influences and pressures in the absence of carefully developed plans and have wasted both physical and financial resources (Inman, 1971, p. 1).
The responsibility of drafting long-range plans is not that of the board of trustees but of the administration. The board's responsibility is to see that it is done in terms which they can approve (Ingram, 1980, p. 35). According to Stuhr (1977),

"Whether we call it an academic blueprint, an educational long-range plan or a master plan for institutional advancement, what we are talking about is a program of action to achieve the highest destinies of our colleges and universities. (p. 31)"

He further states that

"... planning is genuine, and not done just as a backdrop for fund raising, ... planning is concerned with ideas and ideals, rather than dollars, ... planning is done by the entire institution—not just the administration. ... Each project in the blueprint is related to the meaning of the institution as a whole. ... An academic blueprint is an expression of the elements which make up a college or university—people, courses, buildings, programs—put together in a logical way to show where the institution has been, where it stands now, where it should go, and what it will take to get there. (Ibid.)"

Inman (1971) lists five of what may be considered the most important elements of planning:

- Establishing goals and objectives both in broad terms and then more specifically within those parameters
- Designing the programs needed to accomplish objectives and reach goals
- Ensuring the actual benefits—in cost and other terms—to be derived from achievement of goals
- Reviewing and modifying plans to fit the changing social and educational environment
- Involving, to the greatest extent practical, the people who are directly concerned in formulating plans for their areas.
(Inman, 1971, p. 1)

Burns (1966) also states: "Once made, long-term plans should be received and revised; the blueprint should, like the budget, be considered a flexible guide" (p. 125).
To Approve the Educational Program

It has been the conventional practice in the twentieth century that trustees are responsible for the finances, physical plant, and community relations of an institution and should leave the business of education to the administration and faculty. Regarding this Nason states "this is nonsense" (1980, p. 5). He emphasizes that if the ultimate mission and long-range plans are the responsibilities of the trustees and if the educational program is a vital part of an academic institution, then the trustees must be ultimately responsible for the educational program. He reasons further, How can the trustees approve a budget and buildings and grounds if they do not know what they will be used for and have not had some say in the matter?

Contemporary education is not static. It is ever changing, and to keep pace with these constant changes it must be modified frequently to play its role adequately. The board of trustees, to be effective and to fulfill their responsibilities, must be aware of what is happening, what is being done, and what should be done, and be willing to take appropriate actions (Burns, 1966, p. 88).

Gunner (1972) also states: "Know that in today's world there is an immense amount of shifting about. . . . It is up to trustees to understand how times do change" (p. 60).

"The academic institution has one primary function, the education of students. The functions of research and public service are accepted as secondary" (Zwingle, 1975, p. 25). This being the case, trustees need to exercise their rights and obligations by formulating educational policies under which the institution operates and then keep close contact with the academic program (Burns, 1966, p. 88).
Ruml (1959, p. 6) makes a similar point:

The teaching program of a liberal college is not, and cannot be, a matter for determination by each individual member of a faculty. . . . The program leading to the degree is the curriculum, and for this, too, the trustees are responsible, . . . the responsibility remains with the trustees who have the degree awarding power.

Trustee members are generally more objective about institutional programs than most faculty or staff. Burns (1966, p. 88) lists six reasons for this:

1. They are off-campus and in community
2. They are not involved in the day-to-day operation
3. They see the total institutional program, not a single part
4. They are laymen or generalists without allegiance to a scholarly discipline or department
5. They know the needs (occupational and professional) of the community
6. They know the public sentiment and reaction to the institution and its programs.

Therefore,

. . . trustees are in a favorable position to ask pertinent questions, make practical proposals, argue for sound perspectives, and decide upon policies that react to the best interests of the institution, the community, and the persons involved. (Ibid., pp. 88, 89)

Two cautions should be noted with regard to the board's responsibility for educational programs.

First, while the board has the final authority, it should listen very carefully to the recommendations of the president. . . . The president was selected for his or her competence as a professional educator. Presidents are not infallible, and they sometimes barge off in the wrong direction. Most of them, however, know more about education in general and the institution in particular than does the average trustee or regent, their actions should be supported unless they are clearly wrong. Second, trustees should not meddle with the curriculum. The courses to be taught and their content are the responsibility of the faculty. Trustees may decide for or against a department of music. Having decided for it, they should leave the decision on what should be taught to the faculty. (Ingram, 1980, p. 37)
Bell (1956, pp. 353-61) offers a similar argument. Trustees cannot abdicate all concern with educational matters—they have the right—and in fact the duty—to determine what kind of education shall be offered. . . . But once overall policy is decided it ought to be true that the educational experts should determine how the policy is to be implemented.

It is the common custom for trustees to assign to faculties the process of admission, methods and limits of instruction, the daily routine of the classroom, the administration of a particular discipline, and the immediate operation and supervision of academic life. "Trustees should never interfere with matters once consigned to a faculty by statute or custom, unless in the way of inquiry or informal suggestion, or exercise any powers delegated to a faculty" (Elliot, 1908, p. 31).

The preceding being the case, it is essential that there be a close and frank communication between the president and the trustees, and an ongoing communication among trustees, administrators, faculty, and staff. "Trustees should welcome the opportunity to discuss school matters, and faculty should be welcome to join, provided it is all done with the head present or with his knowledge and approval" (Gummere, 1972, p. 60).

Various ways have proved successful, according to Rauh (1969, pp. 34-35), for the fostering of better mutual understanding between trustees and faculty and for improving trustee knowledge of the educational programs of the institution. For example,

1. Joint committees where both trustees and faculty work together on a common problem have usually produced a sounder decision in a setting of mutual understanding and concern.
2. Visiting committees have been used to bring the board into closer touch with various aspects of the educational program as well as with the teachers.

3. Social events have provided the most common contact between trustees and faculty. Informal meetings in the president's home or at other social occasions provide for an exchange of concerns in pleasant surroundings. By their very nature social meetings are usually casual and short. A trustee/faculty retreat can combine a work/social setting.

4. Faculty presentations have been made directly before the board of trustees rather than through the president or a dean.

Since the board is in most institutions an absentee group, and since there is natural curiosity, even distrust, of the absentee who is also a layperson, it is wise for the president to arrange for periodic meetings of representatives of both faculty and board. It is a test of confidence on all sides when such an arrangement is acceptable, but it should not become routine practice. (Zwingle, 1975, p. 25)

Zwingle (1975, pp. 25, 26) further discusses private conversations between faculty and trustees. Since this is a practical matter and is certain to happen "the real question is whether every board member knows how to avoid a seeming commitment."

Unless a board member has been delegated to talk privately with a member of the faculty, for special reasons, he or she can actually only listen. If the board member should offer an opinion, it will almost certainly be accepted as official, no matter what the disclaimers. . . . Of greatest importance is the preservation of the distinction between official representatives and unofficial and personal exchanges. Easy for some, impossible for others.

If the president is chosen for competence as a professional educator, if he or she is to interpret both sides (faculty and trustees) to each other, preserving the confidence of each, his or her
proposals and recommendations should be supported unless there are strong and compelling reasons not to do so, and if the president is wrong too often, the board should start looking for a new president (Nason, 1980, p. 6).

To Insure Financial Solvency

One of the main problems facing higher education today is money. Higher education is currently in severe financial trouble and if educational forecasters are correct it will continue through the 1980s (Burns, 1966, pp. 116, 117; Nason, 1974, p. 16). During the past quarter of a century there has been an accelerated increase of enrollment, buildings, and budgets in higher education—both private and public. Now educational forecasters predict not only slower growth but a decline of enrollment for the next eight to ten years, resulting in greater competition for students (Nason, 1974, p. 16). This, along with inflation, unemployment, and less federal and state aid to schools and students, is certain to present more serious financial problems than universities and colleges have faced in recent years.

Since the board of trustees has final responsibility for the total educational and operational program of an institution, it must concern itself with the financial health of the institution (Burns, 1966, p. 101; Ingram, 1980, p. 38; Nason, 1974, p. 16; Ruml, 1959, p. 13).

Boards of trustees were first appointed to assist the president and professors in handling the business and financial aspects of their institution. However, since the establishment of the first colleges in America (1636), the financial operation of educational
institutions has become big business (Bruns, 1966, p. 101). Operating expenditures for some large universities are in the hundreds of millions of dollars, i.e., a 1979 report for three Michigan universities are as follows: University of Michigan ($501,149,000), Michigan State University ($320,175,608), Wayne State University ($176,070,199). Latest endowment figures (Chronicle of Higher Education, March 23, 1981, p. 6) show that the five institutions with the largest endowments are: Harvard ($1,584,580,000), University of Texas ($1,261,320,000), Yale ($668,800,000), Stanford ($557,740,000), and Columbia University ($553,000,000). The magnitude of these figures underscores the need for "...astute advice and assistance from the trustees in formulating wise policies pertaining to budgeting, finance, business and plant management" (Burns, 1966, p. 101).

Formulation of the kind of financial and business policies to be employed by an institution is a responsibility of the board. There is no set pattern of financial operations that can be applied to all universities and colleges. Even schools of similar size and type are operated differently because of a variety of circumstances. Each school, however, should be run efficiently, effectively, and economically and on accepted, sound financial principles (Burns, 1966, p. 102).

There is no part of higher education which does not require planning. Rauh (1969, pp. 47-49) suggests that planning is especially essential in four areas of financial concerns: (1) budget, (2) campus development, (3) plant maintenance and improvement, and (4) space utilization and services. Rauh (1969, pp. 61-70) discusses a fifth area where planning is also essential, fund raising--obtaining adequate income to meet the institution's financial needs.
Areas for consideration by a trustee as part of his responsibility to insure financial solvency are discussed below:

1. **Budget**

   "Almost every item in a budget for year one has implications for years two, three, four and n. In most cases these implications can be predicted with reasonable accuracy." This being the case, universities and colleges should project their operating needs into the future. Rauh suggests a plan for at least five years, since a five-year plan of expenditures and income can be assured. Each year this projection needs to be corrected in the relationship to actual experience and one more year added to the projection (Ibid.).

   One of the most important documents found on a college campus is the budget. In many ways it effects every one from the chairman of the board to the newest teaching assistant. Most universities and colleges seek to attract faculty with imagination, those who are progressive and try to develop forward-moving programs. The budget process relates needs to resources, and in most cases the first far exceeds the second (Rauh, 1969, p. 41).

   In the budget policy and programs are expressed and unless there is force to oppose, the budget committee often becomes the policy committee, in practice if not in name. In some cases this may be what the board or administration wishes. It is not good, however, for the long-term health and growth of the institution (Ruml, 1959, p. 82).

   The board need not--in fact, should not--become involved in the details of budget planning. The major influences of trustees on the budget should be through the study of trends and patterns of
expenditures and income. "Their greatest leverage is through insistence on planning. . ." (Rauh, 1969, p. 42).

Rauh (pp. 42-44) presents several questions trustees should ask regarding the budget.

1. How Reliable are the Expense Figures?
If the budget is to be a useful guide to management and not merely an exercise in assembling numbers, then it must bear a close relationship to actual expenditures. The yearly comparison of budget with actual expense is an essential measure of the college's management to control expenditures.

2. How Good are the Income Estimates?
Expenses can be controlled. Income can only be estimated. . . . Good managers can make good estimates of income.

3. Is the Deficit Really Deficit?
Some colleges still use the device of creating a deficit budget by omitting contributed income. . . . What trustees and managers are concerned with is the true deficit which results when expenditures exceed all sources of income.

4. Should Deficits and Surpluses Alternate?
Many colleges follow the practice of accumulating deficits for a number of years and then wiping them out with one or more years of surplus (usually by a hike in tuition). . . . A board should consider the perspective issues and guide the president by policy decisions.

5. What Gets Lost?
. . . Almost every budget is some compromise between what is wanted and what is obtainable. It is important that trustees have some idea of what is not in the budget. . . . The things left out could conceivably be as important as those put in.

Proper financial support can be obtained, from either private or public sources, only when there is an open understanding of the needs of the institution and confidence in those who are responsible for the budget and the overall planning (Blue, 1969, p. 13).
2. **Campus Development**

Lest boards become concerned with a pet project, Rauh suggests that an effective way to plan campus facilities is to employ professional assistance in developing an overall plan which relates to needs, costs, and site. More and more institutions are using this method of developing future "campus plans." Plans may need to be changed or altered as conditions change.

3. **Plant Maintenance and Improvement**

"Plant improvement, replacement, and modernization is as much a necessity in educational management as it is in the business world" (Rauh, 1969, p. 48). Few trustees who operate a business would carry out their operations in inadequate facilities, waiting for some major "windfall which would provide the funds to modernize." Trustees must plan for adequate facilities in terms of dollars and a time schedule. This point is covered more thoroughly under "To Maintain the Physical Plant".

4. **Space Utilization and Service**

Space utilization, according to Rauh (1969, p. 49), is more than the hours and density usage of space. It also has to do with the quality of space. Space-utilization studies seldom deal with quality of space. Trustees must consider both in planning.

5. **Fund Raising**

Fraley (1971, p. 1) suggests there are three areas of financial resources for which the board is responsible:

1. Custodianship of property
2. Approving budget and holding the administration responsible for maintaining its spending policies

3. Giving personal support by contribution of time and money

He further challenges the board with "... you dare not vote for a program, expecting others to do what you will not!"

Fundraising has become one of the most serious and significant problems and a chief concern facing trustees. Unless funding is found many private schools will be forced to close or merge with a larger institution (Burns, 1966, p. 14). If trustees are responsible for the financial operation of universities and colleges, it is clear that the combined skills of trustees and management are needed to provide the necessary funds for the operation and development of institutions (Rauh, 1969, pp. 64, 65).

Within the past several years, institutions of higher education have announced fund-raising campaigns that would have been unthinkable a few years ago. Ketchim (1980, p. 6) lists: Yale, 370 million; Stanford, 304 million; Southern California, 265 million; and smaller schools, Bowdoin College, 30 million; Carlton College, 20 million; Hamilton, 16 million.

If trustees or the president of an institution try to raise funds alone, a major component is missing. It is essential that there be a combined effort of trustees, president, and volunteers (Ketchim, 1980, pp. 6-8). Burns (1966, p. 113) adds a further point; raising money is not a "one-shot treatment," rather since it is a continual problem in education, the problem must be dealt with on a continuous basis by all groups. Burns further states:
Trustees, because of their positions of prominence in the civic, social and economic life of the community, state and nation, are the best qualified members of the institutional "family" to give active leadership in this matter of fund-raising.

Unless a basic commitment for a fund raising is established, implemented, and supported by the board, the program will be "doomed to defeat" (Fraley, 1971, p. 1).

Rauh (1969, pp. 163-192) conducted a survey of 5,180 trustees in 1968. The following tables taken directly from Rauh's study show the survey results with regards to (1) hours trustees spent in fund raising, (2) contributions of over $20,000 per year generated by trustees, (3) contributions made by trustees over five years.

### Table B-9

**Hours per Year Spent in Fund Raising**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>20 or less</th>
<th>21-50</th>
<th>51-80</th>
<th>Over 80</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All combined</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public universities</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private junior colleges</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private four-year colleges</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private universities</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic institutions</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective private</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Catholic</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table B-10

**Contribution over $20,000 per Year Generated by Trustees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All combined</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public universities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private junior colleges</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private four-year colleges</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private universities</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic institutions</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective private institutions</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Catholic institutions</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Drevis (1978, pp. 2, 3), in discussing the responsibility of trustees in fund raising, presents twelve generalizations of the trustees' role in development.

1. There should be a personal commitment of each trustee to the goals and objectives of the institution and to the purposes of the development program.

2. Each trustee should be willing to give commensurate with his or her ability.

3. Trustees should recognize that fund raising is highly competitive and be willing to give leadership to the development efforts.

4. Trustees should set feasible guidelines and campaign goals.

5. Trustees should select an aggressive development committee chaired by a dedicated member of the board.

6. Trustees should assist in enlisting volunteer leadership and workers for the development programs.

7. Trustees should make sure that the administration of the institution includes a capable development department headed by an experienced fund raiser.

8. Trustees should ascertain whether outside fund-raising counsel is needed and, if so, see that it is provided.

---

TABLE B-11
Contributions Made by Trustees in Five Years
(In percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of institution</th>
<th>Not answering</th>
<th>Under $10M</th>
<th>$10-$30M</th>
<th>$30-$100M</th>
<th>$100-$500M</th>
<th>$500M-$1 mil.</th>
<th>Over $1 mil.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All combined</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public universities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Jr. College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priv. 4-yr. College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priv. universities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective private</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Catholic</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select. public univ.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Trustees should monitor the effectiveness of development programs and make the necessary adjustments if the administration does not.

10. Trustees should keep up to date on trends and new techniques in fund raising and see if they are applied when appropriate.

11. Trustees should keep up to date in tax changes which effect the institution and its fund-raising ability.

12. Trustees should be kept advised concerning funds available from governmental programs and be sure their institution is receiving its fair share as appropriate.

The most basic evidence of the institutional support of trustees, according to Frantzreb (1970, p. 18), is evidence by their participation in fund-raising efforts. Seldom is 100 percent giving among trustees achieved. However, less than 100 percent giving is "an insult to the board, the college, the president, the staff, the faculty, its students--and should be a matter of conscience to the trustee in default of his responsibility." This point is further stressed by Gale (1977, pp. 5, 6):

I think a person should give until he's proud. . . . It is imperative that the Board of Trustees show solidarity and 100% financial support, then you and others can approach the "community" and say "Our trustees have all given for we really believe in the future plans for this institution. . . ." I think it is vitally important nowadays for boards to give because people ask, corporations ask and foundations ask, "Does your board support you financially?" How much they give is a totally different thing. . . . I think the important thing is that everyone gives according to their means.

Gummere (1972, p. 59) further substantiates the 100 percent philosophy. "Of one thing we are certain; that trustees must participate 100 percent in whatever they have decided to do in fund raising." While all cannot give substantial amounts, all can give something and all can take part in working for gifts from others.
Trustees are expected to participate in fund raising; and following is a composite list of ways trustees should participate (Carefield, n.d., p. 44; Drevs, 1978, pp. 1-3; Freck, 1974, tape; Rauh, 1969, p. 67; Stuhr, 1975, pp. 1, 2; Weatherford, 1979, p. 3). They must:

1. Develop confidence in and dedication to the institution
2. Give leadership and support in all fund-raising programs and campaigns
3. Continually seek out and cultivate prospective donors
4. Give personally according to their ability
5. Solicit from other individuals and groups
6. Be involved in the continuing (a) identification, (b) education, (c) involvement, (d) commitment, and (e) contribution of donors or prospective donors.

Probably the most effective way to organize the trustees into an effective fund-raising group is through a development committee of the board. This committee could further be divided into subcommittees if the need is warranted. Trustees must then have (1) a clear knowledge of fund-raising problems and potentials, (2) an understanding of the proper procedures and relationships between the board of trustees and the administration, and (3) an awareness of methods and techniques of fund raising.

To Maintain the Physical Plant

The physical plant is part of the institution's assets. This being the case trustees are under the obligation to protect these
assets and to concern themselves with buildings, maintenance, and grounds (Nason, 1980, p. 8).

Trustees have traditionally assumed this responsibility. This is partially true because they felt themselves, due to business experience, to be particularly qualified and experienced, more so than their "ministerial presidents." Today, however, there is more professional expertise in plant management, construction, and maintenance among university and college administrators. Care should be taken that trustees not devote an undue proportion of time to this area and give less attention to more important issues that should have consideration (Nason, 1974, p. 16).

Most universities and colleges today have large and complex physical plants. They were built at considerable expense and are maintained at considerable cost. Both directly affect the balance sheet and the operating statement (Nason, 1980).

There seems to be two areas concerning the physical plant that should concern the trustees: (1) providing adequate facilities for the desired educational programs and (2) the maintaining existing buildings.

Regarding providing adequate facilities Nason writes:

If the physical facilities are inadequate for the educational programs conducted or desired, trustees should take the lead in providing them. If trustees are complacent about the proliferation of buildings, they may find themselves struggling with a budget top-heavy with building maintenance. (p. 8)

Nason (1974) also presents the danger that trustees might become too involved in detail campus planning. He says,
Everyone has views on where the new building should go, what style of architecture it should represent, and what type of contract should be negotiated. Board meetings are often cluttered with details which would be better left to the business officer. (p. 16)

Regarding care and maintenance of buildings, Ruml (1959) writes,

The care of buildings and grounds requires the supervision of a special Trustee committee, since either under or over maintenance can result in final operational budget figures of a most misleading character. . . . Trustees must depend on special interests either within or outside the board for proper supervision. (p. 85)

Elliot (1908, p. 22) presents a view similar to that of Nason; however, he adds that it is the duty of the university trustees to take all possible measures to promote healthful and safe surroundings for students, to provide for the care of the campus, to approve the design of buildings, and campus grouping of facilities, to provide adequate space, and to insure the beauty of the buildings, site, and grounds.

Regarding maintenance Mason (1980, p. 8) adds one further caution:

In periods of tight budgets many administrators prefer to cut the buildings and grounds budget rather than the budget for instruction. If continued for long, buildings grow shabby as deferred maintenance mounts up. Trustees can prevent disaster by insisting on prudent and long-term policies.

To Preserve Institutional Autonomy

Among the institutions of modern society, universities and colleges have enjoyed a high degree of autonomy, that being the freedom to manage their own internal affairs without interference or
direction from some outside source (Nason, 1974, p. 20). This freedom from outside control, this degree of independence has been a great source of strength for American universities and colleges, both private and public (Ingram, 1980, p. 41).

Even though higher education has prided itself as autonomous, full autonomy in its fullest sense does not now exist in higher education, nor has it ever existed. "Autonomy is limited by law, by the necessary influences and controls that go with financial support, and by public policy in areas of substantial public concern" (Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1973, p. 17). What is usually meant by autonomy is "the freedom to manage the internal affairs of the university within the broad boundaries set by law, by financial support, and by public policy" (Nason, 1974, p. 21). Internal affairs would include academic freedom, research, curriculum, admission of students, appointment of faculty, and distribution of funds.

Universities and colleges in America comprise a very special kind of organization and community. This uniqueness is so vital to the health and well-being of society that outside groups are constantly trying to exploit, and only a concerned, perceiving, and determined board of trustees can give the necessary protection needed (Ingram, 1980, p. 41).

One of the great contributions being made by modern universities and colleges is the role as critics of society. This can continue only if there is a presupposition of certain independence from the society being criticized, or from those who would silence its criticisms or twist them to serve a special motive (Ingram, 1980,
Since World War II there have been drastic changes, according to the Carnegie Commission (1973, pp. 17-30), and today continued preservation of this independence is one of the major crises facing higher education. Examples of change are (1) campus disruptions, (2) denial of freedom of speech, (3) politization of the campus, (4) increased federal and state legislative control, (5) state/federal funding and grants, (6) multi-campuses and multi-institutional governing boards, (7) rights of conflicting groups, and (8) greater resort to legal procedures (Nason, 1974, p. 21).

Other pressure groups are trying to make themselves felt by exciting pressures on internal policies and management. Donors try to attach unacceptable conditions to their gifts. Alumni seek changes in certain policies. Legislators seek special favors for family or constituents. Business interests bring pressure to stop or pursue certain kinds of research (Ingram, 1980, p. 41). "Simply put, one of the responsibilities of governing boards is to defend the institutions they govern—to defend their existence, their programs and operations, their right to manage their own affairs" (Ibid.). This puts governing boards in a very peculiar, very delicate, and very important position. As stated by Perkins (1973, pp. 208, 209), trustees are at one and the same time agents of the organization which has created their institutions and spokesmen for the special interests of those institutions themselves.

The only solution lies along the lines suggested by Bowen (1969, p. 177):

The function of the governing board is to be a guardian of the public interest while insulating the university from
undue pressures from outside groups. The governing board must so clearly represent the public interest that it can protect the autonomy of the university from improper encroachments of legislative bodies, government agencies, donors, and other outsiders.

To Enhance the Public Image

Cutlip and Center (1964, pp. 1-5) define public relations as a "planned effort to influence opinion . . . based on a two-way communication." Public relations is generally thought of as encompassing promotion, preparation of literature, publicity, news releases, and media presentations. In its broadest sense it could better be called "external affairs" thus encompassing a much larger area of responsibilities. If one accepts this concept the trustees' role becomes much broader and influential (Rauh, 1969, pp. 61, 62).

The day is over when trustees just lend their name to an institution. By lending their name they strengthen the institution in the eyes of the public, but in contemporary higher education good public relations goes far beyond the lending of a name (Nason, 1980, p. 9).

Trustees of a university or college stand in a commanding position to interpret the programs of the institution to the public and then in turn interpret the public's sentiments and feeling to the institution. This is public relations in its truest sense. Trustees then are able to, in a unique way, help bridge the gap between "form and gown" (Burns, 1966, pp. 121, 122).

In order to effectively interpret the institution to the public, a trustee needs to have more than a superficial knowledge of the institution he or she represents. The trustee must be informed of
the total educational policies of the institution he or she represents and must understand the educational and non-educational issues, mission of the institution, long-range plans, and other concerns that may be of interest to the many publics of the institution (Ruml, 1969, p. 78).

Burns (1966, p. 122) lists several ways a board member can serve as intermediary between the institution and the community:

a. By interesting qualified high-school graduates in his college and in discouraging unqualified students from applying

b. By remaining in touch with alumni in his area in order to communicate information to and from the college

c. By introducing faculty and staff members to groups and individuals in his community in order to provide a dissemination of knowledge and broaden the sphere of interest of the college

d. By representing the college with the major media of communication in his area to improve the image of his college and keep it before the public

e. By helping to place recent graduates in positions for which they are qualified and in which they might be interested. (res)

Burns (1966, p. 122) also adds that trustees can do much to emphasize the fact that the "ivory towers" are gone and the public can do much to aid their institution not only with financial support but also in "scientific, cultural and social assistance with educational programs."

To function effectively in enhancing the public image the trustee must (1) defend the institution against outside accusations and attacks, (2) speak up in its defense, (3) set the record straight, (4) scotch rumors, and (5) be able and willing to explain what lies behind controversial policies that have been adopted by the board (Ingram, 1980, p. 43).
"Just as trustees must interpret the campus to the community so they must interpret the needs of society to the college or university" (Nason, 1974, p. 20). Society is always changing while universities and colleges tend to resist change. The more turbulent the change in society the more important is the function of a trustee. Trustees need to be aware of what is happening on the local, national, and international scenes; they must be sensitive to changes, trends, and future directives, and they should encourage constructive changes. They need to challenge the status quo and since they bring a different perspective to the campus they need to ask challenging questions, and suggest directions for the future that will keep their institution in the forefront of a changing world (Ingram, 1980, p. 44; Nason, 1974, p. 20).

Nason (1980, p. 10) presents another pertinent point regarding public image. Trustees may not always agree on policies that are voted. The place for discussion is in the boardroom. Trustees do not fulfill their responsibilities if they do not question, challenge, and debate issues before voting. In public, however, trustees should stand united with the institution on the policies that were voted and which the administration is expected to carry out.

If the issue on which they differ is one of principle or if they hold such strong convictions that they cannot be comfortable with the majority decision, they should resign. Short of that they should maintain a solid front.

Elliot says one way to overcome the inevitable conflict between the university and the community is for the university to open its facilities and enrichments for public use and enjoyment. These could
include lectures, museums, art exhibits, recreation facilities, and the like (Elliot, 1908, pp. 21, 22).

**To Serve as a Court of Appeal**

"Since trustees possess final legal authority, there is no body other than the courts or legislature which can legally challenge their decision" (Nason, 1974, p. 22). This being the case they are the highest court of appeals or the "last resort" (Burns, 1966, p. 132).

There was a time when actions by the faculty, dean, or president, be it concerning students or faculty appointment or termination, were rarely questioned or at least challenged. Since World War II, however, there have been more and more challenges of administrative and faculty decisions. Students, faculty, and some businesses are requesting a final appeal to the board of trustees (Wicke, 1962, p. 62).

In order to lessen the appeals made to the board, trustees should insist there be "clearly established and publicized codes governing faculty status and student behavior, and these should include provisions for due process in all actions" (Ingram, 1960, p. 45). It is hopeful that once procedures are established and carried out, most cases will be resolved before they require board action. If, however, a case does come to the board, the case must be decided on its own merits. Presidents, deans, and administrators are not always right. If they are not and the board must vote against them, which should happen in very few cases, it may be a sign of administrative incompetence and time to look for a new president (Burns, 1966, p. 132; Ingram, 1980, p. 45; Wicke, 1962, p. 62).
To Assess Their Own Performance

With the role and responsibilities of trustees becoming more and more demanding there is less feeling that trusteeship is just ceremony and honor. With the growth of trustee responsibility there needs to be a careful, systematic review and evaluation of trustee performance (Zwingle, 1976, p. 32).

When trustees search for a president, vice presidents, or directors, they search for experience; but the question arises, Where does a trustee get experience? There is no apprenticeship or breaking-in period; there is no course in trusteeship, and rarely is there any orientation. There is an increasing tendency to evaluate the performance of a university president, vice presidents, deans, and managers; however, trustees have exerted little interest or effort in evaluating their own performance as trustees. Trustees who accept the appointment as trustees should do so with a willingness to have their own performance evaluated (Robbins, 1974, pp. 1, 2).

In recent years, according to Zwingle (1975, p. 10), there has been a growing acceptance among more progressive trustees that they should take more seriously the need for evaluation. In the main, however, it is still a sensitive point and not a widely accepted practice.

Regarding trustee evaluation Zwingle draws an interesting parallel:

Therefore one must conclude that institutions need two kinds of audit, one conventional, the other not. The financial audit is understood. . . . Whereas accrediting bodies give a periodic audit of the academic qualities of an institution only governing boards can invite an audit on itself. . . . (Zwingle, 1975, p. 17)
Much has been written on what a board and its board member do. The publication *The Volunteer Board Member in Philanthropy* (1968, pp. 8-20) has compiled the following:

**What a Good Board Does**

1. It inspires and leads
2. It formulates with care the job qualifications required and selects the best person available
3. The board consults with and advises him (president or chief executive officer), supervises, and encourages him; when he is right, it defends him; when he is wrong, it corrects him
4. It identifies priority needs, short-term and long-term goals
5. It assures that its agency cooperates wisely with other groups . . . which are working toward the same or similar goals
6. It encourages experimentation to find better methods to achieve its goals
7. It establishes and orderly procedure for the selection of new board members and for their orientation and training
8. It searches out and uses sources of information and guidance that may help it to improve the discharge of its responsibilities
9. A good board organizes itself and its staff for optimum production.

**A Good Board Member**

1. Is dedicated to helping others . . .
2. Approaches his responsibilities in the spirit of a trustee on behalf of contributors, their intended beneficiaries, and the public at large
3. Stands up for his convictions, even at the cost of misunderstanding or disapproval in his business or social life
4. Backs up other board members and staff, rising to their defense when they are unjustly criticized or attacked
5. Treats staff as a partner in a high calling, while maintaining overall supervision and control

6. Avoids being overawed by others on the board...

7. Welcomes information and the best available advice, but reserves the right to arrive at decisions on the basis of his own judgment

8. Respects the right of other board members and of staff to disagree with him and to have a fair hearing of their points of view

9. Accepts as routine that decisions must be made by majority vote and will at times go against him

10. Criticizes, when necessary, in a constructive way, if possible suggesting an alternative course

11. Recognizes that his time and energy are limited and that over-commitment may prove self-defeating

12. Endeavors to keep disagreements and controversies impersonal, and to promote unity

13. Maintains loyalty to his agency, within a higher loyalty to the welfare of the community and humanity as a whole.

If a self-evaluation is to be conducted by a board of trustees they should start with some reasonable guidelines. Procedures and guidelines for board evaluations are available for those boards who are willing to undertake this "delicate but important task of appraisal" (Zwingle, 1975, p. 10; 1976, p. 32).

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) has developed for boards of each type of college and university Self-Study Guidelines and Criteria (Appendix H).

Axelrod (1977, pp. 9, 10) lists the following as a guide checklist for trustees to assess their performance and improve their role as trustee:

1. I believe I understand my role and responsibility as a board member
2. I understand the distinction between my role as a policy maker, and the role of the president and his/her staff as administrators.

3. I am familiar with my institution's uniqueness, strengths and shortcomings, and can articulate its contributions to society.

4. I am conscientious in keeping pace with new development in post-secondary education by reviewing the literature periodically and/or attending national, state or local meetings.

5. I am aware of the contributions and concerns of the faculty and student body.

6. When possible, I attend campus activities and events to which I am invited.

7. I prepare adequately for each board meeting.

8. I participate actively in all board meetings.

9. I am willing to listen to the other viewpoints expressed by my fellow board members.

10. I support the majority decisions of the board.

11. I exercise discretion in dealing with sensitive matters.

12. I call on my board chairperson or chief executive when I have questions about board policy or operations.

13. I support my institution's fund-raising efforts through an annual gift according to my means, and by my willingness to make solicitation visits as requested by the staff.

14. I receive the kind of information I need to monitor my institution's health and formulate sound policies.

There is no definite recommendation as to the frequency or procedure of a trustee self-evaluation.

Rauh (1969, p. 112) suggests it should be a continuing activity. Nason (1980, p. 12) suggests "the chairman might set aside some part of every meeting for self-examination, or call a special meeting for such a purpose. . . . The use of an outside consultant is
increasingly favored." Ingram (1980, p. 46) adds the use of a special board committee. Frantzreb (1970, p. 5) states, "The board of trustees should establish within its own membership, at least every five years, an ad hoc self-study committee." He further adds:

This committee should examine objectively trustee stewardship of the college, assess its provisions for its own renewal, examine its checks and balances on the effectiveness and efficiency of its policies, procedures, and administration as well as its directives for the future. The status quo should not be allowed to become too comfortable. New insights, new experiences, new knowledge should be sought, diagnosed, discussed, and even applied. (pp. 5, 6)

**Summary**

This chapter has reviewed the literature pertaining to the twelve responsibilities of trustees as listed by John Nason. This review indicates substantial support for these areas of responsibility. The degree to which trustees understand, accept and carry out their responsibilities greatly affects the direction of the institutions they hold in trust.

The role of the trustee is of utmost importance to the growth and development of any institution of higher education. It is an honor to serve as a trustee, but it is more than just an honor, it carries definite responsibilities. It is only as trustees understand their role that they can effectively carry out their responsibilities. Much has been written on trustee responsibilities. Nason (1980) has defined trustee responsibilities which seem to be all inclusive.

In order for trustees to serve their institutions to their fullest capacity, they must not only understand their role in relationship to the present but must be futuristic in their outlook and planning.
There are three questions to which trustees must give considerable study and concern, (1) What will be my future role as trustee? (2) What new challenges face educational institutions, especially the one of which I am a trustee? and (3) How can I meet the opportunities and problems of governance in a rapidly changing society? It is only as trustees are willing to (1) take a long and in-depth look at their responsibilities, such as those defined by John Nason and (2) give of their time and energies to the institutions they govern, that their institutions will prosper.

In accepting their responsibility for planning for the future of their institutions, certain attitudinal concepts must be kept in mind according to Kaiser (1977, p. 87):

1. The future is open, i.e., not determined. We may invent it or prevent it

2. The future does not specify one particular future, but is interested in creating an array of possible futures from which may be selected the most promising one for implementation

3. Our actions today frame the future

4. We are responsible for the future

5. By prognosticating we can:
   a. maximize human choices
   b. anticipate likely problems
   c. think out the consequence of designed change
   d. participate in the shaping of reality
   e. increase our problem-solving ability

6. It is better to plan the future than accept the results of unanticipated consequences.

One can conclude that trustees can assume one of three postures toward the future. (1) They may assume a posture of resigned acceptance. These trustees basically oppose change and accept it only as
external circumstances force them to do so. (2) A more active posture
is that of adaptation. These trustees seek to meet the future by
modifying, redirecting, or influencing the external forces that impact
their institution. (3) The most active posture is that of designing
change. These trustees actively seek to alter the social, political,
and economic environment of the institution. The institution then
becomes a force that acts upon its environment and community. The
trustees thus become architects for change.

Trustees are not accustomed to thinking of themselves
as designers for change. They are likely to be more
present-oriented than future-oriented. Yet the destiny
of their institutions depends upon their foresight and
assertiveness. In a rapidly changing society, the past
is no longer a sure guide for the future. As agents of
change, trustees must ask: (1) What should be done?
(2) How can it be accomplished? and (3) Who can do it?
(Ibid., pp. 88, 89)

The potential for governance has never been higher; trustees
have never before needed to know and to understand their responsibil-
ities as they do now. They need to become active and aggressive in
fulfilling these responsibilities. With this in mind the remainder
of this study is concerned with the role and responsibility of Andrews
University trustees as perceived by themselves and how their role can
be enhanced in the governance of this institution.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter contains information on the population selected, the instrument used to gather data, and the method of analysis of the study.

Selection of Population

Since Andrews University was established in 1960, 154 men and women have served or are serving as trustees. All 154 trustees were used in this study. Sampling procedures were not used since the entire population served as the base for the study.

Description of the Instrument

The instrument (Appendix A) used to gather data was divided into two major sections.

Section one of the questionnaire was developed in order to obtain selected personal information and characteristics of the trustees: i.e., (1) Was this their only experience as a trustee? (2) Age while serving as a trustee, (3) educational level, (4) profession, (5) trustee involvement with Andrews University aside from attending scheduled meetings, (6) basic political and religious views, (7) possible conflict of interest, (8) orientation experience, (9) attendance record, (10) giving record, and (11) extent of professional reading.
Section two of the questionnaire was developed to obtain attitudes of trustees toward trustee responsibilities as listed by Nason (1980). The questionnaire was divided into thirteen subsections with the first entitled Overall Responsibility. The next twelve subsections corresponded with the Nason's twelve trustee responsibilities:

1. To appoint the president
2. To support the president
3. To assess the president's performance
4. To clarify the mission
5. To approve long-range plans
6. To approve the educational program
7. To insure financial solvency
8. To maintain the physical plant
9. To preserve institutional autonomy
10. To enhance the public image
11. To serve as a court of appeal
12. To assess their own performance.

The questionnaire was further subdivided under each subheading. Additional responses were requested to pursue in greater detail their attitude toward the responsibilities as listed by Nason.

The respondents had the choice of four responses to each statement on the questionnaire: (1) highly important, (2) moderately important, (3) of little importance, (4) not trustee responsibility.

At the conclusion of the questionnaire trustees were asked to check the five Nason responsibilities they perceive to be most important.

A total of 28 responses were requested on section one and 106 responses were requested on section two of the questionnaire.

Collection of Data

A letter with other materials was sent to each trustee. These included the following:
1. A letter with a statement explaining the study (Appendix B)

2. The questionnaire (Appendix A)

3. A statement of endorsement by the president of Andrews University (Appendix C)


The above were mailed to each trustee and openly coded to facilitate forwarding a second set of materials to those who failed to respond to the first mailing. Trustees were assured that individuals would not in any way be identified by name or position with the study and that their responses would be held in the strictest confidence. A total of four weeks were allowed for the questionnaire to be returned.

A follow-up letter and a second questionnaire were mailed to those who failed to respond to the first mailing. A copy of the letter is included in Appendix D. A third letter and questionnaire were sent to those who failed to respond to the first two questionnaires (Appendix E).

**Treatment of the Data**

All questionnaires received were thoroughly examined for completeness. The information was transferred to the Andrews University Sigma 6 computer to analyze the questionnaire data. The demographic information was used to develop tabulations and graphs and were interpreted in relation to the problem statement. The responses to the trustee's responsibilities were divided into fourteen sections with two to thirteen items per section. The participants were divided into four groups as well as being combined.
These data were analyzed by a CATSCALE computer program designed by W. G. A. Futcher, Professor of Education at Andrews University (Torgerson, 1958, pp. 205-246) which compares the proportions of times each stimulus (item) was judged to be in each category (scale values of 1-4). The model used in this study involved replication over individuals where each stimulus (item) was judged once by each participant. A CATSCALE value was calculated for each item in each section. These CATSCALE values do not allow the investigator to compare the results of each section among groups of participants, thus the values were transformed to unit intervals on a 0 to 10 scale.

Categorical scale values were computed for each stimulus of the questionnaire. These values were used to determine if there were a relationship between those trustees who are church administrators and those trustees who are not church administrators as their views related to Nason's model. The relationship between trustees who served between 1961-1970 and those who served between 1971-1980 was also examined using scale values.

The stimuli for each section of Nason's model was plotted using a 0 to 10 scale to demonstrate the position each stimulus has to each other.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

There were a total of 154 persons elected as trustees of Andrews University from 1960-1980. Of that number, nine are deceased, two could not be located, and six responded that they were never aware that they were trustees and could not respond to the questionnaire. This left a total of 137 possible respondents. Of this number 121 or 88 percent responded to the questionnaire. The study is based on the 121 (88 percent) responses. The number of church administrators responding was 67 (55 percent) and laymen 54 (45 percent).

TABLE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESPONDENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trustees contacted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number responded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage responded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey instrument was divided into two sections; the first section obtained selected personal information and characteristics of trustees, the second section obtained attitudes of trustees toward trustee responsibilities. The presentation of the findings is divided accordingly.
Section I: Personal Information and Characteristics of Trustees

In this section, the questions as they appeared in the questionnaire occur before each table.

1. Trustee status

TABLE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Trustees</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current trustee</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former trustee</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Age when you began serving as trustee

The study shows that most trustees were between 40 and 60 years of age when they began their service as trustees. A larger percentage (15 percent) of laymen served as trustees under the age

TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Trustees</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 70</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of 39 and all those who served as trustees when over the age of 70 were church administrators.

3. **Highest level of education completed**

   Most trustees are college graduates. In fact, the largest percentage have taken graduate work beyond a baccalaureate degree or have a master's degree. Twenty-three percent hold doctoral or professional degrees. A higher percentage of laymen hold doctoral or professional degrees (43 percent) compared with church administrators (7 percent). It is interesting to note, however, that nine percent of the church administrators have been awarded honorary degrees while no laymen have been so honored.

**TABLE 4**

**EDUCATION OF TRUSTEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than college degree</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some graduate work, no degree</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral degree</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorary doctoral degree</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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4. What was your profession or occupation while serving as a trustee of Andrews University?

The highest profession among trustees is church administrators (55 percent). The second highest profession represented is education (18 percent), and business is third (16 percent). Of those laymen serving as trustees the largest percentage is educators (39 percent) with businessmen a close second (37 percent).

**TABLE 5**

PROFESSION OF TRUSTEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th></th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Administrator</td>
<td>67 55</td>
<td>67 100</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician</td>
<td>7 6</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>7 13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educator</td>
<td>21 18</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>21 39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>20 16</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>20 37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5 4</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>5 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
<td>1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>121 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>67 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>54 100</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions 5-10 are a series of questions concerning Andrews University trustees who served as trustees for other universities and colleges at the same time they served as trustees of Andrews. Questions are asked to establish whether a possible conflict of interest exists.
5. While a trustee of Andrews University, did you also serve as a trustee of any other college or university at the same time?

**TABLE 6**

**OTHER TRUSTEESHIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52 43</td>
<td>39 59</td>
<td>13 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68 56</td>
<td>27 40</td>
<td>41 76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>121 100</td>
<td>67 100</td>
<td>54 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. If yes, were you chairperson of the board?

**TABLE 7**

**OTHER TRUSTEE CHAIRMANSHIPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>22 42</td>
<td>22 56</td>
<td>0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 19</td>
<td>6 16</td>
<td>4 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>20 38</td>
<td>11 28</td>
<td>9 69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>52 100</td>
<td>39 100</td>
<td>13 100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. If you served as a trustee on another board, do you think this created a conflict of interest?

**TABLE 8**

**TRUSTEE CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3  6</td>
<td>1  2</td>
<td>2  15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22  42</td>
<td>18  47</td>
<td>4  31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>27  52</td>
<td>20  51</td>
<td>7  54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>52  100</td>
<td>39  100</td>
<td>13  100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. If you served as chairperson of the board of another college or university, do you think this was a conflict of interest?

**TABLE 9**

**OTHER TRUSTEE CHAIRMANSHIP CONFLICT OF INTEREST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
<td>N  %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4  18</td>
<td>4  18</td>
<td>0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6  27</td>
<td>6  27</td>
<td>0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>12  55</td>
<td>12  55</td>
<td>0  0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22  100</td>
<td>22  100</td>
<td>0  0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is interesting to note (Table 6) that 59 percent of the church administrators serve(d) as trustees on other boards at the same time they serve(d) as trustees at Andrews University, and of those who served on other boards 56 percent (Table 7) serve(d) as chairpersons of these boards. When those (church administrators) serving on boards were asked if that represented a conflict of interest, only two percent (Table 8) said yes. When those who serve(d) as chairpersons of other boards were asked if they felt this represented a conflict of interest, 18 percent (Table 9) said yes.

10. If you did not serve on another board, do you think those trustees who do, have a conflict of interest?

Question 10 (Table 10) revealed a different thought among other trustees, both church administrators and laymen, who did not serve on other boards. Nineteen percent of the clergy and 32 percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 10</th>
<th>OPINIONS OF OTHER TRUSTEES REGARDING CONFLICT OF INTEREST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Church Administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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of the laymen thought those who did serve on other boards had a conflict of interest.

Question 6 asked trustees who served on other boards to name the institution on whose board they serve(d). The institutions named are shown on Table 11.

TABLE 11

COLLEGES WHERE TRUSTEES SERVE(D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Linda</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oakwood</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwestern</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walla Walla</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was felt that it would be of interest to this study to know what kind of training or orientation was given to trustees; of further interest would be whether trustees felt such a program was/would be beneficial. Questions 11 to 13 were asked to solicit information on these points.
11. When you first became a trustee of Andrews University were you given an orientation regarding the responsibilities of a trustee?

The study was quite convincing that there has been little or no orientation given to trustees regarding their responsibilities. Those who indicated no made up 89 percent of the combined grouping--90 percent of the church administrators and 89 percent of laymen.

**TABLE 12**

**ORIENTATION OF TRUSTEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. If answer to 11 is yes, do you think the orientation was:

1. Highly important
2. Moderately important
3. Of little importance
4. Of no importance

Most of those receiving an orientation thought it to be highly or moderately important. This speaks well for the orientation program; however, it must be remembered that 88-90 percent had no response since they had not had any orientation.
TABLE 13
EVALUATION OF ORIENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No importance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. If the answer to 11 is no, do you think an orientation regarding trustee responsibilities would have been:
   1. Very helpful (beneficial)
   2. Moderately helpful
   3. Of little benefit
   4. Not beneficial

   It is interesting to note that the greater percentage of the combined group of trustees (77 percent)—church administrators (75 percent) and laymen (79 percent)—indicated that an orientation toward trustee responsibilities would be either very or moderately helpful.

TABLE 14
VALUE OF ORIENTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately helpful</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little benefit</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No benefit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. Were you active as a trustee at a time other than when you met for the regular trustee meetings, e.g., did you serve on a special trustee committee or in a special advisory capacity?

TABLE 15

TRUSTEE INVOLVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. If answer to 14 is no, would you have been willing to serve on a small trustee group with specific responsibility?

The research shows that only 38 percent of the trustees are used on special trustee committees. It is interesting to note that 48 percent of the church administrators serve(d) on trustee committees and only 26 percent of the laymen. Question 15 indicates that 56 percent of the church administrators and 55 percent of the laymen who were not used for a specific responsibility would have been willing to serve on a special group with specific responsibilities.
TABLE 16
WILLINGNESS FOR GREATER INVOLVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How do you perceive your basic political views?
1. Liberal
2. Moderate to liberal
3. Moderate
4. Moderate to conservative
5. Conservative

It was of interest to this study to learn how trustees viewed themselves on a liberal to conservative continuum in political and religious thought. The parallels are very similar. Very few indicated a liberal point of view either politically or religiously. By far the greatest percentage checked moderate, moderate to conservative, or conservative. The largest percentage of all groups in both areas considered themselves moderate to conservative.
### TABLE 17
POLITICAL VIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to liberal</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to conservative</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE 18
RELIGIOUS VIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to liberal</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to conservative</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Do you think the composition or mix of the trustees of Andrews University is the best? (Church officials, laymen, male, female, ethnic groups, etc.)

When respondents were asked if they felt the present mix of trustees was the best, they indicated a considerable difference of opinion between church administrators and laymen. Ninety-three percent of the church administrators and 63 percent of the laymen felt it was best. While only 3 percent of the church administrators indicated that the mix was not the best, 30 percent of the laymen indicated the composition was not the best.

**TABLE 19**

**EVALUATION OF BOARD COMPOSITION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No response</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. If not, how do you think it could be improved?

Respondents were given the opportunity to list ways they thought the composition of the board could be improved. Following are some of the written responses:

"Too many ex officio members who are too heavily burdened to attend many board meetings."

"Appointment of faculty important. Those committed to the SDA church."

"Trustees need to be more knowledgeable of problems of University."

"More effective if they have no conflict of interests."

"Being a member of many boards limits the time and interest a person can give to each institution."

"Board too large and too dominated by the church. It concerns itself with the wrong issues."

"There should be responsible representation."

"If one is to be a trustee he must accept the responsibilities of such."

"Better attendance. I hurried home from Europe to attend a meeting to find many G.C. members were absent."

"Limit board attendance to trustees only."

"Include students."

"Must understand they are part of a total educational program."

"Andrews University Board is a rubber stamp."

"Trustees too detached geographically."

"Reduce percentage of ex officio members."

"When I was a trustee it was dominated by G.C. officials."

"Church is loaded with laity of substantial stature and are eager to help but never get a chance."
'Boards are rubber stamps for church personnel who are usually ill-prepared or ill-qualified or not at all.'

"I have served on corporate boards, college boards, public school board, and church school boards. The Andrews experience was the most frustrating and the least useful of any of my 23 years of board service. Specialized skills and experience are ignored while the church people precipitate one crisis after another that need never become issues."

"Board is dominated by church representation and far too few laymen. More selected business people on the Board would have been a big asset to deal with issues and problems much more wisely and independently.

"I feel the tendency in the denomination is to believe the ministry has all the right answers, and this may be so in evangelistic matters. But in operating a college or university many business principles are very essential if what is right and best is to prevail."

"Less politics and more quality is needed."

"More laymen and less from ordained ministry."

"Ideally trustees better to be chosen on the basis of qualifications rather than position. In SDA particular situations perhaps the present plan serves the University best."

"Board too large with too many people with special and overriding interests."

20. How often did you attend trustee meetings?
21. Did you attend

Questions 20 and 21 are very similar in nature. Both responses indicate that trustees attend all or almost all meetings. Only a small percentage (less than 10 percent) indicated they occasionally or seldom attended meetings.
### TABLE 20
REGULARITY OF ATTENDANCE AT TRUSTEE MEETINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 20</th>
<th>Combined N</th>
<th>Combined %</th>
<th>Church Administrators N</th>
<th>Church Administrators %</th>
<th>Laymen N</th>
<th>Laymen %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost every</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 21</th>
<th>Combined N</th>
<th>Combined %</th>
<th>Church Administrators N</th>
<th>Church Administrators %</th>
<th>Laymen N</th>
<th>Laymen %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All or most</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few to most</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Did you serve on a trustee sub committee?

Question 22 is similar to question 14, which dealt more with special committees or special advisory capacities. Question 22, however, is more concerned with regular, on-going trustee sub committees as used by many boards. The response here is very similar to that from question 14. Only 39 percent of the combined group have served on a sub committee of the board. A larger percentage of these
are church administrators (43 percent to 33 percent). Sixty-seven percent of the laymen checked no while only 53 percent of the church administrators checked no.

TABLE 21

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Did you make a personal annual financial contribution to Andrews University?

24. Amount of annual contribution

Question 23 and 24 are concerned with the annual financial contributions and support by trustees. Responses to question 23 show that the pattern of financial support is consistent among all groups—the combined group showing 35 percent yes, 58 percent no, and 7 percent no response.

There is considerable difference in the amount of annual support (question 24) given by trustees. Twelve percent of the church administrators gave between $0 - $99 and 24 percent gave between $100-$499. No church administrator gave in any of the other categories.
Eleven percent of the laymen gave between $0 - $99 and 9 percent gave between $100 - $499. However, 7 percent gave between $500 - $999, 2 percent gave between $1,000 and $9,999 and 2 percent gave over $10,000. The no response percentage (combined 63 percent, church administrators 64 percent, and laymen 62 percent) corresponds with the combined 58 percent, church administrators 60 percent, and laymen 57 percent statistics of those who did not give (question 23).

**TABLE 22**

**FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 23</th>
<th>Combined N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Church Administrators N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Laymen N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 24</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Church Administrators N</th>
<th></th>
<th>Laymen N</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0 - $99</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100 - $499</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 - $999</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 - $9,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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25. Did you understand the responsibilities of a trustee before you agreed to become one?

Regarding trustees' understanding of their responsibilities before they became trustees, there was very little difference in the percentage of those who checked yes (combined 84 percent, church administrators 87 percent, and laymen 81 percent). There was, however, a slight difference between church administrators and laymen who checked no (church administrators 7 percent, laymen 17 percent).

TABLE 23
UNDERSTANDING OF RESPONSIBILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Combined</th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26. Were you acquainted with Andrews University's stated mission, institutional plan, and policies when you served as a trustee?

Question 26 received the highest percentage of positive answers. Ninety-six percent combined, 95 percent of church administrators, and 98 percent of laymen thought they were acquainted with the University's stated mission, institutional plan, and policies when they were elected as a trustee.
TABLE 24
UNDERSTANDING UNIVERSITY STATED MISSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. While a trustee, did you stay abreast of higher education trends, legislation, and other public policy by reading any of the following:
Association of Governing Board (AGB)
News Notes, The Chronicle of Higher Education, AGB Reports, or other material?

Most trustees said they stayed abreast of the trends in higher education, legislation, and other public policies by reading materials especially prepared for trustees and educators. Percentages were similar in all responses by all groups.

TABLE 25
CONTINUING EDUCATION OF TRUSTEESHIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Church Administrators</th>
<th>Laymen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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28. In what ways could an Andrews University trustee be more effective?

The concluding question in Part I of the questionnaire was open-ended. Trustees were asked to list ways that Andrews University trustees could be more effective. Following are some of the responses:

"Be concerned with the best for the University and not be so concerned with what the constituency will think. Trustees should be leaders and not followers of constituency thinking."

"Inform trustees of policies."

"Important agenda items should be discussed first and not at the end when trustees are weary. At Andrews University too many routine things are discussed at length at the beginning of meetings and important items are rushed through at the end of the meeting."

"Encourage trustees to attend AGB seminars and interact with trustees of other institutions."

"Receive agendas in advance."

"Be involved in special task force."

"Need to establish sub-committees with specific assignments."

"Take assignments seriously and not just a prestige appointment."

"Know responsibilities."

"Be around enough to know what is going on."

"Administrators run school. Board should give direction."

"Read official university publications."

"Become acquainted with faculty, staff, and families of staff."

"Support university financially."

"By being used more--other than trustee meetings."

"Less emphasis on local personal interests--particularly of church representatives."
"Keeping abreast on educational happenings."

"Involve in a sub-committee."

"Briefings the day before board."

"Executive board members keep up on matters quite well. It's a farce to be a member of the regular board. There is no way one can know enough to be effective."

"The most important emphasis of trustees, administrators, et cetera, is a strong Christian commitment and Christian orientation. This cannot be overemphasized."

"Time for faculty and students to meet trustees personally."

"Cannot be a good board member and meet only twice a year."

"Boards are credited for and/or blamed for many things they have no knowledge of or ever had a discussion of."

"Trustees must hold administration accountable for reports and information."

"Performance standards should be set for the board, the president, the administrators, the staff, and each department."

"Trustees should not meddle in administration."

"Board needs to provide meaningful direction to meet the changing needs of society."

"Takes time to be a worthwhile trustee."

"I suppose certain church administrators ought to be trustees, but I wonder seriously how much they (we) contribute. Some seem to be there to watch their own interests rather than to contribute positively to the board."

"Wish for ways to involve trustees individually. Specific assignments might help."

"By participating in discussions. Many never voice an opinion."

"Greater involvement."

"More communication from the University."

"By making more financial contributions to the University and by encouraging their friends to do so."
"Be better informed."

"Understand role of the board and role of the church."

"Meet more frequently with shorter meetings."

"Improve quality of staff work coming from the administration to the board."

"Be more open."

"Spend time on campus other than trustee meetings."

"Visit with other University administrators to get better acquainted with University's present and future plans."

"Have more minorities and women on Board."

"Trustee orientation."

"More time for discussion."

"Attend professional meetings."

"Take responsibility seriously."

"Do not vote on issues unless fully informed."

"Be fully informed with supporting material on every item on the agenda."

"Impossible for a layperson to be effective unless they are on the executive committee and have substantial time to devote."

"More fully informed on issues discussed. By being given options or pros and cons on issues."

"More information. We make tough decisions with inadequate information."

"More frequent visits to the University."

"Administration and church officials don't listen to the specialized expertise of laity when counsel is given. This happens so often that laymen give up trying to help."

"By reading more professional material on trusteeship."

"Arrange campus tours so trustees know the campus and its strengths and weaknesses."
Section II: Attitudes of Trustees toward Trustee Responsibilities

Part II of the questionnaire was divided into sections corresponding to John Nason's twelve trustee responsibilities.

I. To Appoint the President
II. To Support the President
III. To Assess the President's Performance
IV. To Clarify the Mission of the Institution
V. To Approve Long Range Plans
VI. To Approve the Educational Program
VII. To Insure Financial Solvency
VIII. To Maintain the Physical Plant
IX. To Preserve Institutional Autonomy
X. To Enhance the Public Image
XI. To Serve as a Court of Appeal
XII. To Assess Their Own Performance

The questionnaire was further subdivided. Trustees were asked to respond to each item on the questionnaire on a scale of (1) highly important, (2) moderately important, (3) little importance, (4) not a trustee responsibility. A rank of importance according to trustee response is shown for each item--each of which is plotted on a 0 to 10 scale.

In this study, those items ranked 7-10, on a 0 to 10 scale, are considered of greatest importance, 3-7 as of moderate importance, and 0-3 as of least importance.
Trustee Responsibility: Twelve
Trustee Responsibilities

(I) The Appointment of the President was listed as the greatest responsibility of the composite group (10.0), laymen (10.0), and the 1971-80 trustees (10.0). It also received a high ranking with church administrators (7.9). It received only a moderate importance ranking from 1961-70 trustees (5.5).

(IX) To Preserve Institutional Autonomy was ranked of greatest importance by church administrators (9.6), but of least importance by all other groupings: composite (.8), laymen (.07), 1961-70 trustees (.0), and 1971-80 trustees (1.3).

(IV) To Approve the Educational Program was ranked of greatest importance by church administrators (10.0), but of least importance by all other groupings: Composite (.5), laymen (.0), 1961-70 trustees (2.7), and 1971-80 trustees (.0).

(VI) To Clarify the Mission of the Institution was ranked of highest importance by 1961-70 trustees (10.0). It received a moderate rank among laymen (3.1), and a least important rank with church administrators (2.7), 1971-80 trustees (.3), and composite grouping (1.5).

Four trustee responsibilities (XI) To Serve as a Court of Appeal, (X) To Enhance the Public Image, (VIII) To Maintain the Physical Plant, and (VII) To Insure Financial Solvency all received ranking of moderate importance by church administrators (5.9, 5.6, 4.9, 3.5), but received least importance by laymen (.2, .2, .04, 1.0), 1971-80 trustees (.5, .6, .6, .6), and the composite group (.2, .04, .4, .07).

The responsibility to (III) Assess the President's Performance received a moderate importance rank with laymen (4.6) and a least
EXHIBIT 1
TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY: TWELVE TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITIES

I. To Appoint the President
II. To Support the President
III. To Assess the President's Performance
IV. To Clarify the Mission of the Institution
V. To Approve Long Range Plans
VI. To Approve the Educational Program
VII. To Insure Financial Solvency
VIII. To Maintain the Physical Plant
IX. To Preserve Institutional Autonomy
X. To Enhance the Public Image
XI. To Serve as a Court of Appeal
XII. To Assess Their Own Performance

Legend:
1. Composite
2. Church Administrators
3. Laymen
4. 1961-1970
5. 1971-1980

Unit Interval Scale for Comparison Purposes
important rank with all other groupings: church administrators (.0), 1961-70 trustees (.5), 1971-80 trustees (1.5), and composite (1.2).

Only two responsibilities received least importance ranking by all groups, (II) To Support the President--composite (1.5), church administrators (2.8), laymen (2.9), 1961-70 trustees (1.9), and 1971-80 trustees (.6)--and (V) To Approve Long Range Plans--composite (.3), church administrators (2.7), laymen (2.0), 1961-70 trustees (1.3), and 1971-80 trustees (.8).

Trustee Responsibility: To Appoint the President

Leadership ability (9) was unanimously chosen as of greatest importance in the appointment of the president. It received a ranking of 10.0 from all groups. At the other end, Counsel with students on appointment of president (4) was unanimously ranked the least important, receiving a .0 ranking from all groups. Consider the particular needs of the university or college at the time of the appointment (5) was the only other item that received a greatest importance ranking (8.4) and that only by 1961-70 trustees. It received a moderate importance ranking by laymen and the composite group (4.9 and 4.8 respectively). Church administrators ranked it least important (1.1).

Three groups--laymen, 1961-70 trustees, and composite group (5.6, 5.6, and 3.9 respectively)--ranked the Organize search committee (1) as of moderate importance; church administrators and 1971-80 trustees ranked the needs of a search committee of least importance (.69 and .7, respectively).
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EXHIBIT 2

TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY: TO APPOINT THE PRESIDENT

1. To Appoint the President
   1. Organize search committee
   2. Counsel with faculty and administration on appointment of president
   3. Counsel with alumni on appointment of president
   4. Counsel with students on appointment of president
   5. Consider the particular needs of the university or college at the time of the appointment

   Require that the president should have the following:
   6. Earned doctorate degree
   7. Teaching experience
   8. Previous administrative experience
   9. Leadership ability
It was interesting to note that church administrators and 1971-80 trustees ranked all items as of least importance except the one item concerning leadership ability. Counsel with alumni on appointment of president (3) is the only other item that was ranked by all as least important (composite 1.0, church administrators .2, laymen 1.1, 1961-70 trustees 1.6, and 1971-80 trustees .1).

There was a place at the end of each section for comments. Comments following the To Appoint the President section were as follows:

"Single most important task of trustee."

"Wide counsel should be taken before any action."

"In SDA situation the circle of possibilities for a president is somewhat limited and the candidates are quite well known."

"What about his spiritual qualifications?"

"Spiritual example and consistency of Christian experience."

"Suggestions can be solicited from interest groups."

Trustee Responsibility: To Support the President

To provide adequate administrative staff to assist president (15) received the most greatest importance ranking (composite 10.0, church administrators 10.0, 1961-70 trustees 9.2, 1971-80 trustees 8.7). It received only a 5.0 ranking from laymen. Understand the built-in conflicts and demands placed upon the president (16) received a 10.0 ranking from laymen, but received 3.9 from church administrators, 5.9 from 1961-70 trustees, and 4.0 from 1971-80 trustees; the composite ranking was 9.2. Allow president to lead
EXHIBIT 3

TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY: TO SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT

11. To Support the President
10. Encourage the president
11. Counsel president against potential serious mistakes
12. Support president in time of conflict
13. Be concerned with health of president
14. Be concerned with effectiveness of president
15. Provide adequate administrative staff to assist president
16. Understand the built-in conflicts and demands placed upon the president
17. Allow president to lead rather than having trustees assume the leadership role
rather than having trustees assume the leadership role (17) received greatest importance ranking from church administrators (7.9) and from 1971-80 trustees (8.4). It received only 1.0 from 1961-70 trustees and 3.2 from laymen.

Counsel president against potential serious mistakes (11) received all least important rankings (composite .0, church administrators .0, 1961-70 trustees .0, 1971-80 trustees .1, and laymen .6).

There seems to be little concern also for the President's health (13), laymen .0, 1971-80 trustees .0, church administrators 1.3, and composite 1.7. Only 1961-70 trustees gave it a higher ranking (7.1).

General comments are as follows:

"Let president express his concerns and problems rather than 'smother' him with concern and counsel."

"Important that trustees not try to move into the field of administration."

"It is a credit to the trustees that the president succeeds."

"Should support but not blindly."

"Too many live too far away to be of any help and support to the president."

"Should not be a rubber stamp. If disagree go to president first; board chairman, second; then only to other trustees. Never should president's ability be questioned to non-supporters."

"Board members tend to act politically. They should strive to serve professionally."

"A good working relationship between the president and the chairman is vital."
Trustee Responsibility: To Assess the President's Performance

Understand that perfection cannot be expected (24) received the highest number of greatest importance rankings (laymen 10.0, 1961-70 trustees 10.0, composite 9.2 and 1971-80 trustees 8.0).

Understand the responsibilities of the president (18) also consistently ranked of greatest importance (composite 10.0, church administrators 8.7, laymen 7.7, 1961-70 trustees 7.2, 1971-80 trustees 7.0). Be certain institutional policies are being carried out (20) received a 10.0 by church administrators, an 8.8 by composite 8.6 by 1971-80 trustees and 7.7 by 1961-70 trustees, but only a 4.4 by laymen. Inform the president of the criteria of evaluation before or at the time of appointment (19) received a 10.0 ranking by only 1971-80 trustees. It received from the composite 7.3, church administrators 6.7, laymen 6.3, but only a 2.9 from 1961-70 trustees.

Two items Emphasize ways of improving his performance (22) and Make formal periodic assessment of the president and his performance (21) received least important rankings by all groups.

Personal comments are as follows:

"Criteria should be established when president is selected."

"Could be done through the board chairman."

"Trustees should not breathe down the back of president. He is the leader and should be trusted and left as free as possible to do his job."

"Must realize no one is perfect."

Trustee Responsibility: To Clarify the Mission of the Institution

Understand the clarifying the mission of the institution is a
EXHIBIT 4

TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY: TO ASSESS THE PRESIDENT’S PERFORMANCE

III. To Assess the President’s Performance
18. Understand the responsibilities of the president
19. Inform the president of the criteria of evaluation before or at the time of appointment
20. Be certain institutional policies are being carried out
21. Make formal periodic assessment of the president and his performance
22. Emphasize ways of improving his performance
23. Consider the personality and personal characteristics of the president
24. Understand that perfection cannot be expected
IV. To Clarify the Mission
25. Justify the existence of the institution in terms of its contributions to society and fulfillment of its mission
26. Understand that clarifying the mission of the institution is a joint enterprise of trustees, administration and faculty
27. Realize that over the years circumstances change and the original purposes or mission may be modified
28. Be willing to accept responsibility for all institutional policies
joint enterprise of trustees, administration, and faculty (26)
received rankings of 10.0 from all groups.

Realize that over the years circumstances change and the
original purposes or mission may be modified (27) received the highest
number of least importance rankings (composite .0, church administra-
tors .0, 1961-70 trustees .0, 1971-80 trustees .0 and laymen 2.7).
Be willing to accept responsibility for all institutional policies (28)
also received a least importance ranking by laymen .0, composite 2.3,
and 1971-80 trustees .3. It received a 5.6 ranking by church admin-
istrators and a 6.9 ranking by 1961-70 trustees.

General comments are as follows:

"Can't conceive of any circumstance where basic mission
of Andrews University would change."

"How and why the change is the important question."

"Policies may change but mission should resist change."

"All decisions must be made with the institution's mission
in mind."

"This is window dressing. It is put on paper and ignored."

Trustee Responsibility: To Approve
Long-Range Plans

This responsibility was divided into three sections, first
general responses, second what long-range plans should include, and
third responsibilities of trustees.

There were two areas that were considered to be of greatest
importance: first, in the area of trustee responsibility, Understand
that long-range planning must be flexible and have alternatives (37)
was ranked by composite 10.0, church administrators 7.1, laymen 10.0,
EXHIBIT 6

TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY: TO APPROVE LONG RANGE PLANS

V. To Approve Long Range Plans
29. Understand that long range plans are the strategies for achieving the institution's mission
30. Realize that long range plans are especially needed in a period of declining resources
   Long range planning should include:
31. Finances
32. Curriculum
33. Facilities
34. Student needs

Responsibilities of the trustee are to:
35. Draw up long range plans
36. Approve adequate long range plans drawn up by administration and faculty
37. Understand that long range planning must be flexible and have alternatives
38. Realize that long range planning must also include a realistic way to accomplish the plans
1961-70 trustees 10.0, and 1971-80 trustees 7.1, and second, in what long-range plans should include, **Finances (31)** was ranked by composite 9.9, church administrators 10.0, laymen 7.0, 1961-70 trustees 5.7, 1971-80 trustees 10.0. Even though both groups considered finances to be important in planning, church administrators considered it of higher importance (10.0) than laymen (7.1).

All groups also considered **Realize that long-range planning must also include a realistic way to accomplish the plans (38)** to be of greatest importance (composite 8.4, church administrators 7.7, laymen 7.0, 1961-70, 1971-80 trustees 7.6).

Of least importance in long-range planning was **Draw up long-range plans (35)**. All groups place this at a 0 ranking.

There were two areas where there was considerable difference in the ranking by church administrators vs. laymen and 1961-70 trustees vs. 1971-80 trustees. **Understand that long-range plans are the strategies for achieving the institution's mission (29)** was ranked by church administrators 9.1 as opposed laymen 5.3 and 1961-70 trustees 5.6 to 1971-80 trustees 7.6; and the opinion that long-range planning should include **Curriculum (32)** was shown by church administrators 7.7 to laymen 4.5 and 1961-70 trustees 5.0 to 1971-80 trustees 8.4. The church administrators and 1971-80 trustees were closer in their ranking and the laymen and the 1961-70 trustees were closer in theirs.

General comments were as follows:

"Responsibility of president but trustees should insist it be done."

"Trustees should be involved in formulating long-range plans."
"Even long-range plans can become ignored if not used as a road map."

**Trustee Responsibility: To Approve the Educational Program**

Decide to add or delete schools, departments, or programs (39) was the item considered of greatest importance and received highest ranking by all groups except 1961-70 trustees (composite 10.0, church administrators 10.0, laymen 10.0, 1961-70 trustees 6.2, 1971-80 trustees 10.0). The 1961-70 trustees gave Approve tenure (45) the highest ranking (10.0). Other groups also considered it of greatest importance ranking by all groups except 1961-70 trustees (composite 9.2, church administrators 8.8, laymen 9.2, 1971-80 trustees 8.6, and 1961-70 trustees 6.3).

Approve what is taught in specific classrooms (41) received the least importance ranking .0 by all groups.

General comments are as follows:

"Must act only on recommendation of president."

"Academic freedom does not include right to teach beliefs other than those of the church."

"Academic freedom within the framework of the institution's mission and purpose."

"Academic freedom within framework of the mission and purpose."

"'Tenure.' I'm waiting for a definition that means something more than license."

"Too many cases of academic freedom + tenure + trouble."

"Academic freedom must have certain limitations among SDAs."
VI. To Approve the Educational Program
39. Decide to add or delete schools, departments or programs
40. Approve the curriculum
41. Approve what is taught in specific classrooms
42. Keep abreast of changing times and educational needs
43. Formulate educational policies
44. Understand that faculty should have academic freedom
45. Approve tenure
46. Approve faculty promotions
Trustee Responsibility: To Insure Financial Solvency

Determine the size and adequacy of operating budget (59) received the greatest importance ranking (composite, 10.0, church administrators 10.0, laymen 8.9, 1961-70 trustees 10.0, 1971-80 trustees 9.5). See that institution is managed well (50) also received the greatest importance ranking by most groups (composite 9.1, church administrators 8.9, laymen 10.0, 1971-80 trustees 10.0), but the 1961-70 trustees gave it a moderate importance score (6.0). Be certain that income equals expenses (52) is the only other item that received all greatest importance rankings (composite 8.2, church administrators 8.3, laymen 9.2, 1961-70 trustees 7.5, 1971-80 trustees 8.3).

The least importance ranking was very consistent with all groups and dealt with fund raising and seeking support: Enlist other volunteers (57) was ranked by composite .0, church administrators .3, laymen .0, 1961-70 trustees .0, 1971-80 trustees .0; Solicit contributions from others (56), composite .1, church administrators .0, laymen .8, 1961-70 trustees .09, 1971-80 trustees .1; Contribute personally to the support of the institution (54), composite 2.3, church administrators 2.3, laymen 2.6, 1961-70 trustees 1.2, 1971-80 trustees 2.9; and Help to identify and cultivate potential donors (55), composite 2.5, church administrators 2.4, 1961-70 trustees 1.4. Only the laymen and 1971-80 trustees gave this item a very low moderate importance ranking (3.3 and 3.0, respectively).

General comments are as follows:

"Need to take greater part in responsibility of fund-raising."
EXHIBIT 8

TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY: TO INSURE FINANCIAL SOLVENCY

VII. To Insure Financial Solvency

49. Accept responsibility for financial health of the institution
50. See that institution is managed well
51. Invest endowments with prudence
52. Be certain that income equals expenses
53. Accept the responsibility for seeking new sources of income
54. Contribute personally to the support of the institution
55. Help to identify and cultivate potential donors
56. Solicit contributions from others
57. Enlist other volunteers
58. Provide for fund raising that is continuous
59. Determine the size and adequacy of operating budget
60. Determine tuition and fees
61. Set salary schedules and fringe benefits

Unit Interval Scale for Comparison Purposes

Study Groups

Composite
Church Administrators
Laymen
1961-1970
1971-1980
"Management of finances under direction of financial specialist. Final approval by trustees."

"Personal contributions is desirable but one might not be able to contribute but still be a good trustee."

"Much of this can be handled through sub-committees."

"Not responsible for financial health but must accept responsibility to see that institution is managed properly so it will be financially healthy."

"I gave through the church."

"My dad was a generous contributor for many years and I felt that was sufficient."

**Trustee Responsibility: To Maintain the Physical Plant**

In this area of trustee responsibility there was unanimous ranking on the item of greatest importance and least importance. **Authorize the construction of buildings (63) received a 10.0 rank by all groups and Provide necessary maintenance for buildings and campus (65) received a .0 rank by all groups.** Other items were scattered throughout the entire graph. The only other items that received an extreme high or low rank were **Provide necessary physical facilities to meet institutional goals and educational needs (62) which received a 9.8 by church administrators and Select the architect and approve architectural design (64) which received a .6 from laymen.**

There were no general comments listed under this section.

**Trustee Responsibility: To Preserve Institutional Autonomy**

There was consistent high and low ranking in this area of responsibility. **Insist that donors not be allowed to dictate unacceptable conditions (67) received a 10.0 ranking from all groups and**
EXHIBIT 9

TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY: TO MAINTAIN THE PHYSICAL PLANT

VIII. To Maintain the Physical Plant
62. Provide necessary physical facilities to meet institutional goals and educational needs
63. Authorize the construction of buildings
64. Select the architect and approve architectural design
65. Provide necessary maintenance for buildings and campus
IX. To Preserve Institutional Autonomy

66. See that the university must maintain a high degree of independence from non-sponsored control
67. Insist that donors not be allowed to dictate unacceptable conditions
68. Realize that trustees are responsible for defending the institution
69. Insure that the university maintains its role as critic of society
Insure that the university maintains its role as critic of society (69) received a .0 ranking from all groups.

Only one other item See that the university must maintain a high degree of independence from non-sponsored control (66) received a greatest importance rank (church administrators 9.3). All other groups ranked this as of moderate importance (composite 6.7, laymen 5.3, 1961-70 trustees 3.9, 1971-80 trustees 6.0).

General comments are as follows:

"More important to understand and provide alternatives to society than to criticize."

"Seventh-day Adventist Church and Andrews University are really one unit."

"Should be a place where discussion can take place."

"Must be in relationship to the church that gives support."

"It takes more intelligence to understand society than to criticize it. Society must be assessed both positively and negatively."

Trustee Responsibility: To Enhance the Public Image

There is a contrast in ranking between the 1961-70 trustees and all other groups in this trustee responsibility.

A trustee should interpret the university to the community (74) received a greatest importance and highest ranking by all groups except 1961-70 trustees (composite 10.0, church administrators 10.0, laymen 10.0, 1971-80 trustees 10.0). It received a least importance and lowest ranking by the 1961-70 trustees (.0).

The 1961-70 trustees ranked A trustee should actively promote the institution (72) of greatest importance (10.0). This item received
X. To Enhance the Public Image
70. The responsibility of trustees goes beyond lending their names and prestige to an institution.
71. Trustees should give public support to all board action despite individual and/or personal opinions.
72. A trustee should actively promote the institution.
73. A trustee should interpret the community to the university.
74. A trustee should interpret the university to the community.
a moderate importance ranking by the composite grouping (5.8) and 1971-80 trustees (3.4) and a least important ranking by church administrators (2.6) and laymen (.5).

The responsibility of trustees goes beyond lending their names and prestige to an institution (70) received three least important rankings (composite .0, laymen .0, 1971-80 trustees .0, church administrators 1.4).

The only other item receiving a .0 was by church administrators -- Trustees should give public support to all board action despite individual and/or personal opinions (71). Laymen ranked this 1.4, also of least importance. Two other groups gave it a moderate importance ranking (composite 5.2, 1971-80 trustees 3.2). One group, 1961-70 trustees, ranked it of greatest importance (8.9).

General comments are as follows:

"There could be a minority report" under certain circumstances."

"Must speak mind at board meetings, but once action taken, they must act with one voice."

"Those who say we can't adopt a policy because the constituency will not understand should adopt the policy and take steps to see that the policy is understood."

Trustee Responsibility: To Serve as a Court of Appeal

Of the two items There should be clearly established and publicized codes governing faculty status and student behavior (75) received a 10.0 and greatest importance rank by the composite grouping, church administrators, and 1961-70 trustees. Both faculty and students have rights and should have due processes by which those
XI. To Serve as a Court of Appeal
75. There should be clearly established and publicized codes governing faculty status and student behavior.
76. Both faculty and students have rights and should have due processes by which those rights are protected.
rig hts are protected (76) received a 10.0 and greatest importance ranking by laymen and 1971-80 trustees.

General comments are as follows:

"Due process providing it doesn't get in the way of the mission or heart of the operation."

"Only rarely and for major problems."

"Only after grievance committee has failed to conciliate."

Trustee Responsibility: To Assess Their Own Performance

The final division of trustee responsibility To Assess Their Own Performance is divided into three sections, (1) the type of evaluation that should take place, (2) the frequency of the evaluation, and (3) items a self study should include.

Part I--Type of Evaluation

A Systematic (79) study was ranked as greatest importance by all but the 1961-70 trustees (composite 10.0, church administrators 9.8, laymen 10.0, 1971-80 trustees 10.0). The 1961-70 trustees ranked Systematic (79) at 6.3 and ranked By self study (80) with a 10.0 ranking. All other groups also ranked By self study (80) as of greatest importance with the following scores, composite 8.8, church administrators 10.0, laymen 7.6, 1971-80 trustees 7.9.

By an outside consultant (81) received a least importance ranking by all groups (composite .0, 1971-80 trustees .0). Formal (77) evaluation also received a least important rank by all except the 1961-70 trustees (4.5). Ranking was as follows: composite 1.7, church administrators 1.9, laymen 1.6, 1971-80 trustees .8.
XII. To Assess Their Own Performance

Trustee evaluation should be:
77. Formal
78. Informal
79. Systematic
80. By self study
81. By an outside consultant

EXHIBIT 13

TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY: TO ASSESS THEIR OWN PERFORMANCE
Part II--Frequency of Evaluation

There was unanimous ranking in the frequency of evaluation. Every three years (83) received a greatest importance and 10.0 ranking by all groups. Every year (82) received a least importance and .0 ranking by all groups. Every five years (84) also received a least important ranking and a consistently similar rank by all groups (composite 1.6, church administrators 1.7, laymen 1.7, 1961-70 trustees 1.0, 1971-80 trustees 1.7).

Part III--Items Self Study Should Include

In this section Attendance at board meetings (93) received a greatest importance and a 10.0 rank by the 1961-70 trustees. All other items received a least importance ranking by the 1961-70 trustees.

Understanding trustee responsibility (85) received the greatest importance ranking by composite 10.0, church administrators 7.7, and 1971-80 trustees 10.0. Attendance at board meetings (93) received a 10.0 rank from church administrators and 1961-70 trustees, and the following rank from other groups: composite 8.7, laymen 7.2, and 1971-80 trustees 7.8.

Fulfillment of role as trustee (86) and Active participation in board meetings (89) both received several greatest importance rankings. Fulfillment of role as trustee(86) showed the following ranking: composite 7.1, laymen 7.7, 1971-80 trustees 7.9, with church administrators ranking it 4.9. Active participation in board meetings (89) was ranked by composite 7.8, laymen 8.5, 1971-80 trustees 7.9, and church administrators 5.3.
EXHIBIT 14

TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY: FREQUENCY OF EVALUATION

Frequency of evaluation:
82. Every year
83. Every three years
84. Every five years
EXHIBIT 15

TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY: SELF STUDY SHOULD INCLUDE FOLLOWING ITEMS

Self study should include the following items:

85. Understanding trustee responsibility
86. Fulfillment of role as trustee
87. Knowledge of institution
88. Self improvement of trustee (attending seminars, reading books, etc.)
89. Active participation in board meetings
90. Support of the majority of decisions made
91. Participation in fund raising
92. Adequate preparation for board meetings
93. Attendance at board meetings
94. Participation on committees

Unit Interval Scale for Comparison Purposes
Participation in fund raising (91) was of least importance and ranked .0 by all groups.

Following are general comments on trustee self-evaluation:

"Constituency is responsible in the last analysis for trustee evaluation."

"Should support all decisions resulting from majority vote."

"Too many have 'tunnel vision.'"

"Need a vision of greatness and excellence under God."

"Too much to expect Seventh-day Adventist college trustees to realistically evaluate their performance. At best they are ill-informed of the complexities of college operations. Too often their appointments are made because of their positions. Too many regard their trusteeship as either a burden or an opportunity to foster their other tasks or promote personal 'pet' notions."

"An outside consultant is a waste of money. They have to educate themselves to the institution and they will never understand the uniqueness of an SDA institution."

"Every year trustees should evaluate themselves."

"The mind is capable of assessment that surpasses a formal assessment on paper."
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to:

1. Identify the characteristics of Andrews University trustees including demographic information regarding age, education, profession, political views, trustee preparation, contribution record, and trustee participation.

In summary most Andrews University trustees, when serving as a trustee, were 50-59 years of age (37 percent), held a master's degree (26 percent), were church administrators (55 percent), and did not serve at the same time as a trustee of any other university or college (56 percent). These trustees were not given an orientation to trusteeship (89 percent) but felt that such an orientation would have been helpful (77 percent). They were not actively involved as a trustee other than attending trustee meetings (59 percent) but would have been willing to become more actively involved (56 percent). They considered their political views (39 percent) and their religious views (43 percent) to be moderate to conservative. In addition, the trustees felt that the composition or mix of the board was good (79 percent), they attended most of the regular trustee meetings (93
percent), did not serve on a trustee sub-committee (50 percent), did not make an annual contribution to the university (58 percent) and felt they understood trustee responsibilities (84 percent) and the university's stated mission (96 percent). Most kept abreast on higher educational trends (69 percent).

2. Determine how trustees of Andrews University perceive/ perceived their role in relationship to the twelve trustee responsibilities listed by Nason (1980).

Of the twelve trustee responsibilities listed by Nason (1980), the three trustee groups (composite, laymen, 1971-80 trustees) perceived that To Appoint the President ranked highest in importance. To Approve the Educational Program was ranked highest by trustees who were church administrators; and To Clarify the Mission of the Institution was ranked highest by 1961-70 trustees. To Assess Their Own Performance was ranked lowest by the composite group; To Assess the President's Performance was ranked lowest by the church administrators; and To Approve the Educational Program was ranked lowest by both laymen and 1971-80 trustees. The 1961-70 trustees ranked To Serve as a Court of Appeal as the lowest.


Two of Nason's twelve trustee responsibilities were seen considerably different by the trustees serving from 1961-1970 and those trustees serving from 1971-1980. These were To Clarify the Mission of the Institution (more important to the 1961-70 group) and To Appoint the President (more important to the 1971-80 group).
4. Compare the responses of those whose primary profession was/is ecclesiastical or church administration with other trustees. There were six of Nason's twelve trustee responsibilities where there was considerable difference between church administrators and laymen. Those considered more important by church administrators were (1) To Approve the Educational Program, (2) To Preserve Institutional Autonomy, (3) To Serve as a Court of Appeal, (4) To Enhance the Public Image, (5) To Maintain the Physical Plant. The laymen felt that To Assess the President's Performance was more important.

5. Gather and analyze data and suggest for review, consideration, and possible adaptation a plan of orientation for trustees to their responsibilities.

From the study there seems to be a need for continuing programs of trustee orientation, education, and development. This is needed on three levels: (1) information given, (2) skills developed, and (3) the changing of philosophy and attitudes. In order for an educational program to be successful the following are essential: (1) Trustees must recognize the need, (2) the program must be continuing, (3) those with professional experience in trustee education must be involved, and (4) an adequate budget.

Population Studied

Since its establishment in 1960 and until 1980, 154 have served as trustees of Andrews University. Nine of this group are deceased, two could not be located. The questionnaire was sent to 143 possible respondents. Six stated that they were unaware of their election as trustees and thus were unable to respond. Of the total
trustees, 137 were viable respondents. One hundred twenty-one (88 percent) responded. Of those responding 67 (55 percent) were church administrators, 54 (45 percent) were non-church administrators. Eighty-two (68 percent) were trustees serving from 1971-1980 while 39 (32 percent) were trustees serving from 1961-1970.

Procedures

A two-part questionnaire was sent to each viable trustee. Part one requested twenty-eight responses; part two requested ninety-four responses.

A letter explaining the study, a letter from the President of Andrews University endorsing the study, and a self-addressed envelope were sent with each questionnaire to 143 current and former trustees. Four weeks were allowed for the respondents to complete and return the questionnaire. A second letter and questionnaire were sent to those who did not respond; a request was made that the questionnaire be returned in four weeks. A third letter and questionnaire were sent to those not responding.

Major Findings

This study provides the answer to two questions. After careful analysis of the data, the following answers are given:

Question one. Is there a magnitude difference between the way church administrators and non-church administrators (laymen) view/viewed their trustee responsibilities as listed by Nason?

A spread of four points or more was used as a determining factor for a magnitude difference. There were 106 possible responses.
Sixteen were of magnitude differences. In reporting the differences each item has been listed. In the parentheses following each item is listed first the group with the higher ranking, second the point spread between two groups, and third the group with the lower ranking. (Ch represents the church-administration trustees, and Lay the lay-member trustees.)

Twelve Trustee Responsibilities--

1. To approve the educational program (Ch, 10.0, Lay)
2. To preserve institutional autonomy (Ch, 9.53, Lay)
3. To serve as a court of appeal (Ch, 5.7, Lay)
4. To enhance the public image (Ch, 5.4, Lay)
5. To maintain the physical plant (Ch, 4.86, Lay)
6. To assess the president's performance (Lay, 4.6, Ch)

Sub listings--

7. Organize search committee (Lay, 4.91, Ch)
8. Understand the built-in conflicts and demands placed upon the president (Lay, 6.1, Ch)
9. Provide adequate administrative staff to assist president (Ch, 5.0, Lay)
10. Allow president to lead rather than having trustees assume the leadership role (Ch, 4.7, Lay)
11. Be certain institutional policies are being carried out (Ch, 5.6, Lay)
12. Be willing to accept responsibilities for all institutional policies (Ch, 5.6, Lay)
13. Select the architect and approve architectural design (Ch, 4.5, Lay)

14. There should be clearly established and publicized codes governing faculty status and student behavior (Ch, 10.0, Lay)

15. Both faculty and students have rights and should have due process by which those rights are protected (Lay, 10.0 Ch)

16. Adequate preparation for board meetings (Lay, 4.3, Ch)

Question two. There is a magnitude difference between the way trustees who served between 1961-1970 and those who served between 1971-1980 view/viewed their responsibilities as listed by Nason.

The same determining factor and reporting method is used in question two as was used in question one. There were 106 possible responses, twenty-five were of magnitude difference.

Twelve Trustee Responsibilities--

1. To clarify the mission of the institution (1961-70 trustees, 9.7, 1971-80 trustees)

2. To appoint the president (1971-80 trustees, 4.5, 1961-70 trustees)

Sub Listings--

3. Consider the particular needs of the university or college at the time of the appointment (1961-70 trustees, 7.6, 1971-80 trustees)

4. Counsel with faculty and administration on appointment of president (1961-70 trustees, 5.8, 1971-80 trustees)

6. Previous administrative experience (1961-70 trustees, 5.1, 1971-80 trustees)

7. Organize search committees (1961-70 trustees, 4.9, 1971-80 trustees)


9. Allow president to lead rather than having trustees assume the leadership role (1971-80 trustees, 7.4, 1961-70 trustees)


12. Inform the president of the criteria of evaluation before or at the time of appointment (1971-80 trustees, 7.1, 1961-70 trustees)

13. Be willing to accept responsibility for all institutional policies (1961-70 trustees, 6.6, 1971-80 trustees)

14. See that institution is managed well (1971-80 trustees, 4.0, 1961-70 trustees)

15. A trustee should interpret the university to the community (1971-80 trustees, 10.0, 1961-70 trustees)

16. A trustee should actively promote the institution (1961-70 trustees, 6.6, 1971-80 trustees)

17. The responsibility of trustees goes beyond lending their names and prestige to an institution (1961-70 trustees, 6.4, 1971-80 trustees)
18. Trustees should give public support to all board activities despite individual and/or personal opinions (1961-70 trustees, 5.7, 1971-80 trustees)

19. There should be clearly established and publicized codes governing faculty status and student behavior (1961-70 trustees, 10.0, 1971-80 trustees)

20. Both faculty and students have rights and should have due processes by which those rights are protected (1971-80 trustees, 10.0, 1961-70 trustees)


22. Fulfillment of role as trustee (1971-80 trustees, 7.5, 1961-70 trustees)


24. Knowledge of institution (1971-80 trustees, 6.0, 1961-70 trustees)


Additional Findings from Questionnaire

In addition to the magnitude differences among the grouping of trustees there were other significant findings that the study revealed.

1. All groups ranked counsel with students and alumni in the appointment of the president as least important.
2. All groups ranked *realize that over the years circumstances change and the original purposes or mission may be modified* as of least importance.

3. All groups ranked *approve what is taught in specific classrooms* as of least importance, yet in certain divisions of the institution approval is sought by certain groups.

4. All areas dealing with development and fund raising were ranked as least important; e.g., *contribute personally to the support of the institution, help to identify and cultivate donors, solicit contributions from others, enlist other volunteers*. In addition *participation in fund raising was ranked as least important of items that should be included in a self-study*.

5. All groups ranked the need for a self-study as of greatest importance, but ranked as least important that this study be done by an outside consultant.

**Concerns Listed in General Comments**

1. The president must be a spiritual leader and have a consistent Christian experience.

2. Academic freedom must be allowed only within the framework of the university's philosophy and objectives.

3. The board is comprised of too many ex officio members who represent various aspects of the church and have little real loyalty or interest in the university.

4. There is need to receive agenda of trustee meetings in advance of the meeting.
5. More sub committees or task forces need to be established to deal with special problems or specific assignments.

6. Trustees need to become more acquainted with the campus and faculty and students.

7. There needs to be more involvement of laymen.

Findings of Significance from the General Information of the Questionnaire

1. There is a much higher level of education among the lay trustees than among the church administrators.

2. There are a large number of professional businessmen (37 percent) and educators (39 percent) who are trustees and are not being used to serve on sub committees or special-study groups.

3. A significant number (59 percent church administrators and 24 percent laymen) serve as trustees of other colleges and universities at the same time they serve on Andrews' board. Thirty-three percent serve as chairmen of that board. While they do not think this creates a conflict of interest (only 2 percent of the trustees and 3 percent of the laymen answered yes there was a conflict of interest), 19 percent of the church administrators and 33 percent of the laymen who do not serve on other boards do think there is a conflict of interest.

4. A significant percentage (90 percent church administrators and 89 percent laymen) never received an orientation to trustee responsibilities. At the same time 77 percent of the church administrators and 78 percent laymen thought an orientation to trustee responsibilities would be helpful.
5. A significant percentage of laymen (70 percent) never served on a special trustee committee or in a special advisory capacity. At the same time 65 percent of the laymen indicated a willingness to serve on a small group with specific responsibilities.

6. A significant percentage of church administrators (60 percent) and laymen (57 percent) did not/do not make annual financial contributions to the university.

**Conclusions**

Upon the basis of the review of the literature and the data gathered, and acknowledging the limitations of the study, the following conclusions can be made:

1. Trustees have a limited knowledge of trustee responsibility.

2. There is a need for an orientation of all new trustees.

3. There is a need for a continuing educational and development program for trustees.

4. Andrews University, being a church owned and operated institution, has certain built-in factors that enable the church to control the board of trustees thus the university.

5. Trustees believe there should be clearly established and publicized codes governing faculty status and student behavior and that faculty and students have rights only as they are within these controls.

6. The mission of the institution is established, constant, and is non-negotiable.
7. Trustees believe the president is the leader of the university and that trustees, except for the evaluation of the president in that role, should not in any way be concerned with the ongoing management of the institution.

8. There should be more active participation and involvement of trustees in board meetings and board planning and study groups.

9. There is a great lack of sub-committees or special study groups on the board and at the same time trustees have a desire to become more involved and active in this type of activity.

10. Trustees are not concerned with what is taught in specific classrooms except as it concerns a basic, generally accepted belief of the church. There is a strong resistance to any classroom teaching that may question a basic church doctrine or a traditional church belief.

11. Trustees have not given nor do they believe it is necessary that they give financially to the university or should be involved in identifying, cultivating, or soliciting funds and support from others.

12. A trustee's self-evaluation should take place every three years and should not be conducted by an outside consultant.

13. There should be a greater representation of laymen on the board of trustees.

14. A problem of conflict of interest does exist because so many of the trustees serve on or chair other boards of trustees.

15. Trustees need to spend more time on the university campus becoming better acquainted with the campus, the university programs, future plans, the faculty, and students.
16. Since there is a large percentage (76 percent) of laymen who are professional businessmen or educators there needs to be more use made of their expertise.

**Recommendations**

One of the major values of this investigation is to make recommendations that can be helpful to the participants of the study as well as other institutions of higher education. Based upon the review of the literature and the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. That a committee be set up for a continual identification, appraisal, and recommendation of the best possible trustees for Andrews University, irrespective of position, occupation, or geographical location. (Support for this recommendation comes from Table 19, p. 76, Table 15, p. 73, Table 16, p. 74, Table 4, p. 65, Table 5, p. 66, and general comments, pp. 77, 78, 84-86.)

2. That a handbook for trustees be developed, clearly defining their responsibilities, involvement, and expectation. (Support for this recommendation comes from background information, pp. 1-5 and the review of the literature, pp. 12-17.)

3. That programs be developed for (1) new trustee orientation and (2) continuing trustee education and board development. (See Appendix F) (Support for this recommendation comes from Table 12, p. 71, Table 13, p. 72, Table 14, p. 72.)

4. That trustees be encouraged to attend conferences and workshops sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards. (Support
for this recommendation comes from interviews with selected number of Andrews University trustees.)

5. That in order to provide for an efficient operation and administration of the Board of Trustees, the chairman and secretary attend a workshop or conference designed especially for trustee leadership.

6. That a regular, continuing trustee evaluation process be developed to evaluate trustee performance, and that the AGB Self-Study Guidelines for Governing Boards for Private Colleges and Universities be used as a basis for this evaluation. (see Appendix H)
(Support for this recommendation comes from Exhibit 13, p. 113, Exhibit 14, p. 115, Exhibit 15, p. 116, and the review of the literature, pp. 52-56.)

7. That the Board of Trustees organize various sub-committees for more effective use of trustee expertise. Most frequently organized trustee committees are (a) Membership Committee, (b) Academic Affairs Committee, (c) Finance Committee, (d) Development Committee, (f) Student Affairs Committee, (g) Institutional and Plant Planning Committee, (h) Alumni Committee, and (i) Research Committee. (Support for this recommendation comes from Table 21, p. 81, Table 15, p. 73, Table 16, p. 74 and general comments, pp. 77, 78, 84-86.)

8. That a preliminary agenda of board meetings be prepared and sent to trustees at least fifteen days in advance of the meeting thus permitting trustees to be more prepared for participation. (Support for this recommendation comes from general comments pp. 84-86.)

9. That trustees must recognize that a university is a place of scholarship, research, and in-depth thinking and that sound
scholarship need not threaten or undermine church doctrine or the university mission. (Support for this recommendation comes from Exhibit 7, p. 102, general comments, p. 101 and the review of the literature, pp. 45-48.)

10. That trustees be challenged to personally support the university financially. (Support for this recommendation comes from Exhibit 8, p. 104, Exhibit 15, p. 116, Table 22, p. 81 and review of the literature, pp. 38-43.)

11. That trustees become personally involved in identifying, cultivating, and soliciting contributions and support from others. (Support for this recommendation comes from the review of the literature, pp. 38-43.)

12. That trustees be appointed because of their interest in, support of, and willingness to work for the advancement of the university rather than on the basis of the position they hold. (Support for this recommendation comes from general comments, pp. 77, 78, 84-86, Table 19, p. 76).

13. That those church officials who serve as trustees only because of the position they hold, be appointed as advisory trustees rather than as regular trustees thus enabling the appointment of more laymen to trustee positions. (Support for this recommendation comes from general comments, pp. 77, 78, 84-86.)

14. That trustees spend time on the university campus becoming acquainted with the campus facilities, faculty, student, administration, and the overall university program. (Support for this recommendation comes from general comments, pp. 84-86.)
15. That for protection of both the university and trustees a document regarding non-engagement in conflict of interest be prepared for and signed by all trustees. (Support for this recommendation comes from Table 6, p. 67, Table 7, p. 67, Table 8, p. 68, Table 9, p. 68, and Table 10, p. 69.)

Recommendations for Future Studies

As an outgrowth of this study, there are several recommendations that can be made for further research into trusteeship of Seventh-day Adventist institutions of higher education.

1. That a study of trustees of Andrews University be done to solicit attitudes and perceptions of trustees serving since 1980 and if an orientation or educational program has been instituted, to see if there is any change in the way trustees perceive their role and responsibilities.

2. That a similar study of role and responsibilities of trustees be done at all Seventh-day Adventist colleges and universities to determine whether there is a parallel of their perceptions of trustee responsibilities.

3. That a group be commissioned to study and determine the best composition of Seventh-day Adventist boards of trustees with respect to the percentage of church administrators and laymen. The resulting study could prevent the same church administrators from serving on numerous boards, thus increasing their effectiveness and at the same time opening more trustee positions for laymen.
APPENDIX A

THE INSTRUMENT
SURVEY ON TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITY

Introduction

This questionnaire is comprised of two parts. The first part deals with general information, the second deals with trustee responsibility. Please complete both sections. Specific instructions are at the beginning of each section.

PART I

General Information

Instruction: Please check the most appropriate response.

1. Trustee Status
   ___ Currently serving as trustee  ___ Former trustee

2. Age when you began serving as trustee
   ___ Under 39  ___ 40-49  ___ 50-59  ___ 60-69  ___ 70-over

3. Highest level of education completed
   ___ 1. Less than college  
   ___ 2. Bachelor's degree (college)
   ___ 3. Some graduate education, but no degree
   ___ 4. Master's degree
   ___ 5. Doctoral or professional degree (Ph.D., Ed.D., M.D., J.D., etc.)
   ___ 6. Honorary doctorate

4. What was your profession or occupation while serving as a trustee of Andrews University?
   ___ 1. Clergy or church administrator
   ___ 2. Physician
   ___ 3. Educator
   ___ 4. Business man (Type of business ______________________________________________________________)
   ___ 5. Other________________________________________________________________________________—— —

5. While a trustee of Andrews University, did you also serve as a trustee of any other college or university at the same time?
   ___ Yes  ___ No

6. If yes, name institution __________________________________________________________

7. If yes, were you chairperson of that board?
   ___ Yes  ___ No

8. If you served as a trustee on another board, do you think this created a conflict of interest?
   ___ Yes  ___ No

9. If you served as chairperson of the board of another college or university, do you think this was a conflict of interest?
   ___ Yes  ___ No

10. If you did not serve on another board, do you think those trustees who do have a conflict of interest?
   ___ Yes  ___ No
11. When you first became a trustee of Andrews University were you given an orientation regarding the responsibilities of a trustee?
   ___ Yes   ___ No (if no, go to question 13)

12. If answer to 11 is yes, do you think the orientation was:
   ___ 1. Highly important
   ___ 2. Moderately important
   ___ 3. Of little importance
   ___ 4. Of no importance

13. If the answer to 11 is no, do you think an orientation regarding trustee responsibilities would have been:
   ___ 1. Very helpful (beneficial)
   ___ 2. Moderately helpful
   ___ 3. Of little benefit
   ___ 4. Not beneficial

14. Were you active as a trustee at a time other than when you met for the regular trustee meetings, e.g., did you serve on a special trustee committee or in a special advisory capacity?
   ___ Yes   ___ No

15. If answer to 14 is no, would you have been willing to serve on a small trustee group with specific responsibility?
   ___ Yes   ___ No

16. How do you perceive your basic political views?
   ___ 1. Liberal
   ___ 2. Moderate to liberal
   ___ 3. Moderate
   ___ 4. Moderate to conservative
   ___ 5. Conservative

17. How do you perceive your basic religious views in relationship to the doctrine of the Seventh-day Adventist Church?
   ___ 1. Liberal
   ___ 2. Moderate to liberal
   ___ 3. Moderate
   ___ 4. Moderate to conservative
   ___ 5. Conservative

18. Do you think the composition or mix of the trustees of Andrews University is the best? (Church officials, laymen, male, female, ethnic groups, etc.)
   ___ Yes   ___ No

19. If not, how do you think it could be improved? (Please list below)

20. How often did you attend trustee meetings?
   ___ 1. Every meeting
   ___ 2. Almost every meeting
   ___ 3. Occasionally
   ___ 4. Seldom (less than once a year)
21. Did you attend
    ___ 1. All or most trustee meetings
    ___ 2. Few trustee meetings

22. Did you serve on a trustee sub committee?
    ___ Yes ___ No

23. Did you make a personal annual financial contribution to Andrews University?
    ___ Yes ___ No

24. Amount of annual contribution
    ___ 1. $0 - $99
    ___ 2. $100 - $499
    ___ 3. $500 - $999
    ___ 4. $1,000 - $9,999
    ___ 5. $10,000 or more

25. Did you understand the responsibilities of a trustee before you agreed to become one?
    ___ Yes ___ No

26. Were you acquainted with Andrews University's stated mission, institutional plan and policies when you served as a trustee?
    ___ Yes ___ No

27. While a trustee, did you stay abreast of higher education trends, legislation, and other public policy by reading any of the following: Association of Governing Board (AGB) News Notes, The Chronicle of Higher Education, AGB Reports, or other material?
    ___ Yes ___ No

28. In what ways could an Andrews University trustee be more effective?
PART II
Survey of Trustee Responsibilities

*Instruction:* Each item below will require a response. To the right of each item there are four responses: (1) Highly important, (2) Moderately important, (3) Little importance, and (4) Not a trustee responsibility. In your response please circle the appropriate number. Respond to each item including the main headings. Please do not omit any item. IN EACH RESPONSE PLEASE CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING: HOW IMPORTANT DO I REGARD THIS ITEM AS A RESPONSIBILITY OF A TRUSTEE OF ANDREWS UNIVERSITY?

**Responsibility Scale**

1. Highly important  
2. Moderately important  
3. Little importance  
4. Not a trustee responsibility

**I. To Appoint the President**

1. Organize search committee ........................................ 1 2 3 4
2. Counsel with faculty and administration on appointment of president........................................ 1 2 3 4
3. Counsel with alumni on appointment of president .......................................................... 1 2 3 4
4. Counsel with students on appointment of president............................................................. 1 2 3 4
5. Consider the particular needs of the university or college at the time of the appointment 1 2 3 4
   *Require that the president should have the following:*
6. Earned doctorate degree .......................................................... 1 2 3 4
7. Teaching experience ........................................................................ 1 2 3 4
8. Previous administrative experience ............................................................................... 1 2 3 4
9. Leadership ability .................................................................................. 1 2 3 4

Comments:

**II. To Support the President**

10. Encourage the president .................................................. 1 2 3 4
11. Counsel president against potential serious mistakes .......................................................... 1 2 3 4
12. Support president in time of conflict ................................................................. 1 2 3 4
13. Be concerned with health of president ........................................................................ 1 2 3 4
14. Be concerned with effectiveness of president .................................................................... 1 2 3 4
15. Provide adequate administrative staff to assist president .................................................. 1 2 3 4
16. Understand the built-in conflicts and demands placed upon the president .......................... 1 2 3 4
17. Allow president to lead rather than having trustees assume the leadership role............... 1 2 3 4

Comments:
Responsibility Scale

1. Highly important
2. Moderately important
3. Little importance
4. Not trustee responsibility

III. To Assess the President's Performance

18. Understand the responsibilities of the president
19. Inform the president of the criteria of evaluation before or at the time of appointment
20. Be certain institutional policies are being carried out
21. Make formal periodic assessment of the president and his performance
22. Emphasize ways of improving his performance
23. Consider the personality and personal characteristics of the president
24. Understand that perfection cannot be expected

Comments:

IV. To Clarify the Mission

25. Justify the existence of the institution in terms of its contributions to society and fulfillment of its mission
26. Understand that clarifying the mission of the institution is a joint enterprise of trustees, administration and faculty
27. Realize that over the years circumstances change and the original purposes or mission may be modified
28. Be willing to accept responsibility for all institutional policies

Comments:

V. To Approve Long Range Plans

29. Understand that long range plans are the strategies for achieving the institution’s mission
30. Realize that long range plans are especially needed in a period of declining resources

Long range planning should include:

31. Finances
32. Curriculum
33. Facilities
34. Student needs

Responsibilities of the trustee are to:

35. Draw up long range plans
36. Approve adequate long range plans drawn up by administration and faculty
37. Understand that long range planning must be flexible and have alternatives
38. Realize that long range planning must also include a realistic way to accomplish the plans

Comments:
**Responsibility Scale**

1. **Highly important**
2. **Moderately important**
3. **Little importance**
4. **Not trustee responsibility.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. To Approve the Educational Program</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39. Decide to add or delete schools, departments or programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Approve the curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Approve what is taught in specific classrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Keep abreast of changing times and educational needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Formulate educational policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Understand that faculty should have academic freedom</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Approve tenure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Approve faculty promotions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VII. To Insure Financial Solvency</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49. Accept responsibility for financial health of the institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. See that institution is managed well</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Invest endowments with prudence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Be certain that income equals expenses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Accept the responsibility for seeking new sources of income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Contribute personally to the support of the institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Help to identify and cultivate potential donors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Solicit contributions from others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Enlist other volunteers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Provide for fund raising that is continuous</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Determine the size and adequacy of operating budget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Determine tuition and fees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. Set salary schedules and fringe benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII. To Maintain the Physical Plant</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62. Provide necessary physical facilities to meet institutional goals and educational needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. Authorize the construction of buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Select the architect and approve architectural design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. Provide necessary maintenance for buildings and campus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. To Preserve Institutional Autonomy</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66. See that the university must maintain a high degree of independence from non-sponsored control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Insist that donors not be allowed to dictate unacceptable conditions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Realize that trustees are responsible for defending the institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Insure that the university maintains its role as critic of society</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. To Enhance the Public Image</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>70. The responsibility of trustees goes beyond lending their names and prestige to an institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. Trustees should give public support to all board action despite individual and/or personal opinions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. A trustee should actively promote the institution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. A trustee should interpret the community to the university</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. A trustee should interpret the university to the community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI. To Serve as a Court of Appeal</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75. There should be clearly established and publicized codes governing faculty status and student behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. Both faculty and students have rights and should have due processes by which those rights are protected</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
### Responsibility Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Highly important</th>
<th>3. Little importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Moderately important</td>
<td>4. Not trustee responsibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### XII. To Assess Their Own Performance

**Trustee evaluation should be:**

- 77. Formal
- 78. Informal
- 79. Systematic
- 80. By self study
- 81. By an outside consultant

**Frequency of evaluation:**

- 82. Every year
- 83. Every three years
- 84. Every five years

**Self study should include the following items:**

- 85. Understanding trustee responsibility
- 86. Fulfillment of role as trustee
- 87. Knowledge of institution
- 88. Self improvement of trustee (attending seminars, reading books, etc.)
- 89. Active participation in board meetings
- 90. Support of the majority of decisions made
- 91. Participation in fund raising
- 92. Adequate preparation for board meetings
- 93. Attendance at board meetings
- 94. Participation on committees

Comments:
Please number in order the five points you perceive to be the most important responsibilities of trustees (1 being the most important).

1. To Appoint the President
2. To Support the President
3. To Assess the President's Performance
4. To Clarify the Mission of the Institution
5. To Approve Long Range Plans
6. To Approve the Educational Program
7. To Insure Financial Solvency
8. To Maintain the Physical Plant
9. To Preserve Institutional Autonomy
10. To Enhance the Public Image
11. To Serve as a Court of Appeal
12. To Assess Their Own Performance

Please list any trustee responsibility you think to be more important than any of those listed above.

___

Comments: (Your comments on any question will be appreciated. Be sure to give the number of the question involved. Should you require more space, please feel free to write on the enclosed blank page.)
APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE MAILED WITH THE QUESTIONNAIRE
As a former trustee of Andrews University you served with distinction to make this institution a strong educational force in the Seventh-day Adventist Church.

In order to complete my doctoral dissertation at Andrews University I am studying the work and responsibilities of the trustees. My dissertation is entitled, "The Role and Responsibilities of Andrews University Trustees as Perceived by Themselves."

The purpose of this study is to survey all who have ever served as trustees of Andrews University. The study will (1) determine their perception of their role and responsibilities as trustees, (2) assess their experience while serving as trustee, and (3) provide recommendations for more effective function of trustees on behalf of Andrews University thus making their service of greater significance to the University and the Seventh-day Adventist Church. I believe this study is significant and its effects can be far-reaching.

In order to secure the necessary information I have developed the enclosed questionnaire. I am asking all 152 who have ever served as trustees of Andrews University to complete the questionnaire. Because of the limited number of trustees I need one hundred percent participation. May I therefore request that you complete the questionnaire at your earliest convenience and return it to me.

The questionnaire is streamlined to meet the demands of busy people. Only a very few questions require more than just a check or a circle. It will be of tremendous help to me if the questionnaire can be returned before July 20, 1981.

Please note that there is no place for your name. The information will be held in strictest confidence and will be used for statistical purposes only. You will not be identified personally.
I am enclosing a self addressed stamped envelope for your convenience to return the questionnaire to me.

Thank you so much for your help.

Sincerely yours,

David H. Bauer
Doctoral student, Andrews University

Supported by:
Dr. Bernard M. Lall
Professor of Educational Administration
and my advisor

P.S. Please note the endorsement of this project by Dr. Joseph G. Smoot, president of Andrews University which is enclosed.

Enc.: One set of questionnaire
APPENDIX C

PRESIDENT'S LETTER OF ENDORSEMENT
As president of Andrews University I want to express my personal appreciation for the years of service you have given as trustee of this institution. It has grown and developed into an outstanding educational center and provides far reaching services for the Seventh-day Adventist church.

David Bauer is presently serving as vice president for development and public relations at Andrews University. He has been on the staff of the University for 13 years and is presently completing his doctoral studies along with his responsibilities as the vice president for development and public relations.

I am pleased to fully endorse his studies of trustees. The contribution of Andrews University trustees has been a tremendous force in the development of this institution. It is my hope that you will give Mr. Bauer your full support by completing his questionnaire.

Very sincerely yours,

Joseph G. Smoot
President
APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER
Several weeks ago I sent a questionnaire to all present and former trustees of Andrews University requesting help in a study I am doing for my doctoral dissertation, "The Role and Responsibilities of Andrews University Trustees as Perceived by Themselves." Most of the questionnaires have been returned, but a few have not yet been completed and returned to me.

In order to insure complete confidentiality I do not know whether or not you returned your questionnaire. If you have not had the time to complete it or if you have misplaced the one I sent to you, I have enclosed another for your convenience. If you will take a few minutes and complete the questionnaire it will be of tremendous help, not only to my dissertation, but also in evaluating the responsibilities of trustees who serve Andrews University for more effective trustee leadership in the future.

I would appreciate it very much if you will return the questionnaire by September 15. If you have already completed the questionnaire and returned it to me, please disregard this material.

Sincerely yours,

David H. Bauer
Vice President

Enclosures

P.S. As you may recall from the information sent to you earlier, a letter from Dr. Joseph G. Smoot, president of Andrews University, was enclosed giving full support of this project.
APPENDIX E

SECOND FOLLOW-UP LETTER
I want to express my personal thanks to the many trustees who responded to a questionnaire I sent to them several weeks ago. So far I have received over 88 percent return.

If you were one of the 88 percent who returned the questionnaire I thank you very much for assisting me in this project. It has been of great help to me and I am certain the information I have received will be far reaching in helping to develop a more effective university board of trustees.

If you have not completed the questionnaire, I am enclosing one more copy. I will be making my final tabulation on October 15. If it is returned to me by that date you can still be part of this very important study.

Sincerely yours,

David H. Bauer
Vice President

Enclosure
APPENDIX F

TRUSTEE ORIENTATION, EDUCATION, AND
BOARD DEVELOPMENT
People who serve as trustees are generally viewed as community leaders, successful businessmen, philanthropic persons who are generally above the average in intelligence, wisdom and experience. Even so they are in need of training to execute their responsibilities as trustees in the most effective way (Witt, 1977, p. 63).

According to Witt (1977, p. 64) there are three levels of trustee training and education: (1) information given, (2) skills developed and (3) the changing of philosophy and attitude. Much of what a trustee receives is information given—"minutes of meetings, budgets, financial statements, audits, reprints of articles . . . ."

An untapped area of trustee education involves skill development, most trustees, even chairmen, have not been trained in committee chairmanship, discussion, delegation and committee membership. The third area of training and education involves changing attitudes and behavior. If an individual after five years on a board maintains preconceived, illadvised attitudes toward his institution he has in fact "not had the opportunity to study his own institution, competing institutions, and the better institutions within the entire field."

The real point is that we can no longer close the box and hide the need for board training. It now will become necessary for individual institutions to have their boards address this subject. . . . It will become imperative . . . to develop a philosophy on board development, indicating that they are committing a given amount of time and money to the continual development of the board. . . . We hear over and over
again of the executives who agree that their board is weak, that they need training, but that the trustees lack the time and the commitment to pursue this. (Witt, 1977, p. 66)

Before any educational training program can begin it must first be decided what the planners wish to accomplish. It is far better to think long-term and avoid the temptation to deal with symptoms and what may seem on the surface to be an issue of immediate concern but could be part of a larger and deeper problem. It is important that trustees understand the full scope of their role and responsibilities. The most successful workshops or training programs are those which fit into a comprehensive strategy of board development. It is also desirable for an educational program to extend over a two or three year period of time or be continual rather than just be a one shot attempt to correct an immediate problem or concern (Ingram, 1977, pp. 1, 2).

It is essential for trustees to recognize a need exists. In planning an educational program it is important for the chairman of the board, chief executive, trustees and staff be involved in planning. Ingram (1977, pp. 3-5) lists thirteen points that should be considered:

1. Look around for help. Take advantage of professional sources experienced in trustee training. A.G.B. (Association of Governing Boards) is an excellent source.

2. Recognize the nature of an "outside" facilitator, group leader, or observer.

3. Consider the services of a consultant or firm. A consultant can help the board assess long-term needs, provide greater objectives, and assist in areas of special concern.
4. Choose a time which avoids preoccupation with routine board business. A serious workshop deserves its own special time.

5. Find a way to encourage maximum trustee attendance.

6. Develop an adequate budget.

7. Insure board members' involvement in the program itself. Small group discussions are essential.

8. Keep the number of participants as small as possible. But don't overlook others who may benefit from the meetings and make significant contributions of key administrative officers.

9. Choose a setting away from board's usual meeting place.

10. Consider co-chairpersons for leadership.

11. Encourage some advance trustee participation. These could include advanced questions to be answered, advanced reading assignments and a copy of the agenda.

12. Provide a summary record.


Special attention should be given to the education and orientation of new trustees. Too often a good person with excellent trustee potential spends two or three years on the board without ever coming to grips with what is going on. "Such a waste of time and talent cannot be tolerated in this period of challenge for postsecondary education" (Gale, 1980, p. 10).

According to Gale (1980, pp. 10-12) new trustees should (1) become familiar with the campus as soon as possible, at the first board session if possible, (2) get together with other new trustees at an A.G.B. scheduled seminar, (3) be assigned immediately to an
active committee, and (4) should receive personalized attention by other trustees and administrators.

What should be included in an orientation? A composite list has been compiled from many studies. This will need to be adjusted to the particular interests and needs of an institution.

1. History and traditions of the institution
2. Philosophy and goals
3. Organization of the trustees and the institution
4. Long-range plans in facilitating academic, enrollment and financial planning
5. Charter and by-laws
6. Budget and financing
7. Composition of the student body
8. Academic policies

Presentations can be made via discussions, speeches, filmstrips, films, multi-media and others as available (Burns, 1966, pp. 70-71; Herron, 1969, pp. 111-153; Ingram, 1977, pp. 6-10; Rauh, 1959, pp. 85-88).

In service education and trustee orientation should be geared to equip the trustee with the necessary information and knowledge to enable him to pursue within his maximum potential the objectives of the institution he serves. An educational program is only a beginning of the professional development of trustees but it is an excellent beginning and one which every board should be encouraged to do if it wishes to excell for in no other way can the sights of a board be raised so that trustees with enthusiasm support and indeed call for a better way (Herron, 1969, p. 153).
APPENDIX G

PUBLICATIONS BY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS
OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES
PUBLICATIONS BY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNING BOARDS
OF UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES

1. A GUIDE FOR NEW TRUSTEES - Nancy R. Axelrod

2. ACADEMIC COLLECTIVE BARGAINING - Kenneth P. Mortimer

3. AFFIRMATIVE ACTION - Betty Newcomb

4. THE BOARD CHAIRPERSON AND THE PRESIDENT - John W. Pocock

5. BUILDING A MORE EFFECTIVE BOARD - Robert L. Gale

6. COLLECTIVE BARGAINING: IMPACT ON GOVERNANCE - E. D. Duryea

7. EFFECTIVE TRUSTEESHIP: GUIDELINES FOR BOARD MEMBERS - J. L. Zwingle


9. THE FUND-RAISING ROLE - Michael Radock

10. THE FUTURE OF TRUSTEESHIP: THE ROLE AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY BOARDS - John W. Nason

11. HANDBOOK OF COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY TRUSTEESHIP - Edited by Richard T. Ingram

12. INSTITUTIONAL PLANNING - Rhoda M. Dorsey

13. MANAGING YOUR ENDOWMENT - J. Peter Williamson

14. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING TRUSTEE SELECTION

15. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES - Charles A. Nelson

16. THE TENURE ISSUE - Richard P. Chait and Andrew T. Ford

17. TRUSTEE RESPONSIBILITIES - John W. Nason

18. TRUSTEE WORKSHOPS AND RETREATS - Richard T. Ingram

19. TRUSTEES AND PREVENTIVE LAW - Kent Weeks

20. UNIVERSITY GOVERNANCE AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING - John M. Lavine and Wallace L. Lemon
APPENDIX H

SELF-STUDY GUIDELINES
self-study guidelines
for governing boards of private colleges and universities
These guidelines are the result of a project sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) and conducted by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. It was made possible through the interest and support of The Ford Foundation.

The materials contained here were developed by Dr. James Gilbert Patridge, Research Educator, with the assistance of Mrs. Frances La Yonne White, Research Assistant, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, and the collaboration of Dr. Richard T. Ingram, Vice President of the Association of Governing Boards.

A national Advisory Committee of ten chief executives, and ten members of various types of postsecondary education boards, contributed significantly to this project. AGB and the authors express their appreciation to the Committee, as well as to the trustees of several institutional boards who participated in field-testing of early versions of the criteria.

Any viewpoints implied or expressed about the performance standards of higher education boards are the sole responsibility of the authors, and not those of the project's Advisory Committee, The Ford Foundation, the Association of Governing Boards, or the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

The Association will welcome reports from institutions using these materials and suggestions for improving both the criteria and the suggested procedures.
Suggestions To Users

Toward Better Performance in the Public Trust

Governing boards of colleges and universities are responsible to many constituencies whom they serve in a relationship of trust. This trust relationship embraces the public and its representatives, as well as many other organizations, which benefit materially and culturally from an educated citizenry, who in turn commit a share of their financial resources to the governing boards of educational institutions. The trust relationship also embraces those within the academy who give of their efforts and substance to learn, to teach, and to discover new knowledge.

The obligation to provide an educational institution of highest quality and to assure each of these constituencies that its resources are spent wisely is a responsibility the board must assume if it is to fulfill its trust. Since educational institutions, private as well as public, are increasingly being held accountable for this performance, a board is wise periodically to evaluate the execution of its trusteeship.

The materials provided here reflect the interest of the Association of Governing Boards in meeting the expressed needs of its member boards which have asked for help in improving their performances.

Why Self-Study?

Evaluation of governing boards goes on continuously. It can and usually does take many forms. It may be an informal, even obscure process, or it may be a formal and exhaustive process. It may be responsible and fair; it may also be spurious and unfair. It may be voluntary, or it may be compulsory. It may be done in calm and quiet deliberation, or it may be done in crisis. It may be done to effect necessary changes to strengthen board policies and practices, or it may be done to support the status quo.

Wisdom would indicate that a board should systematically evaluate its own performance at regular intervals. The advantage of such a procedure is that it forces critical introspection. By forthrightly asking and honestly answering questions of itself, the board can assess its effectiveness.

The Proposed Method of Self-Study

The technique proposed here for board self-study is based upon comprehensive surveys of the board members' individual and combined perceptions of the board's effectiveness as a unit— as a working organization. The inquiry has been organized around a set of criteria or objectives drawn from the contemporary literature on trusteeship and which relate to a board's various obligations and functions. The perceived relevance and importance of each criterion, however, may vary from board to board. The conclusions to be drawn from this evaluation are based upon the members' consensus of the effectiveness of the entire board's performance in relation to each of the criteria.

The proposed procedure makes the assumption that there is no generally accepted "standard" or "ideal model" by which the performance of every board may be judged. There is really no "average" or "typical" board with which your board should be compared. The procedure relies upon posing key questions about each of a number of suggested criteria (each related to a different function or organizational component) so that the multiple responses of all members should produce a composite description of the quality and the nature of the board's performance. Many of the questions have been purposely designed to evoke thought and comment. The lack of unanimity of responses on particular questions may illuminate problem areas heretofore unnoticed. In a post-evaluation conference the board should be able to identify strengths or weaknesses in its policies and practices.
Planning a Self-Study Project

The following suggestions are offered as a means of conducting a self-study:

1. The board should appoint a special committee, or designate an appropriate standing committee, to supervise the project and to see that its results are properly summarized and presented to the full board.

2. The criteria and questions here proposed are the end product of much thought and discussion. They are presented in the hope that they will be useful, in whole or in part. They are not sacrosanct, however, and any institution wishing to add to or delete from them or to institute its own questionnaire should feel free to do so.

3. The committee should be given staff assistance necessary to prepare and distribute the materials, compile responses, and administer other details under the committee's supervision.

4. Members should be urged to amplify or clarify their responses with supplementary comments that may draw forth suggestions for changes or improvements that may not otherwise come forward.

5. Anonymity of the individual responses should be protected. Supply a self-addressed, stamped envelope with each questionnaire.

6. Give each member sufficient time to prepare thoughtful responses—perhaps two or three weeks. A deadline date for return should be specified.

7. Returned questionnaires should be entrusted to someone who is capable of tabulating the information and accurately synthesizing the discursive responses so that all viewpoints are presented fairly. The alternative to preparing a synthesis, of course, is to simply quote all discursive responses in full. This may even be preferable, depending upon their number and length.

Planning the Board's Post-Study Conference

The suggestions which follow may be of value in planning the most important phase of the project, the post-study conference.

1. After all the responses have been collated, the committee should prepare a complete summary and make it available to all members.

2. The committee might then prepare a report to the board in which general results are outlined and the most significant returns singled out for special comment.

3. Particular attention should be given to subject areas in which there may be a marked divergence of opinion among board members, as well as areas in which there appears to be confusion among members as to actual practices, existing policies, or existing documents with which some members may not be familiar.

4. The committee may also be asked to draw up some tentative recommendations on how the board might consider changing some of its ways of doing things as well as subject areas that should be studied in more depth.

Concluding Word

This activity should be viewed as an important but first step in any serious attempt to look constructively at board behavior. This material is offered neither as a panacea nor as something which can stand by itself. Hopefully, the process suggested by its use will accomplish longer-term ends by encouraging more frequent and comprehensive self-assessments, perhaps annually or every two or three years. In any event, what is done by a board following the use of these materials will determine their real usefulness.
Sample Instructions

*These instructions might be incorporated in a personalized letter to each board member from the board chairperson.*

At the Board’s [date] meeting, we committed ourselves to conduct a serious study of the Board’s current performance. Materials for this effort are enclosed.

The purpose of this material is to solicit your perceptions of how well the Board meets its responsibilities in relation to each of several criteria. These criteria have been developed as part of a project sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards. They relate to the principal functions, obligations and organizational characteristics which tend to distinguish an effective governing board.

As an exercise in self-evaluation the queries which follow should be read as ones you might ask of yourself, not as interrogations by a third party.

The assembly of thoughtful responses from you and each of your colleagues will produce a composite picture of how our Board performs. This should provide a basis for substantive discussion leading to consensus about the Board’s strengths and shortcomings.

Opportunity has been provided for further comments on each criterion. You may wish to clarify or amplify certain of your responses. You are particularly urged to suggest changes or improvements in Board policies or practices which can be discussed later. If you need more space for your comments, use the reverse side or attach a separate page.

Responses will be anonymous and the summary of responses will be confidential to the members of the Board. Please use the enclosed envelope to return your questionnaires on or before [date].

Sincerely,

[Chairperson]

Enclosures
self-study criteria
for governing boards of private colleges and universities
These criteria are the result of a project sponsored by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) and conducted by the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley. It was made possible through the interest and support of The Ford Foundation.

The materials contained here were developed by Dr. James Gilbert Paltridge, Research Educator, with the assistance of Mrs. Frances La Vonne White, Research Assistant, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, and the collaboration of Dr. Richard T. Ingram, Vice President of the Association of Governing Boards.

A national Advisory Committee of ten chief executives and ten members of various types of postsecondary education boards, contributed significantly to this project. AGB and the authors express their appreciation to the Committee, as well as to the trustees of several institutional boards who participated in field-testing of early versions of the criteria.

Any viewpoints implied or expressed about the performance standards of higher education boards are the sole responsibility of the authors, and not those of the project’s Advisory Committee, The Ford Foundation, the Association of Governing Boards, or the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley.

The Association will welcome reports from institutions using these materials and suggestions for improving both the criteria and the suggested procedures.

Suggestion to Users: This form can be adapted to meet the distinctive characteristics of your board and institution. Responses which require qualification or clarification can be explained in the “comment” section for each criterion. (A separate User’s Guide for implementing a self-study is also available from AGB.)

Self-Study Guidelines and Criteria for Governing Boards of Private Colleges and Universities were developed with the assistance of a grant from the Ford Foundation.
## Criterion 1

### Institutional Mission and Educational Policy

No institution can be all things to all people. Each institution must decide what its particular mission is—its real purpose—if it is to have sound direction. The mission must be clearly defined so students will know the institution's purposes and objectives, faculty members will know how to direct their efforts, and the several publics on whom the campus community depends will know what they are supporting.

An official statement setting forth the specific mission of a college or university should be a cooperative effort of the administration, the faculty, and the governing board. Acting alone, the board lacks the professional experience to define educational goals in detail. Its role is to insure that the mission is clearly stated; and because it stands apart from day-to-day operations, administrative preoccupations, and faculty special interests, the board is in a unique position to lead, seek consensus, and stimulate action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Can't Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there a written and officially adopted statement of the institution's mission or purpose?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In your opinion is this statement sufficiently clear and useful to serve as a guide to the board, administration, and faculty?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the board periodically review its statement of purpose and educational goals, and examine the policies which implement them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the board assume a role in helping to determine whether educational programs are viable and consistent with the institution's mission?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you feel that the institution lives up to its stated mission?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's overall performance has been:

- Very Good
- Good
- Barely Adequate
- Poor

Don't Know or Cannot Judge

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:
Criterion 2

Institutional Planning

In the difficult period stretching ahead for higher education, effective planning is increasingly essential. The number and future sources of students should be anticipated. Projections of expenses and income need to be studied. The character of the educational program and student services must be considered. The size of the faculty and its distribution by rank and tenured status are matters to be carefully plotted.

The board should be involved in the planning process, and adopted plans should be used by the board as a guide to decision making.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Does the board require, participate in, review, and approve comprehensive institutional planning regarding:</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Can't Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. enrollments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. staffing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. physical facilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. availability of resources?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. educational programs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Has the board approved a comprehensive institutional plan within the past five years?

3. Does the board have a schedule for reviewing and, if desirable, revising the plan at regular intervals?

4. Was the faculty involved in the plan's development?

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's overall performance has been:

Very Good ________ Good. ________ Barely Adequate ________ Poor ________

Don't Know or Cannot Judge ________

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:
Criterion 3

Physical Plant

It is the board’s responsibility to create and maintain a physical environment that is conducive to learning and consistent with reasonable expectations of future funds and enrollment trends. Decisions that involve the campus master plan and the capital outlay budget request are the major concerns. Prudence demands that maximum use be made of the present physical plant before construction or remodeling is considered. And maintenance should not be deferred to the possible peril of the institution’s future. Efficient use of the board’s time and effort requires that it be concerned only with those matters that cannot properly be delegated to the staff.

1. Has the board approved a master plan for the physical campus which includes both present and anticipated needs? Yes No Can’t Judge

2. Within the past two years, has the board received and reviewed a report on physical plant utilization—classroom, laboratory, dormitory, office, and other building space? Yes No Can’t Judge

3. Prior to its consideration of requests for remodeling or new construction has the board satisfied itself that present spaces are being used effectively and instructional areas are scheduled for optimum utilization? Yes No Can’t Judge

4. Is the board satisfied that maintenance programs are adequate and that they are not being unreasonably deferred? Yes No Can’t Judge

5. Do you feel that the board makes decisions on details related to buildings and grounds that really should be delegated to the administrative staff? Yes No Can’t Judge

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board’s overall performance has been:

Very Good Good Barely Adequate Poor

Don’t Know or Cannot Judge

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:
Criterion 4

Financial Support and Management

In the financial affairs of the institution the board has a dual responsibility. It must secure the financial resources sufficient to meet operating costs and maintain the institution in a manner consistent with its stated mission and goals. It must be sure that the institution has prudent fiscal management. The collective effort of all board members is essential to the first responsibility. The second responsibility calls upon the expertise of those board members who are experienced in devising financial policies, managing investments, or have other financial skills. The board must see to it that sound financial policies are followed, yet refrain from personal involvement in execution of policies and administration of financial programs.

1. Do you feel that the resource development program is well organized into a continuing and coordinated effort of the board and the president? Yes No Don’t Know or Can’t Judge

2. Do you feel there is an adequate financial commitment on the part of the individual members to:
   a. personal giving?
   b. influencing other persons or organizations to give?

3. Does the board have within its membership persons with special expertise who give their advice and leadership in the following areas:
   a. long-range fiscal planning?
   b. investment practices?
   c. fiscal management?
   d. budget review?
   e. analyses of reports and recommendations of the auditor?

4. Does the board understand “fund accounting” and the data presented in regular financial reports?

5. Do you feel that the board fully accepts its responsibility for prudent fiscal management?

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board’s overall performance has been:

Very Good_____ Good_____ Barely Adequate_____ Poor____

Don’t Know or Cannot Judge______

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:
**Criterion 5**

**Board Membership**

A primary requisite for effective governance is to be sure that the men and women responsible for the institution's policy direction have the skills, knowledge, and background necessary for effective decision making. The complex operation of modern educational institutions requires that boards have available to them a wide range of experiences and expertise. The larger society to which these institutions are now linked more closely than ever before requires that the board's membership be more diverse in terms of geographic, social, or occupational origins, and viewpoints. Such diversity does not require that members be representatives of special groups or interests unless this is specified in the bylaws or charter. Each member must be willing to serve the interests of the institution as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know or Can’t Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you feel that the board now contains a sufficient range of expertise, attitudes, and external relationships to make it an effective board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the board have a committee that assesses its needs in the way of qualifications of new members, and that maintains a roster of prospective members?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the board have a committee that reviews the performance of its individual members?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Does the board have an established procedure for orienting new members to their institution and to their duties and responsibilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you feel that the board should alter its policies and practices with respect to:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. size of the board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. length of term?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. number of successive terms?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. age limit or mandatory retirement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. age composition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. sex composition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. minority composition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. geographical composition?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. persons with educational experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. persons with financial management experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. requiring a minimum attendance record?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary:** In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's overall performance has been:

- Very Good
- Good
- Barely Adequate
- Poor
- Don't Know or Cannot Judge

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:
Criterion 6

Board Organization

The effectiveness of a board greatly depends on the structure of its organization and the conduct of its meetings. A productive board is usually one that has periodically taken the time to thoughtfully sort out its duties, critically review its organizational structure and rules of procedure, and update its bylaws, policy or operations documents. Committee structure depends upon the board’s size, the frequency of meetings, and the workload that can be placed on individual members. Periodic critical review should also determine, among other things, if a few persons in fact are making most of the board’s decisions, if responsible minority opinions have the opportunity for full board consideration, and if communication between the campus community and the public is open.

1. Within the past two or three years, has the board in some formal way reviewed its organization, committee practices, and bylaws? Yes No Can’t Judge

2. Do meeting agendas:
   a. put before you issues of policy the board should consider? Yes No Can’t Judge
   b. include appropriate supporting information in the right amount? Yes No Can’t Judge
   c. reach you sufficiently in advance of the meeting? Yes No Can’t Judge

3. Do you believe that the number and duration of board meetings are sufficient to properly take care of the institution’s business? Yes No Can’t Judge

4. Are board meetings effectively conducted and reasonably stimulating? Yes No Can’t Judge

5. Do you feel that the present committee structure:
   a. efficiently handles the board’s work? Yes No Can’t Judge
   b. gives the full board the opportunity to consider all matters of key importance? Yes No Can’t Judge
   c. allows constituencies to be heard before recommendations are formed? Yes No Can’t Judge

6. Do board policies governing board and committee membership afford sufficient opportunity for rotating leadership? Yes No Can’t Judge

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board’s overall performance has been:

Very Good Barely Adequate

Good Poor

Don’t Know or Cannot Judge

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:
Criterion 7

Board/Chief Executive Relations

Trustees and the chief executive officer share at least one major characteristic: they have a total institutional perspective. The quality of the "working relationship" between the board and the executive officer is of critical importance to the effectiveness of each. While the board must take responsibility for basic policies and their consequences it must also give the chief executive the authority and flexibility to act decisively.

Selection of the chief executive officer is a major responsibility of the governing board. This selection should be preceded by a clear definition of his or her qualifications and expected accomplishments.

1. Is there a climate of mutual trust and support between the board and chief executive? 

2. Have the board or some of its members counseled with the chief executive to provide guidelines or strengthen certain areas of performance?

3. Do you feel that the board has delegated to the chief executive the authority he or she needs to administer the institution successfully?

4. Is there a written statement of role and responsibility for the chief executive which clearly defines his or her functions and the board's expectations?

5. Is there a clear understanding of the respective responsibilities between the executive and the board concerning their fund-raising roles?

6. Should the board or a board committee formally assess the chief executive's performance in some systematic way from time to time?

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's overall performance has been:

Very Good ______ Good ______ Barely Adequate ______ Poor ______

Don't Know or Cannot Judge ______

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:
Criterion 8
Board/Faculty Relations

In academic affairs a measure of the board's success is the nature of its relationship with the faculty. Most lay board members lack the professional expertise to legislate in this area, yet they share the burden of responsibility for the quality of the institution and for the manner in which the institution fulfills its academic goals. Therefore, the board must trust the professionals for advice, and delegate to them authority to carry out educational policies and procedures.

The line between governing policy and operating policy is not easily drawn but it must be established with reasonable clarity. The institution needs to be given academic direction, yet the faculty must be free to perform its professional work.

1. Does the board have effective means of two-way communication with the faculty?

2. Does the board, through the chief executive, seek the advice and recommendations of faculty leaders in formulating basic educational policies?

3. Do you feel that the board exercises authority over:
   a. _____ more aspects of educational affairs than it needs to?
   b. _____ fewer aspects of educational affairs than it should?
   c. _____ neither. Its participation in educational affairs is about right.

4. Does the board delegate to the chief executive and faculty full responsibility for implementing educational policies?

5. Has the board adopted adequate policies concerning:
   a. grievance procedures?
   b. process for selection, promotion, retention, tenure?
   c. standards for faculty performance?

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's overall performance has been:

Very Good _____ Good _____ Barely Adequate _____ Poor _____

Don't Know or Cannot Judge _____

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:
**Criterion 9**

**Board/Student Relations**

The board has ultimate responsibility to protect the welfare of students and to provide a healthy campus environment that is conducive to scholarship and personal development. The students' health and comfort are essential to learning. The students' freedom to learn independently is a basic tenet of academic freedom, and like other freedoms it must be exercised under the obligation to protect the welfare of the community as a whole. The board should have good communication with students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Does the board have a satisfactory means for continuing two-way communication with students?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know or Can't Judge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Has the board approved policies that make adequate provision for the students' health, welfare, and non-curricular (cultural, educational, recreational) activities?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don't Know or Can't Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has the board set adequate policies for student appeal of perceived injustices (academic or other)?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don't Know or Can't Judge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are students and student organizations free to examine and discuss questions or issues of interest to them and to express opinions publicly, so long as it is made clear that they speak only for themselves?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don't Know or Can't Judge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's overall performance has been:

- Very Good
- Good
- Barely Adequate
- Poor
- Don't Know or Cannot Judge

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:
Criterion 10
Court of Appeal

Governing boards may be called upon to fulfill a quasi-judicial function in the settlement of disputes arising within the institutional community, though generally disputes should be settled at the lowest possible administrative level to avoid inappropriate board involvement in operational matters. The board should carefully develop due process policies and delegate authority.

1. Has the board developed procedural due process or "fair hearing" requirements which delegate the management of conflict situations to the chief executive and to academic administrators or faculty leaders? ______ Yes ______ No ______ Can't Judge ______

2. Are the disputes that have been brought to the board:
   a. accurately and concisely briefed for your study? ______ Yes ______ No ______ Can't Judge ______
   b. brought to the board before they have escalated to crisis proportions? ______ Yes ______ No ______ Can't Judge ______
   c. settled without unduly prolonged debate? ______ Yes ______ No ______ Can't Judge ______

3. Do you feel that disputes have been settled with sympathetic understanding of the human and institutional issues involved? ______ Yes ______ No ______ Can't Judge ______

4. Do you feel that the board has been called upon to adjudicate cases of conflict that should have been settled before they came to the board? ______ Yes ______ No ______ Can't Judge ______

Summary: In relation to this criterion I feel that the board's overall performance has been:

Very Good ________ Good ________ Barely Adequate ________ Poor ________

Don't Know or Cannot Judge ________

Further comments or suggestions related to this criterion:
General Assessment

1. What issues have most occupied the board's time and attention during the past year?

2. What were the one or two successes during the past year for which the board feels some satisfaction?

3. What particular shortcomings do you see in the board's organization or performance that need attention?

4. Other comments or suggestions?
Trustee Audit

The responsibilities of individual trustees are different from those of boards as corporate entities. The following checklist is designed to help board members assess the extent to which they have absorbed the breadth and depth of their roles and institutions. The questions seem somewhat imposing, but they are not intended to cause acute trustee or presidential depression. A "perfect score" is an unreasonable expectation.

Candid responses can be helpful to the design of orientation programs for new board members, or future workshops and retreats. The checklist can be adapted to the unique characteristics of your particular institution as a supplement to the preceding board self-study criteria. It was developed by Richard T. Ingram, vice president of AGB, as part of a Handbook of College and University Trusteeship to be published by Jossey-Bass, Fall, 1979. The questions are the result of the scrutiny of a number of chief executives and trustees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you feel you have adequate opportunity to understand your obligations, responsibilities and opportunities for growth as a trustee?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Have you a clear grasp of your board's responsibilities?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If you have answered yes to either or both questions, what has been the primary source(s) of your information? (e.g., an orientation program, a particular individual, a book, prior service as a board member.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are you familiar with your institution's stated mission, institutional plan and current policies?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do you stay abreast of higher education trends, legislation and other public policy by reading AGB News Notes, The Chronicle of Higher Education, AGB Reports or other material?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Have you recently taken an opportunity to meet with trustees and educators from other institutions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Do you have adequate opportunities to know your fellow trustees?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Do you find any conflict between your responsibility for the welfare and advancement of your institution and your responsibility to the citizens of your region, state or nation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What do you feel are your strongest areas of expertise based on your background and experience (x):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Finance</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>Faculty Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Fund Raising</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Public Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Affairs</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Management</td>
<td>Government Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Now go back and indicate any primary areas of interest outside of your areas of expertise (x).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge of the Institution

11. Are you familiar with your institution’s recent history and what makes it distinctive from neighboring colleges and universities?
   
12. Cite three of its special strengths:
   a) ____________________________________________
   b) ____________________________________________
   c) ____________________________________________

13. And its three greatest needs:
   a) ____________________________________________
   b) ____________________________________________
   c) ____________________________________________

14. Do you feel well informed about the type and quality of your institution’s educational programs?
   
15. Have you attended a campus event within the past year?
   
16. Do you regularly read the campus newspaper or faculty or student organization minutes?
   
17. Do you know the names of your institution’s:
   a) Key administrators?
   b) Faculty leaders?
   c) Student leaders?

18. Have you met some of them apart from board meetings?
   
19. Are you acquainted with the physical plant and maintenance needs of your institution?
   
Board and Committee Meetings

20. Are you satisfied with your attendance at board and committee meetings?
   
21. Do you read the minutes of meetings to determine whether they faithfully represent the proceedings and decisions as you recall them?
   
22. Do you prepare for board meetings by reading agendas and supporting materials?
   
23. Do you sometimes suggest agenda items?
   
24. Do you help board and committee meetings to steer clear of non-policy matters better left to the administration?
   
Fund Raising and Public Relations

25. Do you contribute a gift to your institution according to your means for:
   a) Annual operations?
   b) Capital campaigns?

26. Within the past year or two, have you helped secure a gift from an individual, corporation or other source?
   
27. Have you recently taken advantage of an opportunity to say a good word about your institution to a policymaker or organization at the state level?
   
28. Do you take advantage of opportunities to inform other groups or persons about your institution or higher education generally?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trustee Concerns</th>
<th>174</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Somewhat or Sometimes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29. Do you understand the concept of &quot;fund-accounting&quot;?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Do you find your institution's financial statements intelligible?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Are you mindful of your institution's stated mission, institutional plan and goals, and current policies when voting on proposals presented to the board?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Do you feel you are sensitive to the concerns of students and faculty while maintaining impartiality and a total institutional perspective?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Do you help meet the needs of your chief executive for occasional counsel and support in his or her often difficult relationships with groups on- and off-campus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Do you appreciate the importance of keeping your chief executive informed in the event you establish personal communication lines with individuals on campus, and of the need to avoid prejudiced judgments on the basis of such relationships?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Have you ever suggested to the board's nominating committee or to the appointing authority someone who would make an outstanding new board member?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Are you satisfied that there are no real or apparent conflicts of interest in your service as a trustee?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Do you avoid asking special favors of the administration, including requests for information without the knowledge of at least the board or committee chairman?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. If you have not already done so, would you be willing to serve as a committee chairman or board officer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why (or why not)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Have you found your trusteeship to be stimulating and rewarding thus far?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why (or why not)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. How would you rate yourself as a trustee at this time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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