**r**aas

National Library of canada

ry Bibliothèque hationale du Canada CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CAMADIENNES SUR NICROFICHE

BEAUDR ARTHUR AWRENCE NAME OF AUTHOR / NOM \*AIITEII AN Immestic TEL TITLE OF THESIS / TITRE DE LA THÈSE\_ And Education Nist Ð Univers he. UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITE. DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/ GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THESE FUT PRESENTEE. Education Master 1978 YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED ANNEE D'OUTENTION DE CE GRADE KONKA NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE.

42

GUOS

Ther

JOK

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission. L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÉ-QUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

SIGNED /SIGNE DATED/DATE

PERMANENT ADDRESS / RESIDENCE EIXE

#### National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada K1A 0N4

## NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

## THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogage Division des thèses canadiennes

La qualité de cette micrôfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

AVIS

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré, le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

## LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

## THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE BACKGROUNDS, ROLES, AND EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES OF ALBERTA PUBLIC SCHOOL TRUSTEES

by

C Lawrence Arthur Beaudry

## A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1978

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled "An Investigation Into the Backgrounds, Roles, and Educational Attitudes of Alberta Public School Trustees" submitted by Lawrence Arthur Beaudry in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

Date

## ABSTRACT

The primary focus of this study was an investigation into the backgrounds, roles and educational attitudes of Alberta public school trustees, and the interrelationship between trustee backgrounds and characteristics and their attitudes toward selected educational issues.

The data were collected through the use of a questionnaire distributed to all public school trustees in the province of Alberta. In total, 488 usable responses out of a possible 953 were received for a response rate of 51.3 percent.

The data were compiled and analyzed with the assistance of the University of Alberta's computer services and the SPSS and DERS computer programs. Although both parametric and non-parametric procedures were employed, where possible preference was given to parametric procedures.

The data analysis was organized into three general categories; these being the profile of the Alberta school trustee, the roles and functions of the Alberta school trustee, and trustee attitudes and opinions on selected issues.

The findings revealed that the typical Alberta trustee was male, in the 40 to 59 year age group, financially well off, with limited formal education. He was typically employed in a nonprofessional field and viewed himself as a political moderate. Larger jurisdictions typically attracted a larger proportion of more highly educated and professional trustees. Similarly the results indicated that larger urban centres had a larger percentage of female trustees.

iv

With regard to trustee functions the study revealed that above all other functions trustees attended meetings. These included board meetings, meetings with administrative and school teacher personnel, and meetings with parent groups.

Trustees perceived themselves as having major decision, making authority relative to financial and economic affairs, administrative structure, and administrative appointments. They indicated a strong preference for an hierarchical authority structure with major decision-making authority vested in the board and or administration. Similarly, they preferred a minimum of Department of Education, faculty, or student involvement in the vast majority of decision making areas.

Trustees in general favoured the status quo with respect to board composition and trustee selection; they were strongly in favor of electing trustees from local constituencies as opposed to having man appointed by government. Similarly, trustees were generally estrictive and control oriented with regard to student affairs, advocating greater discipline in schools, administrative control of the student newspaper, and suspension or expulsion of disruptive students. In the area of faculty affairs trustees were supportive of freedom of expression for teachers and felt that degree qualifications should receive less emphasis in staff recruitment.

Major conclusions of the study included: 1) when educational standing and occupational status were accepted as indices of socioeconomic status, it appeared that larger urban centres attracted a larger proportion of higher status trustees; 2) newly elected trustees were significantly different from their more experienced counterparts with respect to age, level of formal education and political preferences; 3) the data reflected considerable trust occupation with maintaining authority and control, a reluctance to apply management philosophies that promoted direct staff or community involvement in decision making; 4) trustee responses on the majority of educational issues reflected a significant degree of conservatism and a general hesitancy to disrupt the status guo; and 5) when formal education and occupation were accepted as an index of social status, trustee attitudes on educational issues were significantly related to social status.

Ŀ

Major implications for practice included the need to develop selection procedures that assured representativeness, as well as the need for effective in-service training for trustees. Finally a number of suggestions for further research were delineated.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation for the invaluable assistance and direction provided throughout the preparation of this thesis by Dr. A. Konrad, Chairman of the thesis committee, and to thank Dr. H. Hodysh and Dr. G. McIntosh, members of the committee, for their suggestions and criticisms.

Similarly, the co-operation of the Alberta School Trustees' Association, both in terms of financial support and an introductory letter were greatly appreciated.

Sincere thanks is also extended to Chris Prokop for her assistance with the computer programs, and to Pauline Klinck who typed the manuscript.

The writer would also like to thank his wife, Maureen for her patient understanding and support.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

٠

Y

|     | CHAPT                                    | ER PAGE  |
|-----|--|--|
| Ŋ   | Ι.                                       |  |
|     | • , .                                    | THE PROBLEM                                      |
|     |  | Statement of the Problem                         |
| 1   |  | SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY                        |
|     | ·  | DEFINITION OF TERMS                              |
| R.  |  | DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY                       |
|     | , <del>.</del>                           | LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY                         |
| •   |  | ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS                       |
|     | II.                                      | A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH 10   |
| •   | •  | AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE                        |
|     |  | ROLE AND FUNCTIONS                               |
| • . | • .                                      | The Legal Basis for Board Function in Alberta 14 |
|     | ~  | Related Research and Literature                  |
| 1.  | •  | TRUSTEE SELECTION AND BOARD COMPOSITION          |
|     |  | Selection  |
|     |  | Board Composition                                |
|     |  | ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS                           |
|     | 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1 | SUMMARY  |
|     | III.                                     | DESIGN OF THE STUDY $\ldots$ 31                  |
|     |  | * THE INSTRUMENT                                 |
|     | 5  | DISTRIBUTION OF THE INSTRUMENT                   |
|     |  | THE RESPONSE                                     |
| )   | •  | STATISTICAL PROCEDURES AND ANALYSES              |

viii

•

|            | β.   |
|------------|--|
| CHAPT      | TER PAGE   |
| IV.        | A PROFILE OF THE ALBERTA SCHOOL TRUSTEE                        |
|            | PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS                                       |
|            | Sex  |
|            | Age  |
|            | SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS  |
|            | Education  |
| •          | Occupation   |
|            | Income   |
| , •        | POLITICAL REFERENCES   |
|            | EXPERIENCE   |
|            | Trustee Characteristics Relative to Experience                 |
|            | TRUSTEES' READING HABITS                                       |
| 1          | SUMMARY  |
| ν.         | ROLE AND FUNCTION OF ALBERTA SCHOOL TRUSTEES 64                |
|            | TRUSTEE ACTIVITIES   |
| •          | TRUSTEE INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING                         |
|            | PREFEFRED AUTHORITY STRUCTURE                                  |
|            | SUMMARY  |
| VI.        | TRUSTEE ATTITUDES ON SELECTED ISSUES                           |
|            | TRUSTEE ATTITUDES ON SELECTED ISSUES 77   BOARD COMPOSITION 77 |
| , <b>9</b> | PREFERRED CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUSTEES                          |
| •.         | SELECTION OF A SUPERINTENDENT                                  |
| ·<br>·     | ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATIONAL ISSUES                            |
|            | Student Affairs  |
| •          |  |
|            | · ix   |

| ,      | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·     |     |
|--------|---|-----|
| CHAP   | TER PAGE                                  |     |
|        | Faculty Affairs                           |     |
| 0      | Educational Philosophy                    | •   |
| ,<br>, | Admissions and standards                  | Ϊ.  |
| 1      | Institutional focus                       | Ę   |
| . '    | Administrative policy                     |     |
|        | Attitudes Relative to Formal Education    |     |
| ,<br>, | Attitudes Relative to Sex                 |     |
| •      | Attitudes Relative to Age                 |     |
|        | Attitudes Relative to Professional Status |     |
|        | Attitudes Relative to Experience          |     |
|        | SUMMARY                                   |     |
| ,      | Board Composition and Selection           |     |
| ×      | Selection of the Superintendent           |     |
| 3      | Student Affairs                           |     |
| (      | Faculty Affairs                           |     |
| ⇒ \    | Educational Philosophy 142                |     |
| VII.   | SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS    |     |
| •      | SUMMARY                                   |     |
|        | The trustee profile                       |     |
| r      | Trustee role and function                 | • , |
|        | Trustee attitude on selected issues       |     |
| •      | CONCLUSIONS                               |     |
|        | IMPLICATIONS                              |     |
| •      | Implications for Practice                 |     |
|        | Implications for Further Research         | a   |
|        | ×   |     |



## LIST OF TABLES

| لملى     | TABLE          | Description  | PAGE      |    |
|----------|----------------|--|-----------|----|
| ,        | I,             | School Division, Counties and Districts Surveyed                         | 33        |    |
|          | II             | Response By Geographic Location  | 4Q        | •  |
|          | III            | Response By Jurisdiction Size  | 41        | •  |
|          | IV             | Sex Distribution By Size of Jurisdiction                                 | 46        |    |
|          | V              | Relationship Between Sex Distribution and<br>Jurisdiction Size           | 47        | ,  |
|          | VI             | Age - Sex Distribution   | 48        |    |
|          | VII            | Formal Education of Trustees   | 49        | •  |
|          | VIII           | Relationship Between Jurisdiction Size and Level of<br>Formal Education  | 50        |    |
| <b>.</b> | f <del>x</del> | Trustees' Occupational Status  | 51        |    |
| 4        | x              | Occupational Status Relative of Jurisdiction Size                        | 52        |    |
|          | XI             | Income of Trustees 4   | 53        | ĩ  |
| 1        | XII            | Political Preferences of Trustees  | 53        | *  |
|          | XIII           | Variations in Political Ideology Relative to<br>Jurisdiction Size        | 54        | •  |
| •        | XIV            | Scheffe Procedure - Political Ideology                                   | 55        |    |
| •        | xv             | Variations in Provincial Party Preferences Relative to Jurisdiction Size | •56       |    |
|          | IVX            | Scheffé Procedure - Provincial Party Preferences                         | <b>56</b> |    |
|          | XVII           | Trustee Experience   | 57        |    |
|          | 7<br>XVIII     | Differences Between Recently Elected and Experienced<br>Trustees         | 58        | \$ |
|          | , XIX          | Trustee Familiarity with Books and Periodicals                           | 62        | 7  |
| · Ø      | xx             | Trustee Activities   | . 66      |    |
|          | XXI            | Trustee Involvement in Decision-making                                   | 68        |    |

xii

|         | ð  |      |
|---------|--|------|
| TABLE   | Description  | PAGE |
|         |  |      |
| XXII    | Preferred Locus of Authority   | 70   |
| XXIII   | Trustee Decision Making By Rank Order of Means   | 74   |
| * XXIV  | Trustee Attitudes on Board Composition   | 79   |
| XXV     | Trustee Rating of Personal Characteristics   | 82   |
| XXVI    | Rating of Personal Characteristics of a Superintendent   | 84   |
| XXVII   | Variations Between Educational Groups and Attitudes<br>Regarding Desirable Characteristics of Superintendents                              | 85   |
| XXVIII  | Trustee Experience Relative to Preferred<br>Characteristics for a Superintendent   | 88   |
| * ****  | Variations In Trustee Attitudes Regarding Desirable<br>Characteristics of Superintendents Relative to Sex                                  | 90   |
| XXX     | Variation Between Trustee Attitudes Concerning<br>Characteristics of Superintendents Relative to<br>Professional or Nonprofessional Status | 92   |
| XXXI    | Student Related Issues   | - 95 |
| XXX     | Faculty Related Issues   | 96   |
| XXXIII  | Trustee Attitudes Regarding Educational Philosophy   | 99   |
| VIXXX   | Trustee Attitudes Relative to Education  | 103  |
| ° XXXV  | Trustee Attitudes Relative to Sex  | 109  |
| XXXVI   | Trustee Attitudes Relative to Age  | 115  |
| XXXVII  | Probability Matrices for Scheffe Multiple Comparison<br>of Means   | 121  |
| XXXVIII | Trustee Attitudes Relative to Professional or<br>Nonprofessional Status  | 128  |
| XXXXIX  | Trusțee Attitudes Relative to Experience   | 134  |

xiii

۵. ۵.

22 .78

9

.c

**)**.

•

1<sup>723</sup>

**)** 

#### CHAPTER L

#### INTRODUCTION

The administration of education in Canada is primarily the responsibility of provincial governments. In this regard Section 93 of the British North America Act states: "In and for each Province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education." (British Statutes 1867). Thus, with the exception of provisions designed to protect religious rights and freedoms related to separate and denominational schools, provincial sovereignty over education is clearly established in constitutional law. As a result, each of the ten provinces has an independent educational system charged with the responsibility for the organization and administration of education in their respective jurisdictions.

In most provinces, including Alberta, the provincial legislature has decentralized some of the decision making functions by creating individual school jurisdictions and delegating responsibility for some administrative decisions to locally elected school boards. At present (1978), 144 individual jurisdictions, consisting of 30 School Divisions, 30 Counties, and 84 Independent School Districts, are operational in Alberta. These jurisdictions are represented by a school board or school committee varying in size from one to fifteen members. In total, in excess of 950 public and separate school trustees presently hold elected positions on school boards or school committees in the province.

These trustees, as outlined in <u>Section 65</u> of <u>The School Act</u> (1970), are responsible for establishing local policy and making administrative

decisions relative to a variety of issues. Specifically, their responsibilities fall into two broad categories--mandatory obligations, and discretionary powers. Mandatory obligations refer to the duties and functions that boards must perform, such as hiring teachers, providing and maintaining school buildings, arranging busing and transportation, and fiscal management. Discretionary powers refer to actions that boards or school committees may take if they are so inclined. For example, a board may exercise its discretionary powers to provide increased special education services for a school or school district if it feels that such a program is warranted on the basis of local need. In addition to the discretionary powers granted school boards under The School Act, considerable leeway is also given trustees relative to the fulfillment of their mandatory obligations. For example, the board is required to hire teachers, but apart from certain minimum requirements, no one dictates to the board what pupil-teacher ratios must be employed, or how the staff that is hired is to be allocated relative to grade level.

11.0

Thus it is apparent, that through the exercise of authority relative to both their mandatory obligations and discretionary powers, school trustees are in a position to significantly influence the nature and quality of the educational services offered in a school jurisdiction. The decisions that they make and the priorities that they set can profoundly affect programs, facilities, and the quality of the professional staff, in an area. It follows, that the importance of the school trustee's function in the administration of education should not be underestimated. Despite the vital role that school trustees play in the administration of public education in Alberta, there is a paucity of Canadian research dealing with school trusteeship. Very little information concerning who trustees are, what they actually do, and what their views on educational issues are, is available in current academic literature. This study seeks partial resolution of this problem in terms of an investigation of Alberta school trustees relative to their backgrounds, perceptions and attitudes on a variety of educational issues.

THE PROBLEM

#### Statement of the Problem

This study provides a profile of the members of the governing boards of public and separate school jurisdictions in the province of Alberta with respect to their backgrounds, educational attitudes, and role perceptions. Specifically, the study addresses itself to three broad questions. These are:

- Who are the trustees in the Province of Alberta? What are their ages, incomes, occupations, sex, educational backgrounds, political preferences, reading habits, and community functions?
- 2) What are their actual functions as trustees? What decisions do they make and for what tasks are they responsible?
- 3) What are their views on various educational issues including: selection and composition of school boards, qualifications of trustees, student affairs, faculty affairs, selection of a superintendent, locus of authority, and general educational philosophy?

### Sub-problèms

. In addition to the three general problem areas delineated

- above, a number of telated questions are examined. These include:
  - 1. What relationships are present between independent variables such as age, sex, education, occupation, and political preferences of trustees, and dependent variables such as their geographic location in Alberta and size of the jurisdiction represented?
  - 2. Are there any significant differences between the profiles (age, sex, education, occupation, political preferences) of recently elected (less than one year of service) and more experienced trustees?
  - 3, Are there any significant differences between trustee attitudes toward student affairs, faculty affairs, and educational philosophy and independent variables such as age, sex, level of formal education, occupation and experience?

#### SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study will add to the extremely limited amount of research that has been done on public school trusteeship in Canada. Furthermore, since the study is the first of its kind to be conducted with public school trustees in the province, it should provide some baseline data relative to Alberta school trustees, hitherto unavailable. Specifically, the project will provide data on the personal characteristics, functions, and attitudes of the individuals involved in making local educational policy decisions, as well as provide some indication of the relationships between personal characteristics such as dge, sex, education, etc. and attitudes toward educational issues. In addition, important issues such as the selection of a superintendent, school board selection and composition, and preferred locus of authority will be analyzed from the perspective of the school

#### trustee.

This data should be of considerable interest to school boards. Board members, who presently find themselves operating in an increasingly political milieu with growing pressures and demands from various interest groups, should be interested in the views held by their colleagues on various educational issues, since this will allow them to relate their decisions to a larger contextual base.

In addition to the significance of the study for school trustees, the data should be valuable for school superintendents and other school administrators in that it will provide more information on who trustees are, how they view their role and function, as well as what their attitudes are on the selected issues. The sections on the selection of a superintendent and actual and preferred locus of authority will obviously be of particular concern.

Similarly, it is important that provincial legislators know what the views of trustees are on such critically important issues as board selection and composition and preferred locus of authority. This is particularly significant in view of the fact that the role and function of the Alberta School Trustee is presently in a state of flux. As Miklos (1974:4) notes, school boards find themselves "caught up in the pressures for centralization and decentralization which could conceivably leave them at one extreme with greatly changed powers, or at the least, modified roles." Recent trends toward increasing provincial control of education, concurrent with growing demands for local participation in school governance are ample evidence that the question of "Who decides, and at what level?" will continue to be a topic of controversy and debate. How, trustees and school boards react to these pressures will have a significant impact on the organization of education in Alberta.

Finally, the study should serve to stimulate interest in the topic of school trusteeship and hopefully, as a result, generate more research in the area. It seems reasonable to argue that if trustees are to continue to play a significant role in the administration of education in Alberta, more information and research on trusteeship is warranted.

### DEFINITION OF TERMS

<u>Trustee</u>: A person, elected or appointed in accordance with <u>Sections 30 and 31 of The School Act</u>, charged with the responsibility for administering a school jurisdiction as outlined in <u>Section 65</u> of <u>The School Act</u>. The terms trustee, committee member, and board member are used interchangeably.

Board: The board of trustees of a school district or division or regional district, or the school committee of a county council. The terms board, school board, school committee, and governing board are synonomous for purposes of this thesis.

<u>Trustee Profile</u>: A description of trustees formulated on the basis of demographic variables such as age, sex, occupation, reading habits, education, political predispositions and community functions.

Professional: An individual engaged in an occupation that properly involves a liberal, scientific, or artistic education or its equivalent, and is usually mental rather than manual labour oriented. For purposes of this study, trustees were categorized by occupation as professional or nonprofessional as presented in Table IX. <u>Public School Jurisdiction</u>: A County, School Division, or Independent School District that provides services for grades one to twelve students or combination thereof regardless of religious affiliation.

<u>Separate School Jurisdiction</u>: A separate or dissentient school district, duly formed pursuant to <u>Section 93</u> of the <u>B.N.A. Act</u> for either a Protestant or Roman Catholic minority.

### DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

For purposes of this study only public and separate school trustees in the province of Alberta were surveyed.

The study was also delimited to trustees who were involved with the administration of the regular grade school system, that is, grades one to twelve or some combination thereof. Private school trustees, community college trustees, advisory boards for Alberta Vocational Centres, and University trustees were not surveyed.

No attempt was made to draw distinctions between trustees representing public as opposed to separate school jurisdictions. Similarly, no attempt to relate trustee responses to their representation of either Counties, School Divisions, or Independent School Districts was undertaken.

#### LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The major limitation of the study centres around the timing of the survey. Since the survey was conducted three months after the province-wide elections for school trustees, recently elected members experienced some difficulty responding to the portions of Part II of the questionnaire which dealt with actual trustee functions. This necessitated basing the analysis of this section on data collected only from trustees who had been in office longer than one year.

Another limitation relates to follow-up procedures. Since the Alberta School Trustees' Association (ASTA) mailed the questionnaires out, there was no way of specifically identifying which trustees had not responded. As a result, apart from general letters sent to all trustees and all superintendents, follow-up procedures were somewhat limited.

One final limitation is inherent in the utilization of a questionnaire as the sole data collection instrument. The possibility of respondents misinterpreting the meaning of a question, or not being able to fully express their answers within the limitations of the questionnaire format, is always present.

### ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

This chapter has identified and analyzed the problem and its significance. In addition, an operational definition of terms, and an outline of the scope and limitations of the study has been provided.

The following chapter summarizes the related literature both in terms of theory and research data. Chapter III discusses the design of the study. Particular emphasis is placed upon the instrument, the nature of the responses, the treatment of the data, and the statistical procedures employed.

Chapters IV to VI inclusive report the findings and discuss the analysis of the data. Chapter IV provides a profile of the Alberta school trustee. It is concerned with demographic variables such as age, sex, education, occupation, and experience Chapter V deals with actual and preferred trustee functions; and Chapter VI addresses the issue of trustee attitudes (toward a variety of educational issues and the relationship between these attitudes and trustee profiles.

N 9

The final chapter includes a summary of the study, the conclusions and implications and some suggested directions for further research.

#### CHAPTER II

#### A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

This chapter focuses on a discussion of the literature and research relative to school trustees, with particular emphasis placed upon the historical development of school boards, trustee role and function, trustee selection and board composition, and the educational opinions and attitudes held by trustees. The literature reviewed relates to public school, community college, and university trustees; however, emphasis is placed on the material related to the public school system.

As indicated in Chapter I, Canadian research dealing with school trusteeship is limited. Consequently, much of the material reviewed herein has its origins in the United States. However, given the similarities between Canada and the United States relative to both educational practice and socio-economic composition, there should be little argument with the relevance of these studies to a totally Canadian situation.

## AN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The practice of vesting authority for the administration of schools with locally elected lay officials has its origins in seventeenth century New England (Callahan, 1975). According to Callahan (1975), the city of Boston established an important precedent in 1789 when they instituted a law which provided for the creation of a school committee of twelve locally elected lay members. From these beginnings, other American school jurisdictions gradually embraced the concept until by the mid-1800's virtually every town, city and rural school district in the United States had a locally elected school board charged with the responsibility for school district management.

Prior to 1895, school boards exercised extensive direct control over the administration of education in their respective jurisdictions. However, with the increasing complexity of the administrative task, precipitated in part by rapid population growth, many boards found it expedient to delegate much of their decision-making authority to the superintendent and his administrative officers. These factors, in combination with active campaigns by powerful superintendents such as Maxwell and Drapper to secure greater power and tenure (National Education Association Proceedings, 1895-6), resulted in a trend to restrict board involvement to policy decisions only, and to leave the actual administration in the hands of the professionals. Some educators went so far as to suggest that school boards were unnecessary and that they should be abolished.

It was during this period that George S. Counts (1927) conducted his now famous study of the social composition of school boards. He found that boards were overwhelmingly composed of business and professional people and that labour and minority groups were generally not represented (Counts 1927). His study served to focus public debate on the issue of representativeness and the school board's proper role in the administration of education -- a debate which was not resolved until George Strayer (1938), one of the leading educators in the United States at that time, outlined in his book, The Structure and

Administration of Education In American Democracy, his perceptions of the role of the school board in the educational order of things. According to Callahan (1975:41), this book was "the most influential statement ever published on the subject" and the recommendations contained therein subsequently became the "conventional wisdom accepted and adopted throughout the country."

Specifically, Strayer (1938:59) argued that school boards were essential to the concept of American democracy; and he recommended that they be small, locally elected, removed from partisan and municipal politics, serve as a legislative body, and delegate the executive function to the superintendent and the professional staff. He argued further, that: "The final authority must reside with the lay board. The schools belong to the people."

These recommendations became the modus operendi for school boards in America subsequent to 1938. However, two of Strayer's important recommendations were not embraced by school boards; these being that teachers be involved in policy development, and that input be solicited from all segments of the community regarding educational policy decisions (Callahan, 1975). Partly as a consequence of school trustees' general reluctance to embrace this philosophy of participatory management, the post 1960 period has witnessed increased teacher militancy and growing demands for staff and community involvement in policy formulation (Usdan, 1975) -- demands that have forced boards to re-examine their roles and share some of the control that they traditionally held.

Within the Canadian context the historical development of school boards is not that dissimilar from the American experience. The British

North America Act, which was the cornerstone of the Canadian constitution, clearly designated education as an area of provincial jurisdiction. Consequently, each of the ten provinces, and each of the territories has an independent educational system to administer education in their respective jurisdiction (Bergen, 1976).

The concept of lay control of local school administration was given expression in most of the provinces, including Alberta, through the creation of small school units with locally elected boards. The viability of the original 4 by 4 mile units was soon subject to close scrutiny as a result of problems such as economic disparity between units, low teacher salaries, difficulty attracting teachers, and limited educational services (Hodgson, 1976). To alleviate some of these difficulties it became necessary to form larger, more efficient units.

For Alberta, the change came in 1936 when by Ministerial order 4,000 rural public school districts were combined to produce 60 larger units (Hodgson, 1976). The larger units were administered by a board of trustees composed of 5, 7 or 9 trustees elected on a ward or sub-unit basis (Hodgson, 1976). While many Albertans vigourously objected to The change on the basis of lost local control of schools, the formation of the larger units served to reduce economic disparity and generally improved the quality and range of educational services offered in rural areas (Flower, 1976).

Subsequent to this reorganization (after 1950), Alberta passed legislation which provided for the formation of counties, thus allowing the local governmental councils to assume responsibility for both school and municipal administration. The formulation of co-terminous boundaries for enlarged school and municipal units, during the period

from 1953 to 1955, made it easier to develop counties (Hodgson:1976). As a result the number of counties grew considerably until at present Alberta has 30 counties, 30 school divisions, and 84 independent school districts.

### ROLE AND FUNCTIONS

# The Legal Basis for Board Function in Alberta

The duties, powers and responsibilities of Alberta school trustees are clearly delineated in <u>The School Act</u>, the principal piece of legislation in Alberta relative to trustee role and functions (Statute of Alberta:1970). According to Enns (1976), the Act defines trustee functions in terms of two broad categories; mandatory obligations and discretionary powers. Mandatory duties or obligations include:

1. Provision of school accommodation for all children six years old and over;

2. Provision and maintenance of school buildings, drinking water, sanitation facilities, etc. in accordance with established standards of health and safety;

3. Provision of necessary teaching facilities and equipment for each school;

4. Preparation of a detailed budget for the current year;

5. Employment of teachers and designation of teaching and/or administrative assignments;

6. Determination of the school year in accordance with the guidelines established by The School Act.

7. Suspension or expulsion of any pupil guilty of open opposition to authority, willful disobedience, habitual neglect of duties, or conduct injurious to the moral tone of the school;

8. Adoption of a salary schedule for staff and arrangement for payment of monthly salary;

9. Resolution of disputes between teachers and parents of pupils; and

10. Supervision of schools to assure that they function in accordance with the laws and regulations established by the legislature.

Discret pary powers of school boards refer to actions that boards may take. These include:

1. Payment of compensation to trustees for board service;

2. Provision of a health service for schools;

3. Dismissal or suspension of teachers guilty of gross misconduct, negléct of duty or refusal to obey a lawful order of the board;

4. Provision of free lunches, textbooks and pupil supplies;

5. Provision of teacher residences; -

6. Provision of scholarships;

7. Provision of in-service training programs for the staff;

and

8. Provision of special courses or programs, as required on the basis of local need, in addition to the core curriculum.

While the preceding lists are not intended to represent a complete enumeration of school board responsibilities and powers, they are extensive enough to define the parameters of trustee role and function in Alberta, and to focus attention upon the potentially significant

role that local school boards can play in the administration of education in this province.

## Related Research and Literature

In addition to the legal duties and responsibilities of trustees outlined in school related legislation, a fairly extensive body of literature and research focuses on the issue of trustee role and function.

One of the more comprehensive school board studies conducted was done by Lipham in 1967. His three year study, which sought to analyze the role of the school board as an agency for resolving conflict between the community and the school, collected data by interviewing 90 trustees, 183 public officials, 240 teachers, and 1,792 citizens from 12 Wisconsin school districts. Conflict resolution was assessed by observing school board meetings during budget debates.

The study found that limited consensus existed between parent, public official, teacher, and trustee groups relative to trustee role expectations. Of considerable interest also was the fact that there existed significant disagreement within the trustee group itself, as to their own roles. Regarding the issue of conflict resolution, Lipham (1967) found that conflict was rarely resolved at board meetings. In fact, 89.3 per cent of all votes taken by the boards studied were unanimous. He also noted that trustees tended to engage in role avoidance, often delegating responsibility for decision-making to superintendents, when potential for serious conflict was present.

Kerr (1964) fundertook an in-depth case study of two city school

districts to determine the nature of the interactions among and between board members and administrative staff, and the effect that these had on trustee functions. His research indicated that because of deference to educational expertise, and the relative ignorance of trustees and communities about the school system, school board decisions tended to be pro forma in nature, primarily designed to legitimize the policies of the administrative staff to the community rather than "representing the community to the school" (Kerr, 1964). This contention that educational expertise has "largely won the day" was also reflected in studies by Iannaccone (1967), Kirst (1970), Goldhammer (1964) and most recently Zeigler and Jennings (1974).

Similarly, Masotti (1968:285) concluded after studying four Chicago districts that

The superintendents agree that their power lies in the ability to control the dissemination of educational knowledge, which then enables them to set the board's agenda, to channel the deliberation, and usually to determine the decision, while the board is permitted to indulge itself with the notion that it makes policy. Proviso's superintendent summed it up this way: "It is agreed that the superintendent will submit policy proposals to the board for its approval and then he will administer it; they seldom disapprove of a policy proposal because they haven't sufficient information to evaluate the consequences of the alternative."

These findings would appear to support Scribner's (1966) contention that, rather than making policy, boards of trustees are frequently engaged in quasi-judicial functions, mediating the terms for the application of governmental and administrative policy to local circumstances.

In addition to studies concerned with the duties, responsibilities and functions of public school trustees, a substantial body of literature relative to the role and function of community college and university trustees exists. The duties and responsibilities of governing boards have been discussed in general terms by such prominent writers as Henderson (1967), Heilbron (1973), and Rauh (1969).

Henderson (1967) identified: management of the institution in the public interest, financial accountability to government and the public, supervision and administration of endowment funds, and ethical and moral responsibilities relative to the education of students, as the primary functions of a board of trustees. Heilbron (1970) emphasized the liaison function between the institution and the public. He saw the board as a vehicle to convey public sentiment concerning the institution to the administration and academic staff, Rauh (1969) perceived the board's function and responsibilities as including selection and determination of tenure for the college president, acting as a last court of appeal on the campus, the development of institutional goals and objectives, as well as the basic trust responsibilities relative to education of youth.

The role of the community college trustee has also been subject to empirical study by Hartnett (1969) and Konrad (1976). Hartnett (1969) surveyed over 5,000 community college trustees in the United States relative to their backgrounds, roles and educational attitudes. His findings relative to role indicated that trustees preferred having major authority for most decisions reside with the board and/or administration. In terms of actual function, the study indicated that trustees perceived their major responsibilities as residing in the areas of finance, physical plant, and external affairs. In the other areas, trustees appeared to make primarily pro forma decisions, often confirming or approving decisions made or actions recommended by the administration.

Konrad (1976) surveyed 219 community college trustees in Alberta, British Columbia, and Quebec, utilizing a data collection instrument that represented a revision of the questionnaire used in the Hartnett. (1969) study.

The results indicated that trustees did not perceive themselves as directly involved in any of the decision-making, areas identified. They generally viewed their decision-making functions relative to physical plant, personnel, institutional development, instructional issues, and nomination and appointment of board members as pro forma. Similarly they saw themselves as uninvolved in decisions relative to student life and external affairs, and involved only in an advisory capacity in decisions relating to institutional role.

An analysis of preferred locus of authority was also undertaken. The findings revealed that trustees favored an "hierarchical authority structure" with major decision-making authority vested in the board and/or administration. They generally preferred greater board involvement in decisions related to fund-raising, nominating board members, selecting an architect, and appointing the college president; and less involvement in program development, budget development, and budget allocation.

The results of these and other studies (Pattridge, 1973; Perkins, 1973) suggest that governing boards of community colleges are engaged primarily in legitimizing the decisions already taken by their administrative staff, rather than developing policy and charting new directions for their institutions. These findings are generally consistent with the research cited earlier on public school trustee functions as well.

TRUSTEE SELECTION AND BOARD COMPOSITION

#### Selection

Generally, candidacy for school board positions in North America is contingent only upon the perspective trustees being qualified voters of the state or province and the school district within which they reside (Cistone,1975). There are some minor exceptions to this in the United States; Goldhammer (1964) noted that eleven states have some educational requirements; a small number of states demand character references; and three require that candidates be parents or ratepayers. In Canada no qualifications other than residence and voting status in the province and the school district are necessary. As a result virtually any Canadian citizen residing in the district has the leg#1 right to seek office as a school trustee.

While "formal or legal opportunity determines who may seek office; effective or practical opportunity dictates who can seek office" (Cistone, 1975:53). Among the critical determinants identified are such variables as occupation, income, education, ability, resources, age, sex, and motivation (Milbrath, 1965).

The issue of "effective or practical eligibility" for candidacy to school boards has been explored in several studies in the United States. Cronin (1973) and Crain (1968) attempted to determine the degree of involvement by "parapolitical" and civic association groups in sponsoring school board candidates. These studies, which focused upon several large American cities concluded that candidates were very often representatives of major religious, racial or parapolitical interest groups in the community.

Somewhat different findings were noted by Zeigler and Jennings (1974). They found in their national study of trustees that, while evidence of parapolitical involvement in sponsoring candidates was present in some large urban centres, it was not endemic to school governance on a national basis. According to Zeigler and Jennings (1974) the practice of incumbent trustees instigating the candidacy of others was much more common. Cistone's (1974) research relative to trustee recruitment generally corroborates Zeigler and Jennings' findings.

While the vast majority of public school trustees are elected, community college and university trustees are often appointed. A concise summary of the relative strengths and weaknesses of both approaches to trustee selection was provided by Polk (1975) in his excellent article entitled "Trustee Selection: Who Gets What, Who Pays What?" He concluded that neither method was inherently "better" for all participants and suggested that combining the two approaches to select a board often had merit.

The issue of trustee selection was also addressed by Konrad (1977) in his study of 35 newly appointed community college trustees in Alberta. He concluded that: (1) college board members represented a "limited" cross-section of their communities; (2) involvement in partisan politics prior to their selection was common; (3) faculty and student membership on boards in Alberta was strongly favored by the respondents; and (4) most trustees were satisfied with appointment as a method of selection to governing boards.

## Board Composition-

r

Educational literature in the United States abounds with references to studies of the composition of school boards. The first study of major significance in the area, and the one that laid the groundwork for a number of future studies, was conducted by Counts in 1927. His survey of 1,654 boards of education including rural, city and college boards throughout the United States, identified the typical school trustee as middle aged, professional, male, married with children in school, and very active in community affairs. He concluded that boards typically represented the business and professional communities only, and as a result tended toward conservatism. Counts®was extremely critical of the existing state of affairs relative to board composition, and advocated a festructuring of selection procedures to assure representation from labour and minority groups as well as from the business and professional strata.

Approximately 20 years after the Counts' study, The National Education Association (1946) conducted an exhaustive survey designed to ascertain whether significant changes in board composition had occurred in the two decades after 1927. Their findings suggested that the original stereotype of the school trustee presented by Counts (1927) was still valid.
Subsequent to the NEA's (1946) study, research into board composition was conducted by Stapley (1957), Gross (1958), McCarty (1959), Bowan (1963), Milbrath (1965), Minar (1966), NEA (1974), Zeigler and Jennings (1974) and others. None of these studies seriously challenge the original stereotype, and there is little in the literature to suggest that it will be challenged in the near future.

23

In addition to the research conducted on the characteristics of public school trustees, a number of significant studies relative to the characteristics of community college and university trustees are available. Beck (1947) gathered extensive data on the characteristics of members of governing boards of 30 private and public universities in the United States. He found that board members were typically older males, businessmen or professionals, with substantially above average incomes. Nineteen years later, Duster's (1966) replication of Beck's study revealed similar results.

Hartnett (1969:19) conducted a survey of the trustees of over 500 colleges and universities in The United States for the Educational Testing Service. He found that trustees were typically

male, in their 50's, white, well educated, and financially well off. They occupy prestige positions frequently in the professional fields, but more often as business executives. As a group they usually personify success in the usual American sense of that word.

Similar findings were noted by Gilliland (1969), Mills (1972) and Bernd (1973).

Within the Canadian context a recent study by Konrad (1976) revealed similar patterns relative to the characteristics of community college trustees. Konrad (1976:72) identified the "typical board member" as "male, in his middle forties, a long-time resident of the province, highly educated, a member of a profession, and well off financially.

These studies would seem to suggest that board composition relative to both postsecondary institutions and public schools is very similar. Further, it is apparent that the type of person that typically is elected or appointed to these positions has remained somewhat constant during the past half century.

#### ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS

While a significant amount of research exists relative to board composition, studies that address the issue of trustee attitudes and opinions are somewhat more limited. One of the first investigations of trustee attitudes was conducted by Arnett in 1932. He employed The Harper Social Belief Test in an attempt to determine the social predispositions and beliefs of trustees, and their relationship to demographic and social status variables. He found that a high positive correlation existed between the beliefs of board members, and occupation, age, education, political preferences, and religious affiliation. He also noted that professional men were more progressive in their attitudes toward social issues than any other occupational group. Similarly, members with higher income levels tended to be more progressive than their counterparts with lower incomes. These findings are somewhat antithetical to Counts' (1927) original arguments that the upper status trustees were more conservative than trustees from other segments of society.

24,

In 1956, a survey of the attitudes of Pennsylvania trustees relative to educational problems was conducted by Teal. His study, based upon 661 responses from trustees of both rural and urban boards in the state, concluded that board members who were highly educated, professionals, and had higher income levels, tended to have a more liberal point of view on educational issues (Teal 1956). Similar findings were reported by Tiedt (1961).

Stapley and Barnhart (1957) surveyed superintendents and school board members of 12 Midwestern states to assess trustee effectiveness and to determine the relationship between effectiveness and trustee characteristics. They found that formal education, personal economic success, experience as a school trustee, and the amount of time available to devote to board activities were positively correlated to trustee effectiveness. No significant relationships between effectiveness and sex, age, or parenthood were noted (Stapley and Barnhat, 1957).

Gross (1958) investigated the relationship between the social characteristics of board members, and the nature of their functioning on boards of education. His survey of superintendents led him to conclude that a high positive correlation existed between education, income level, time devoted to board activities, and efforts to increase one's knowledge of educational issues, on the one hand, and the degree of "progressivism" artributed to the trustees on the other. Some reservations relative to Gross's (1958) findings appear to be in order, however, since they were based entirely upon the perceptions of superintendents and thus did not allow for input from board members.

Subsequent to Gross' (1958) study, Reber (1959) investigated

the characteristics of California school trustees and the relationships of these variables to trustee attitudes on selected educational issues. His data, drawn from 322 responses from trustees from all types of school districts, revealed that no significant relationships existed between occupation, income, and other socio-economic status variables and trustee attitudes. Similar findings were noted in Abbott's (1960) study of 213 Midwestern United States trustees.

Proudfoot (1962:153) surveyed trustees in the province of Alberta to determine

if selected variables concerning the socio-economic status of High Influence members of school boards and their attitudes toward certain common problems confronting school boards, are different from those of Low Influence members.

His findings indicated that high influence was usually associated with professional status, high levels of formal education, and higher income levels. He also noted that trustees who were identified as influential tended to have significantly different attitudes relative to the areas of teacher personnel, curriculum, and school facilities. For example, higher influence trustees were more supportive of hiring only teachers with university degrees, parent advisory groups, merit increments for superior teachers, experimentation with accreditation, and having the superintendent and staff . involved in the planning of school buildings. Proudfoot's findings generally appear to concur with the findings of Teal (1956), Tiedt (1961), Gross (1958), and Stapley and Barnhat (1957), suggesting that social status variables are positively correlated to both trustee effectiveness and "progressivism."

\$

More recently, a study conducted by Zeigler and Jennings (1974), found that meither the average level of education, occupational status, or income had any significant relationship to their measure of "professionalism" in the board's role orientation. However, as Boyd (1975:111) noted, Zeigler and Jennings' (1974) "measure of professionalism did not relate directly to such matters as propensity to defer to expertise," but instead was based upon a measure of trustee perceptions of role conflict between public trust and trustee loyalty to the administrative staff. Boyd (1975) correctly suggested that there was some doubt as to whether or not this procedure adequately "taps the attitudes of trustees" relative to professionalism.

Boyd (1975), in a comparative case study of eight suburban Chicago districts, noted that trustees in higher status areas (income, education, and occupation) generally were more "public regarding" and more likely to defer to administrative empertise, than were lower status trustees. According to Boyd (1975), lower status trustees were inclined toward "private regarding attitudes" which usually resulted in mobilizing conflict. Studies by Cistone (1971), Minar (1966) and Cistone and Hennessy (1971) concurred with Boyd's findings.

In addition to investigations of the attitudes and opinions of public school trustees, a few studies relative to the attitudes and opinions of community college trustees are also of significance. The best known of these is Hartnett's (1969) study of the backgrounds, roles and educational attitudes of college trustees in The United States. His data, gathered from a sample of over 5,000 trustees, revealed that: (1) trustees were somewhat cautious and conservative regarding the

notion of academic freedom; (2) they preferred an hierarchical authority structure often preferring to exclude faculty even from decisions having to do with academic program; and, (3) they were generally extremely conservative as a group with regard to educational attitudes and opinions.

Hill (1977) surveyed 171 governing board members of black public colleges and universities in the Southern States. He collected both demographic information about trustees as well as their attitudes relative to a number of issues of educational concern. The study revealed that the major areas of concern identified by trustees were issues relating to role clarification and financial management.

Finally, Konrad (1976) and (1977) investigated the attitudes and opinions of trustees relative to role, locus of authority, board composition, and the importance of selected trustee tharacteristics. The study revealed that, although trustess favored an hierarchical authority structure with major decision-making authority vested in the board and/or administration, they strongly supported student and faculty representation on governing boards. Similarly, 68 per cent of the trustees advocated that boards be composed of both elected and appointed members. Finally, the most important prerequisites for trusteeship identified were interest in higher education, vision to move ahead with new ideas, understanding of the institutional role, and time to devote to board activities.

#### SUMMARY

The literature and research reviewed in this chapter focused upon four major areas. These included: the historical evolution of the school board as an administrative body, the role and functions of trustees, trustee selection and board composition, and finally, the educational attitudes and opinions of trustees.

An whollistic analysis of this literature and research precipitates a number of general observations and conclusions. Specifically these are:

 The concept of lay control over the administration of schools is firmly entrenched in both the American and Canadian democratic philosophy;

2) Much of the research relative to trustee role and function would seem to suggest a continuing erosion of board control and power as a mesult of deference to educational expertise, and increasing incursions by provincial and state departments of education into areas of board jurisdication;

3) The original stereotype of the school trustee as: middleaged, professional, male, married with children in school, and very active in community affairs appears to remain an accurate reflection of school trustees and community college trustees;

4) While the data presented are far from conclusive with regard to the exact nature of the relationships among and between specific attitudes and trustee characteristics, it appears that much can be learned about the educational attitudes and opinions of trustees by examining their backgrounds; and

5) Finally, Counts' (1927) assertion that over representation of the business and professional strata militates strongly in favor of conservatism in educational policy is questionable. In fact a significant body of the research suggests that the antithesis may be a more accurate reflection of reality.

#### CHAPTER III

#### DESIGN OF THE STUDY

This chapter focuses on the research design and methodology employed for the study. Methodology is discussed in terms of selection, development and distribution of the instrument, the nature of the response, and the statistical tests of significance used.

#### THE INSTRUMENT

The instrument utilized for data collection was a 16 page questionnaire which compiled data concerning: (1) the demographic characteristics of trustees including: age, sex, income, education, occupation, reading habits, political preferences, location and size of jurisdiction represented; (2) trustee activities relative to both their actual and preferred functions; and (3) trustee attitudes on board selection and composition, selection of a superintendent, student affairs, faculty affairs and educational philosophy in general.

The decision to utilize a questionnaire as a data collection instrument was motivated in part by the large size of the population being surveyed and the extensive geographic region represented by the respondents. Furthermore, the successful utilization of questionnaires by Hartnett in 1969 and Konrad in 1975 to collect similar information on community college trustees, provided a valid basis for both the utilization and design of the instrument employed for this study. The final draft of the questionnaire that trustees completed was, in reality, a revision of the instrument used by Konrad in his

1975 study of community college trustees in Canada.

The instrument was pilot tested with a group of ten trustees, two divisional superintendents, two secretary-treasurers, and the executive director of the Alberta School Trustees' Association for suggestions and crimicisms. The final draft of the questionnaire took their recommendations into consideration. Appendix A includes a copy of the instrument.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF THE INSTRUMENT

The entire population of Alberta school trustees was surveyed. Table I provides a complete listing of all of the school jurisdictions surveyed and the corresponding number of trustees associated with each. The identification of the trustees who fell within the delimitations of the study was made by the use of the ASTA's mailing list. The co-operation of the ASTA, in terms of both financial assistance and a supporting letter of introduction, was essential in achieving an acceptable response rate. A copy of the covering letter from the Executive Director of the ASTA is included in Appendix B.

To ensure anonimity, the questionnaires were not numbered or identified in any other manner. Follow-up was conducted through the offices of the district superintendents; a letter to all school superintendents requesting their assistance by reminding their trustees to complete the questionnaire, was sent out one month after the initial mailings. A cut-off date for receipt of usable responses was set at seven weeks after the initial mailings.

# TABLE I

# School Divisions, Counties and Districts Surveyed

.

1.1.7.2

# Jurisdictions

0

•

## No. of Trustees

1.1

33

.12

¢

# School Divisions

| Acadia                         | No. 8                                 | 5       |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Berry Creek                    | No. 1                                 | 4       |
| Bonnyville                     | No. 46                                | 6       |
| Calgary                        | No. 41                                | 6       |
| Cardston                       | No. 2                                 | 7       |
| Crowsnest Pass                 | No. 63                                | 7       |
| Drumheller Valley              | No. 62                                | 5       |
| East Smoky                     | No. 54                                | 6       |
| Fairview                       | No. 50                                | 8       |
| Foothills                      | No. 38                                | 7       |
| Fort Vermilion                 | No. 52                                | 7       |
| High Prairie                   | No. 48                                | 5       |
| Lac La Biche                   | No. 51                                | 5       |
| Medicine Hat                   | No. 4                                 | 5       |
| Neutral Hills                  | No. 16                                | 5       |
| Northland                      | No. 61                                | 7       |
| Peace River                    | No. 10                                | 7       |
| Pincher Creek                  | No. 29                                | 7       |
| Provost                        | No. 33                                | 5       |
| Rocky Mountain                 | No. 15                                | '5<br>' |
| Spirit River                   | No / 47                               | 7       |
| Starland                       | No. 30                                | 5       |
|                                |                                       |         |
| 计专用时间 化合物 建塑料器 化乙酰基甲基乙酰基 建浓度合金 | 에서 한 동안들은 것은 것 같은 것은 것이 같은 것이 가지 못했다. |         |

-

| Jurisdictions            | •      | No. of Trustees |
|--------------------------|--------|-----------------|
| School Divisions         |        |                 |
| Sturgeon                 | No. 24 | • • • • 7       |
| Sullivan Lake            | No. 9  | 8               |
| Taber                    | No. 6  | 7               |
| Three Hills              | No. 60 | 6               |
| Wainwright               | No. 32 | 7               |
| Westlock                 | No. 37 | ••• 7           |
| Willow Creek             | No. 28 | • • • • 8       |
| Yellowhead               | No. 12 | •••••           |
| Total (School Divisions) |        | 188             |
| Counties                 |        |                 |
| Athabasca County         | No. 12 | ••••12          |
| Barrhead County          | No. 11 | 10              |
| Beaver County            |        |                 |
| Camrose County           | No. 22 | 14              |

School Divisions, Counties and Districts Surveyed

| Athabasca County     | . No. 12                              | 12     |
|----------------------|---------------------------------------|--------|
|                      | . No. 11                              |        |
|                      | . No. 9                               |        |
|                      | . No. 22                              |        |
| Flagstaff County     | . No. 29                              | •••8•  |
| Forty Mile County    | $. No. 8 \cdots \cdots \cdots \cdots$ | 14     |
|                      | . No. 1                               |        |
| Lac Ste. Anne County | . No. 28                              | 14     |
| Lacombe County       | . No. 14                              | 15     |
| Lamont County        | No. 30                                | 10     |
| Leduc County         | No. 25                                | 16     |
| Lethbridge County    |                                       | •••9   |
| Minbern County       | No. 27                                | ••• 13 |

| Counties                      |   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Mountain View County No. 17   | •••••••• 13   |
| Newell County No. 4           | •••••   |
| Paintearth County No. 18      | •••••••• 10   |
| Parkland County No. 31        | 15  |
| Ponoka County No. 3           | 9   |
| Red Deer County No. 23        | · · · · · · · · · · · 14                            |
| St. Paul County No. 19        | • • • • • • • • 8                                   |
| Smoky Lake County No. 13      | ••••••  |
| Stettler County No. 6         | ••••12  |
| Strathcona County No. 20      | ••• ••• ••• • <b>14</b>                             |
| Thorhild County No. 7         | ••• • • • • • • 8                                   |
| Two Hills County No. 21       | ••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••              |
| Vermilion River County No. 24 |   |
| Vulcan County No. 2           | 이는 것은 것은 것을 알려야 한 것을 가지 않는 것을 하는 것을 가지 않는 아니는 🕊 이 것 |
| Warner County No. 5           |   |
| Wetaskiwin County No. 10      |   |
| Wheatland County No. 16       | • • • • • • • • <b>13</b>                           |
| Total (Counties)              | 360   |

School Divisions, Counties and Districts Surveyed

.

.

1

r

.

.

۰.

.

- A 1

1.1

|          | Total (Counties) |              |            | 360    | ų     |
|----------|------------------|--------------|------------|--------|-------|
|          | School Dist      | <u>ricts</u> |            |        |       |
| <u> </u> | Assumption C.S   | No.          | 50         | ••••5  |       |
|          | Banff            | No.          | 102        | •••••5 |       |
|          | Barons Cons      | No.          | 8          | ••••5  |       |
| •        | Beaverlodge C.S  | No.          | 68 • • • • | 5      | þ     |
|          |                  |              |            |        | 5<br> |

| Jurisdictions                             |            |                                       | No. of Trustees |
|---|------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| School Districts                          |            |                                       |                 |
| Biggin Hill                               | . No. 5029 | ••••                                  | ••••9           |
| Bonnyville                                | . No. 2665 | •                                     | 5               |
| Bonnyville Region<br>High School District | . No. 4    | · · · · · · · ·                       | ••••0           |
| Boy, Island C.S                           | . No. 82   | • • • • • • •                         | · · · · 5       |
| Brooks                                    | . No. 2092 | • • • • • • •                         | ••• 5           |
| Calgary                                   | . No. 19   | • • • • • •                           | •••• 7          |
| Calgary C.S                               | . No. 1    | ••••                                  | ••••7           |
| Camrose                                   | . No. 1315 |                                       | • •, • • 5      |
| Camrose C.S                               | . No. 60   | •••••                                 | 5               |
| Canadian Forces Base                      | . No. 4986 | • • • • • • •                         | •••             |
| Canmore                                   | . No. 168  | • • • • • • •                         | ••••3           |
| Coaldale C.S. C.S                         | • No. 73   | • • • • •                             | • • • 5         |
| Cold Lake C.S                             | . No. 64   | • • • • • •                           | 5               |
| Devon                                     | . No. 4972 |                                       | •••7            |
| Drayton Valley C.S                        | . No. 111  | • • • • • •                           | · · · 5         |
| Drumheller C.S                            | . No. 25   |                                       | •••5            |
| Edmonton Public                           | . No. 7    |                                       | ••• 9           |
| Edmonton C.S                              | . No. 7    | · · · · · · ·                         | ••• 7           |
| Exshaw                                    | . No. 1699 | • • • • • •                           | ••• 2           |
| Falher Cons                               | . No. 69   | •                                     | 5               |
| Fort McMurray C.S                         | • No. 32   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | • • • • 7       |
| Fort McMurray                             | • No. 2833 | • • • • • • •                         | ••• • • 5       |
| Fort Saskatchewan C.S.                    | . No. 104  | • • • • •                             | • • • 5         |

School Divisions, Counties and Districts Surveyed

| ÷                  | •    |                  |         |       |       |           |          |
|--------------------|------|------------------|---------|-------|-------|-----------|----------|
| Jurisdictions      |      |                  |         | ·     |       | No. of    | Trustees |
| School Districts   |      |                  |         |       |       |           | •        |
| Fort Vermilion C.S | No.  | 26               | •       | • • • | •     | • • • • • | 3        |
| Glen Avon P.S.     | No.  | 5                |         |       | • • • | • • • •   | 5        |
| Grande Centre C.S  | No.  | 67               | • •     |       | • •   |           | 5        |
| Grande Cache       |      |                  |         |       | • •   | • • • •   | 5        |
| Grande Prairie     | No.  | 2357             | • •     | • • • | • •   | • • • •   | 5        |
| Grande Prairie C.S | No.  | 28               | • •     | • • • | ••    | • • • •   | 5        |
| Grimshaw C.S       |      |                  |         |       |       | •         | 5 *      |
| Grovedale          | No.  | 4910             | • •     | • • • | • •   | • • • •   | 3        |
| Hanna              | No.  | 29               | • •     | • • • | • •   | • • • •   | 0        |
| High Prairie C.S   | No.  | 56               | • •     | • • • | •     | • • • •   | 5        |
| Jasper             | No.  | 3063             | · • •   | • • • | ••    | • • • •   | 9        |
| Killam C.S         | No.  | 49               | • •     | • •   | •     |           | 6        |
| Legal              |      |                  |         |       |       | • • • •   | 5        |
| Lethbridge         | No.  | 51               | ••      | • •   | • •   | • • • •   | 7        |
| Lethbridge C.S     |      | 1. C.            |         | •••   |       | • • • •   | 5        |
| Lousana Cons       |      | · · ·            | , et    | • •   |       | • • • •   | 3        |
|                    | No . | ч.н.<br>1. н. н. | •       | • •   | · · · | • • • •   | 5        |
| Medicine Hat       | No.  | • 76             | ••      | • •   |       |           | 5        |
| Medicine Hat C.S   | No.  | 21               | • •     | • •   | • • • |           | 5        |
| Mynarski Park      | No.  | 5012             | • •     | •     | • • • |           | 1        |
| Nampa C.S          | No.  | 96               | •       | • •   | • • • | • • • •   | 3        |
|                    | No.  | 43               | • •     | •     | • • • |           | 5        |
| Picture Butte C.S  | No.  | 79               | ••      | • •   | •     |           | 5        |
|                    |      |                  | et es t |       |       |           |          |

Ŧ

School Divisions, Counties and Districts Surveyed

| Jurisdictions                             | `     |      | " v     |       |              | No.          | of             | Trustees |
|---|-------|------|---------|-------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------|
| School Districts                          |       |      | . ,     |       | •            | • <b>0</b> • | 0              | • •)     |
| Pincher Creek C.S                         | No.   | 18   | ••      |       | ••           | • • • •      | •              | 5        |
| Ponoka C.S                                | No.   | 95   | ••      |       | •••          | •\.• ;• •    | •              | 5        |
| Provost C.S.                              | No.   | 65   | , ••••  | • •   | • •          | • • • •      | •              | 5        |
| Ralston                                   | No.   | 4981 | • •     | • •   | • •          | ••••         | •              | 3        |
| Raymond C.S                               | No.   | 100  | ••      | • •   | • •          | ••••         | •              | 3        |
| Redcliff                                  | No.   | 2283 | • •     | •     | • • .•       | • • • •      | •              | 5        |
| Red Deer                                  | No.   | 104  | •       | • •   | • • •        |              | . • '          | 7        |
| Red Deer C.S                              | No.   | 17   | • •     | •     | • • •        | • • • •      | •              | 5        |
| Rosary C.S                                | No.   | 37   | • •     | • • • | • • • •      | • • • •      | •              | 5        |
| St. Albert                                | No.   | 3    | • •     | •     | • • •        | • • • •      | •              | 5        |
| St. Albert P.S                            | No.   | 6    | ••      | •     | • • •        | • • • •      | •              | 5        |
| St. Martin's C.S                          | No.   | 16   | •       | •     | • • •        | • • • •      | •              | 5        |
| St. Paul                                  | No.   | 2228 | • •     | ••.   | •••          | • • • •      | •              | 5        |
| St. Paul Regional<br>High School District | . No. | - 1- |         | •••   | ء<br>• • آ • | • • •        | ▶ 4 - <b>1</b> | 0        |
| St. Rita's C.S                            | . No. | 27   | еў<br>• | ••.   | • • •        | • • • •      | <b>i</b> - •   | 7        |
| St. Thomas More C.S                       | . No. | 35   | . • •   | ••    | • • •        | •••          |                | 5        |
| Seebe •                                   | . No. | 4152 |         | ••,   | • • •        | • • •        | <b>N</b> ., ●  | 3        |
| Sexsmith C.S                              | . No. | .51  | •       | • •   | •••          | • • •        | • •            | 5        |
| Sherwood Park Catholic<br>Separate School |       |      |         |       | τ            | τ            | ь              | <b>-</b> |
| District                                  |       | 105  |         | • •   | • • •        | • • •        | ••             | 5 。      |
| Spirit River C.S                          |       | 36   | . 3     | • •   | • • •        | • • •        |                | 5        |
| Stettler                                  | . No. | 1475 | •       | ••    | • • •        | • • •        | ••             | 5        |
| Stirling                                  | . No. | 647  | •       | • .•  | • • •        |              | • •            | 5        |

# School Divisions, Counties and Districts Surveyed

۴.

Jurisdications No. of Trustees School Districts No. 5109 Swan Hills .... 5 5 54 Taber . . . No. . . Thibault C.P. . No. 35 5 No. - 84 Valleyview C.S. . 5 . . . . . . Vermilion C.S. . . . No. 97 No. 31 Wainwright C.S. . . . . 5 Waterton Park .... No. 4233 3 Westlock C.S. . . . . . 110 5 No. Wetaskiwin . No. 264 5 Wetaskiwin C.S. 15 5 No. Whitecourt C.S. . . . 94 5 No. Total (School Districts) 405 Grand Total 953

School Divisions, Counties and Districts Surveyed

<u>م</u>جن

In total, of the 953 questionnaires mailed out, 488 usable responses were received for a response rate of 51.3 percent. Although specific information relative to the return rate from each jurisdiction is not available, a response profile based upon geographic location in Alberta, and size of the jurisdiction represented is provided in Tables II and III.

| TABLE | II |
|-------|----|
|-------|----|

|    |                       | • • •    |   |   |            | esponse 🕉 |     |
|----|-----------------------|----------|---|---|------------|-----------|-----|
|    | Location              | <u>.</u> |   |   | Relative   | Frequency | (%) |
| 1£ | North-eastern Alberta | 3        |   |   | <b>k</b> • | 17        | é   |
| 2. | North-western Alberta |          | • | ÷ | * * *      | 21        |     |
| 3. | Central Alberta       |          |   |   | ~          | 38        |     |
| 4. | South-eastern Alberta |          | • |   |            | 11 ′      |     |
| 5. | South-western Alberta | ¥.       | • |   | . •        | 13        | 25  |
|    | Total                 | ·····    |   | • | •          | 100%      |     |

| Response | Bу | Geographic | Location |
|----------|----|------------|----------|
|----------|----|------------|----------|

Inspection of Table II reveals that 38 percent of the respondents identified themselves as residing in Northern Alberta, 38 percent indicated that they lived in Central Alberta and 24 percent resided in the Southern Alberta area. This suggests that more trustees from Central and Northern Alberta completed the survey as compared to trustees in the southern part of the province. However, since a significant number of responses (124) were received from Southern

### TABLE III

Response By Jurisdiction Size

|     |  | ······································ | Response |            |
|-----|--|--|----------|------------|
|     | Size of Jurisdiction   | Possible                               | Actual   | % Received |
| 1.  | Large urban centre (population<br>in excess of 100,000) (    | 36 •                                   | 30       | 83         |
| 2.  | Smaller urban centre (population between 25,000 and 100,000) | 74                                     | 37       | 50         |
| 3.  | Large town (population between 5,000 and 25,000)             | 141                                    | 87       | 62         |
| 4., | Small town or village<br>(population under 5,000)            | 37,8*                                  |          | <b>ن</b> گ |
| 5.  | A rural (farm) area  | 324*                                   | INZ A    | 45         |
|     | Total  | 953                                    | 40       | 51.3       |

\* Due to considerable overlap between small towns and villages and rural farm areas these figures are estimates only.

Alberta trustees, the results can be validly generalized for all of Alberta.

With regard to response by jurisdiction size, the data in Table III reveal that, apart from an extremely high response rate (83%) from the large urban centres with population in excess of 100,000, responses were generally similar by jurisdiction size. Fifty percent of the trustees from smaller urban centres responded, and approximately 50 percent and 45 percent of the trustees in small towns and rural areas respectively, returned the completed question-

naire.

## STATISTICAL PROCEDURES AND ANALYSES

The data presented in this study are both descriptive and comparative in nature. Survey data related to demographic characteristics, trustee opinions concerning board selection and composition, preferences relative to the selection of a superintendent, and attitudes on educational issues, are presented by the use of means and/ or relative frequencies. Analyses of relationships between trustee attitudes were accomplished primarily through the use of t-tests and F-tests. A Scheffe procedure was used to analyze the nature of differences between groups relative to jurisdiction size and political ideology. Similarly, the probability matrix for Scheffe Multiple Comparison of Means was utilized to determine the nature of differences in trustee response patterns relative to the six age categories.

The decision to rely primarily on parametric procedures was motivated by a number of factors. As Popham (1973:313-17) notes, parametric procedures are often "more powerful than their non-parametric counterparts" and have the added advantage of greater flexibility, allowing the categorization of variables in such a way as to simultaneously analyze relationships between a dependent variable and many independent variables. In addition, since most of the data were recorded on ordinal or interval scales, the use of parametric procedures was appropriate. In this regard Popham (1973:313) notes: "The conclusion of leading statisticians is generally in favor of using parametric procedures with ordinal as well as interval data." In addition to the parametric procedures identified above, the

22

nature of parts of the analyses necessitated the application of some non-parametric techniques. Analyses that involved comparisons of noncontinuous variables, such as sex by geographic location, were analyzed by the use of the Chi Square. Similarly, a Spéarman Rank-Order Correlation Coefficient was employed to provide a comparison of trustee perceptions of actual and preferred locus of authority. The selection of this procedure was based on the fact that its use did not require that certain assumptions such as homoscedasticity be satisfied.

The statistical tests employed and the research procedures utilized were generally compatible with similar research designs employed by Konrad in 1975 and Hartnett in 1969 to study community college trustees. The actual analysis was done with the aid of the University of Alberta's computer services. The SPSS and DERS computer programs were employed.

### SUMMARY

\$

. . . The data for the study were collected by the use of a 16 page questionnaire that represented a revision of an instrument used by Konrad (1975) in his community colleges trustees study. Input regarding the instrument from a group of trustees and Central Office administrators was sought, and their recommendations were taken into consideration in the final draft of the questionnaire.

All school trustees in the province of Alberta were surveyed. Distribution of the instrument was accomplished with the assistance of the ASTA. A response rate of 51.3 percent was recorded. With minor exceptions -- these being a slight under representation of Southern Alberta and an over representation of large urban centres -- the response was generally representative by jurisdiction size and geographic location.

1 5.

Analyses were done with the assistance of the SPSS and DERS computer programs at the University of Alberta. With minor exceptions, the data were analyzed by the use of parametric procedures. A detailed presentation and analysis of the survey data follows in the next three chapters.

#### CHAPTER IV

#### A PROFILE OF THE ALBERTA SCHOOL TRUSTEE

This chapter is addressed primarily to providing an answer to the question, "Who are the trustees in the province of Alberta?" The data presented are, for the most part, descript of the mature and focus upon demographic characteristics of trustees such as dge, sex, education, occupation and political preferences. In addition, the relationships between age, sex, socio-economic status and political preferences relative to variables such as size and location of jurisdiction are explored.

#### PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS

findings reflected considerable diversity with respect to truster reckgrounds. These differences notwithstanding, the stereotype of the typical school trustee was that of a male, between 40 and 59 years of age, employed in a nonprofessional field, with limited postsecondary education. He was usually financially well off and viewed himself as a political moderate.

#### Sex

Trustees in Alberta are predominantly male. Of the 488 respondents, 71 percent were male and 29 percent were female. A significant relationship between sex and the size of jurisdiction represented was observed (Table IV). Large urban centres had significantly more females than did small rural (farm) areas (46% as compared to 19% for the rural areas). Smaller urban centres, large towns, and small towns or villages, had very similar distributions -- 33 percent, 32 percent, and 31 percent respectively. The t-test was applied to determine the significance of these variations. The results, as outlined in Table V, indicated a strong positive relationship between jurisdiction size and the proportion of female trustees.

46

Sex distribution relative to geographic location in the province was also studied. Central Alberta recorded the largest proportion of female trustees (34%); Northern Alberta was next with 27 percent; and Southern Alberta had the fewest (23%).

#### TABLE IV

## Sex Distribution By Size of Jurisdiction

|    | Size of Jurisdiction >   | . Female | <u>Mal</u> |
|----|--|----------|------------|
| 1. | Large urban centre (population in excess<br>of 100,000 people) | 46       | ŝ          |
| 2. | Population between 25,000 - 100,000                            | - 33     | 67         |
| з. | Population between 5,000 - 25,000                              | 32       | 68         |
| 4. | Small town or village (population under 5,000)                 | 31       | 69         |
| 5. | Rural (farm) area  | ب<br>۱۹  | 81         |
|    | Total  | 100      | 100        |
|    | Total  | 100      | 10(        |

#### TABLE V

## Relationship Between Sex Distribution and Jurisdiction Size

|            | Grou | D NO | o. of | Cases | Mea | a<br>n | <b>T-</b> v | alue | Df | 2 | -Tail Prob. | -      |
|------------|------|------|-------|-------|-----|--------|-------------|------|----|---|-------------|--------|
| 2          | Fema | 6    | 14    |       | 3.5 | 4      |             |      | 48 | • | .092*       | ت<br>ه |
|            | Male |      | 34.   | 5     | 3.8 | 9      |             | 8.10 | 40 | • |             | •      |
| <i>1</i> . |      |      |       |       |     |        |             |      |    |   | •           |        |

<sup>a</sup>The larger the mean, the smaller the size of the jurisdiction represented.

\*P ≤ 0.05

#### Age

With respect to age, it appears that boards drew their trustees primarily from the 40 to 59 year age group. Sixty-one percent of all respondents fell into that age category. It is noteworthy that young people were not very often elected to Alberta school boards; only four percent of the respondents were under 30 years of age.

An age - sex distribution for the respondents was developed (see Table VI). The distribution revealed that with the exception of the 60 to 69 year age group, where there were disproportionately fewer females, the age distribution of both male and female trustees,

was very similar.

## TABLE VI

# Age - Sex Distribution

| Age (years) |          | % of F | emales  | % of Males    | Total 7  |
|-------------|----------|--------|---------|---------------|----------|
| Under 30    |          | 1      | :2      | 2.8           | 4        |
| 30–39       |          | 7      | .9      | 15 <b>.</b> 1 | 23       |
| 40-49       |          |        | .1      | 26.9          | 34.      |
| 50-59       | <b>0</b> | 3      | •6<br>7 | 24.4<br>10.3  | 28<br>11 |
| 60-69<br>   |          |        |         | 79.5          | 100      |

## SOCIO-ECONOMIC STATUS

Among the more common indicators of socio-economic status are education, occupation and income level. This section provides detailed information relative to these three variables.

### Education

It is noteworthy that approximately one out of four trustees had not completed secondary school, and approximately 46 percent of the respondents had not pursued a postsecondary education. One fourth of the respondents had completed a university degree or higher and the remaining 27 percent had attended college or technical school. A detailed breakdown is provided in Table VII.

An Snalysis of formal educational level relative to sisdiction size and location was undertaken. To facilitate the analysis the ten educational categories were collapsed into three groups: (1) trustees who had not gone beyond high school; (2) trustees who had attended technical school, college, or some university; and (3) those who had earned a university degree or higher. The F-test was applied and the results indicated that the larger the jurisdication, the higher the formal educational level of trustees. The results are reported in Table VIII.

L

125

## TABLE VII

## Formal Education of Trustees

| Level of Education                                     | Relative | Frequency        | (%    |
|--|----------|------------------|-------|
| Did not complete secondary school                      |          | 22               |       |
| Graduate from secondary school                         |          | 25 🦻             |       |
| Graduated from technical school                        |          | 6                |       |
| Some college or university (did not<br>obtain diplome) |          | 14               |       |
| Graduated from college                                 |          | 7                |       |
| Graduated from university (degree)                     |          | ·16 <sup>-</sup> |       |
| Attained Master's Degree                               |          | 4                | <br>• |
| Attained Professional degree<br>(M.D. D.D.S.)          |          | 5                |       |
| Attained Doctoral Degree                               |          | 1                |       |
| Total  |          | 100              |       |
|  |          |                  |       |

49

ŧ,

## TABLE VIII

## Relationship Between Jurisdiction Size and Level of Formal Education

| Level of Education                                 | Mean F-Value Prob. |
|--|--------------------|
| 1. High school or lower                            | 4.12               |
| 2. Technical school, college<br>or some university | 3.81 29.41 0.000*  |
| 3. University degree or higher                     | 3.20               |

# Occupation

< 0.05

As anticipated, given the large number of rural boards, the most common occupation of Alberta trustees was farming. Twenty-nine percent of all respondents were farm owners or farm managers. The second largest occupational group represented were business owners or managers (20%) with homemakers a close third (17%). The largest professional group were teaching professionals who represented 7 percent of the total number of trustees in the province.

A categorization of occupations based upon professional or non-professional status revealed that 79 percent of trustees were nonprofessionals and 21 percent were professionals. Table IX provides a detailed description of trustee occupations in order of decreasing frequency in each of the major categories.

An analysis of the differences between trustee occupations (in terms of professional or non-professional status), relative to ... jurisdiction size was undertaken. Application of the t-test revealed

| • | TABLE | IX |
|---|-------|----|
|   |       |    |

| -        | A            | C      |
|----------|--------------|--------|
| Trustees | Occupational | Scacus |

| Non-professional Fr                                     | equency (%) | Professional                            | Frequency (%) |
|---|-------------|---|---------------|
| Farm owner or<br>manager                                | 29          | Teaching Profes-<br>sional              | 7             |
| Homemaker   | 17          | Health Profes-<br>sional                | 6             |
| Small or medium<br>sized business<br>owners or managers | 15          | Government official<br>or administrator | 4             |
| Manager, Owner,<br>Executive of a large                 |             | Lawyer, judge, notary                   | 1             |
| business  | 5           | Clergy or religious<br>order            | 1             |
| Sales (insurance,<br>real estate, etc.)                 | 4           | Physical Science<br>professional        | <b>1</b>      |
| Clerical  | 2           | Social Sciences                         | æ             |
| Skilled craftsmen                                       | 2           | professional                            | 1             |
| Paraprofessional  | 1           |   |               |
| Protective Services                                     | 1           |   |               |
| Other   | 3           |   |               |
| Total Non-professional                                  | s 79        | Total Professionals                     | 21            |

that a significantly larger proportion of trustees were professionals in the larger jurisdictions (Table X).

This finding was consistent with the fact that a large number of trustees were farmers. Similarly, since a greater number of professional people are usually found in larger urban centres, as opposed to small towns or farm areas, it seemed logical that a Parger number

51`

#### TABLE X

Occupational Status Relative to Jurisdiction Size

|                                       |                   |                | · · · · ·  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| Group                                 | Mean <sup>a</sup> | <b>T-value</b> | df         | 2-Tail Prob.                          |
| Non-professional                      | 3.94              | 5.98           | 482        | 0.000*                                |
| Professional                          | 3.21              |                | <b>`</b> . |                                       |
| • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | ·                 |                |            |                                       |

<sup>a</sup>The larger the mean, the smaller the jurisdiction size. \*P  $\leq 0.05$ 

of professional people would serve on school boards in these centres.

<u>Income</u>: Trustees were asked to estimate their total family net incomesfrom all sources before taxes. Eighty-two percent or the trustees recorded family incomes in excess of \$15,000 annually; 62 percent had incomes in excess of \$20,000 annually; and a significant number (32%) indicated family incomes in excess of \$30,000 yearly. These findings, which were presented in detail in Table XI suggest that the income level of Alberta trustees is significantly above the norm for the province.

#### POLITICAL PREFERENCES

Trustees were asked to provide an indication of their political ideology or leaning as well as their provincial political party preferences. The results are reported in Table XII. The majority of trustees viewed themselves as moderates (53%); 28 percent identified their major political leaning as conservative, and the remaining 19

# TABLE XI

53

Income of Trustees

| Leve1                   |  | •              | Frequency | (%)    |
|-------------------------|--|----------------|-----------|--------|
| 1. less than \$10,000   | 3  |                | - 5       |        |
| 2. \$10,000 to \$14,999 |  |                | 13        |        |
| 3. \$15,000 to \$19,999 | en e |                | 20        | .•     |
| 4. \$20,000 to \$29,999 | <b>A</b> ,                               |                | 30        | •      |
| 5. \$30,000 to \$49,999 |  | un 1           | 23        |        |
| 6. \$50,000 to \$74,999 |  | •              | 5         | •<br>• |
| 7. \$75,000 to \$99,999 |  | and the second | 2         |        |
| 8. \$100,000 or more    | •  | ** • • •       | 2         | • '    |
| Total                   |  |                | 100       | :      |
|                         |  |                |           |        |

TABLE XII

•

.

Political Preferences of Trustees

| Variable                              | Category                    | Frequency (%)<br>(percentages are rounded |    |  |  |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|----|--|--|
| Political Ideology                    | Moderate                    |   | 53 |  |  |
|                                       | Conservative                | ¥ . 5.                                    | 28 |  |  |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Liberal                     |   | 19 |  |  |
| Party Preference                      | Progressive<br>Conservative |   | 55 |  |  |
| <i>ب</i> ر ج                          | Social Credit ·             | •   | 18 |  |  |
|                                       | Liberal                     |   | 14 |  |  |
|                                       | NDP                         |   | 10 |  |  |
|                                       | Other                       |   | 3  |  |  |

percent generally viewed themselves as liberals. In terms of provincial party preferences the majority of trustees (55%) supported the Progressive Conservatives, with the remaining trustees variously supporting the Liberal, New Democratic, and Social Credit parties.

An analysis of the differences between political ideology and jurisdiction size was undertaken (Table XIII). The f-test revealed significant differences between ideological groups and jurisdiction size (F Prob. = 0.0003). A Scheffe Procedure was utilized to determine the exact nature of the differences. As indicated in Table XIV, the larger the jurisdiction the greater the number of trustees that perceived themselves as Liberals. There were, however, no significant differences between the number of Conservatives and Moderates relative to the size of the jurisdiction represented.

## TABLE XIII

| Group        | • | Mean | F-value | df  | 2-Tail Prob. |
|--------------|---|------|---------|-----|--------------|
| Conservative | , | 3.87 | 8,421   | 480 | 0.0003*      |
| Moderate     |   | 3.88 |         |     |              |

Variations in Political Ideology Relative to Jurisdiction Size

The larger the mean, the smaller the jurisdiction size.

\*P ≤ 0.05

55

## TABLE XIV

Scheffe Procedure - Political Ideology

| Subset |        | 99999 |    | Groups         | $\cdot$         | Group Mean <sup>a</sup> |
|--------|--------|-------|----|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| #1     | د.<br> |       | #3 | (Liberals)     | •               | 3.33                    |
| #2     | s      | ·     | #1 | (Conservative) | - <b>-</b> - 1) | 3.87                    |
|        |        |       | #2 | (Moderate)     |                 | 3.88                    |

<sup>a</sup>The larger the mean, the smaller the jurisdiction size.

 $P \leq 0.10$ 

With regard to provincial political party preferences relative to jurisdiction size, a significant F ratio (0.0013) was also observed (Table XV). The Scheffe procedure identified significant differences between the distribution of Liberal and Social Credit Party supporters with respect to jurisdiction size. It was noted that trustees in smaller communities and rural areas disproportionately supported the Social Credit Party as compared to the Liberal Party. (See Table XVI) These findings were consistent with the findings relative to political ideology and were generally indicative of more traditional and conservative attitudes in rural areas as opposed to larger urban centres.

## Experience

Trustee experience was surveyed in terms of three variables: (1) years of experience with the present board; (2) the number of other school boards on which the trustees had served; and (3) the number of boards other than school boards on which the trustee had served in the past five years. The results are summarized in Table XVII.

## TABLE XV

56

# Variations in Provincial Party Preferences Relative to Jurisdiction Size

|                             | М  | ean , F    | -value | df. | 2-Tail Prob.                      |
|-----------------------------|----|------------|--------|-----|-----------------------------------|
| Liberal                     | 3. | .42        |        |     |                                   |
| Progressive<br>Conservative | 3. | .81        | 4.558  | 469 | <b>A</b> <sup>2</sup> <b>A3 A</b> |
| Social Credit               |    | .55 .      | 4.J30  | 407 | 0.0013*                           |
| New Democrati<br>Other      |    | .55<br>.32 |        |     | <b>9</b>                          |

<sup>a</sup>The larger the mean, the smaller the jurisdiction.

\*P ≤ 0.05

## TABLE XVI

Scheffe Procedure - Provincial Party Preferences

| Subset    | Groups                        | Group Mean <sup>a</sup> |
|-----------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <b>#1</b> | #2 (Liber#1)                  | 3.42                    |
|           | <b>₽</b> 5 (Other)            | 3.52                    |
|           | .#3 (NDP)                     | 3.55                    |
| 20<br>20  | #1 (Progressive Conservative) | 3.81                    |
| <b>#2</b> | #5 (Other)                    | 3.52                    |
|           | #3 (NDP)                      | 3.55                    |
|           | #1 (Progressive Conservative) | 3.81                    |
|           | #4 (Social Credit)            | 4.13                    |

<sup>a</sup>The larger the mean, the smaller the jurisdiction.

**P**. ≤ 0.10

### - TABLE XVII

¥ E

Ē

57

-

Trustee Experience 

|   | Category            | Frequency  |
|---|---------------------|--|
|   | <u>No. of Years</u> | Frequency (%)  |
| 1. Years of service with present                                    | less than 1         | 37   |
| school board.   | 1-3                 | 19   |
|   | 4-7                 | 18   |
|   | · 8–11              | 13   |
|   | 12 or more          | 13   |
|   |                     | 100  |
|   | No. of Boards       | Frequency (7)  |
| 2. Number of other school boards                                    | 0                   | 90   |
| exclusive of the present board,<br>on which the trustee has served. | 1<br>2              | 10 .   |
|   |                     | 100  |
|   | No. of Boards       | Frequency (Z)  |
| 3. Number of boards other than                                      | 1 or less           | 1  |
| school boards on which the<br>trustee has served in the past        | 2                   | 14 🛹   |
| 5 years.  | 3                   | 21   |
|   | 4                   | s 23   |
|   | 5                   |  |
| 그는 그는 것 같은 것 같                        | 6 or more           | 20_  |
|   |                     | وسيت المستخدم والمستحد والمستحد والمستحد المستحد المستحد المستحد المستحد المستحد المستحد والمستحد والمس |

It is interesting to note that a substantial number of the

••• trustees were newly elected. Thirty-seven percent of all respondents had served less than one year, with the remaining trustees having served anywhere from one to in excess of twelve years.

The vast majority (90%) of the respondents had experience w with only their present school board. However, trustees as a group were very actively involved in community affairs. In the past five years 75 percent of the respondents served, or were continuing to serve, as members of three or more community boards in addition to the school board.

Trustee Characteristics Relative to Experience. To determine whether significant differences existed relative to the charactéristics of newly elected as opposed to experienced trustees, the chi square test was employed. The variables analyzed included sex, age, political ideology, provincial political party preferences, formal education, and occupational status. The results are presented in Table XVIII.

#### TABLE XVLII

| V <b>đ</b> riable 🗸          | <b>6</b><br>8 | Chi Square | df -            | Significance |
|------------------------------|---------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Sex                          |               | 1.423      | .1              | 0.233        |
| Age                          |               | 99.7       | 4-              | 0,000*       |
| Political Ideo               | logy          | 2.284      | 2               | 0.319        |
| Provincial Par<br>Preference | <b>C7</b>     | 10.792     |                 | 0.029*       |
| Formal Educati               | on            | 8.055      | . <i>j</i><br>2 | 0.018*       |
| Occupation                   |               | . 0.631 .  | . <b>1</b>      | -0.427       |

# Differences Between Recently Elected

 $P \leq 0.03$ 

Ð
The results indicated that significant differences relative to age, provincial party preference, and level of formal education eristed. The crosstables were inspected to determine the nature of these differences. Among the conclusions and generalizations implicit. in the data were the following:

1. Newly elected trustees were significantly younger than their experienced counterparts. Ten percent of the newly elected trustees were under 30 as compared to 1 percent for the experienced trustees; 41 percent of the newly elected trustees were under 39 as compared to 32 percent for their experienced counterparts; and only 17 percent of the newly elected trustees were over 49 years old as compared with 52 percent forgexperienced trustees.

2. Proportionately there were twice as many newly elected trustees that identified their provincial political party preference as NDP. Conversely, experienced trustees proportionally favored the Social Credit Party twice as often as did newly elected members. Both groups were equally supportive of the Progressive Conservative and the Liberal Parties.

3. Newly elected trustees tended to be significantly better educated, than their experienced counterparts. Only 37 percent of the recently elected trustees were in the high school or less category as compared to 50 percent for the experienced group; and 33 percent of the newly elected trustees had a university degree or higher compared with 22 percent for the experienced group.

On the basis of these findings it would appear that school boards in the last election attracted a larger number of young, well educated people. Similarly the data are suggestive of a shift in

i9

political party preferences from the Social Credit to the NDP, at least where newly elected school trustees were concerned.

ŧĽ)

Part of the explanation for the demonstrated increase in interest of young and well educated people in school board affairs may be may be found in the recent legislative changes relative to trustee selection. In 1976, the Alberts government modified the election procedures by making all board positions three year terms, and holding them at the same time as the municipal elections. It was felt that these changes would increase public interest in school board elections, as well as attract a higher calibre of candidate, thus partially solving the problems of public apathy and lack of representativeness that the Decision Making Information Canada Limited Study (1974) identified as being major problems relative to Alberta school

Whether these data are indeed indicative of a trend in the directions identified above is still speculative. Follow-up research over a period of several years would be necessary before firm conclusions could be reached. However, these data do suggest that, significant differences do exist between selected characteristics of newly elected and experienced trustees relative to the 1977 elections.

## Trustees' Reading Habits

A committee consisting of superintendents, secretarytreasurers, and ASTA members was asked to provide a list of books and periodicals that they deemed as relevant reading for trustees. The most common choices were used in the questionnaire to provide an

indicator of trustees' reading habits. Trustees were asked to indicate their familiarity with the books and periodicals listed by responding on a 5 category response scale ranging from (1) have read completely to (5) have never heard of it. A summary of the responses appears in Table XIX.

The data presented in Table XIX indicated that trustees were somewhat familiar with the majority of the books and periodicals identified as relevant to their administrative roles. Of the five books listed, at least one out of three trustees had some familiarity with four of them; and of the five periodicals, at least 60 percent of the trustees had some familiarity with two of them. It should also be noted that since 37 percent of the trustees were recently elected, their familiarity with the materials listed would understandably be more limited.

#### SUMMARY

Some general observations and conclusions relative to school trustees in the province of Alberta are implicit in the data presented in this study. Specifically these are:

1. Alberta school trustees are predominantly males in the 40 to 59 age groups. (Seventy-one percent of the respondents were males and sixty-one percent were between the ages of 40 and 59 years.)

2. In terms of socio-economic status, trustees are typically nonprofessional people, with limited formal education, and significantly higher than average family incomes. The largest occupational group represented on school boards were farmers (29%), with business

## TA TABLE XIX

62 U.

1

i.

Merters nuirs p

# Trustee Familiarity with Books and Feriodicals

6 

44.5 

| Variable  | Frequencies (2)                          |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| Booles  | Some Familiarity* No Familiarity         |  |  |
| 1. Local School Board Policy<br>Handbook  |  |  |  |
| 2. Downey, <u>The School</u><br><u>Superintendency In Alberta</u>                           | 43 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |  |  |
| 3. Alberta Education, <u>The</u><br><u>Minister's Committee On</u><br><u>School Finance</u> | 38 3 56                                  |  |  |
| 4. Worth, W. <u>A Choice of</u><br><u>Futures</u>   | 32 - 60                                  |  |  |
| 5. Porter, <u>Towards 2000</u>  | · 3                                      |  |  |
| Periodicals   | Some Familiarity* No Familiarit          |  |  |
| /1. "The Alberta School Trustee"  | ·  |  |  |
| 2. "The ATA Magazine"   | 60 /· 28                                 |  |  |
| 3. "Alberta Journal of<br>Educational Research  | n  |  |  |
| 4. "Phi Delta Kappan", 🕈  | 8  |  |  |
| 5, "The Canadian Administrator"   | .5                                       |  |  |

\* Includes trustees who have read completely or read portions of it. \*\* Includes trustees who have never weard of, or seen the book or periodical.

men second with 20 percent, and homemakers a close third with 17 percent. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents were employed in a nonprofessional field. The mean family income of all trustees surveyed was \$28,280.

3. Politically, the majority of Alberta trustees (53%) view themselves as moderates. In terms of provincial party preferences, the Progressive Conservative Party was the most popular.

4. While the majority of trustees have limited experience // with school board administration (37% were recently elected and 56% had served less than three years), they were extremely active in community affairs. Many trustees (over 75%) had served on three or more community boards in addition to the school board in the past five years.

5. Recently elected trustees appear to be significantly different from more experienced trustees in that they have higher levels of formal education, are younger, and appear to be more supportive of the New Democratic Party at the expense of the Social Credit Party.

6. Size of jurisdiction is positively related to the number of female trustees on school boards, the educational level of board members, the number of professional people on boards, and the number of trustees that perceive themselves as liberals.

7. No significant relationships between geographic region and trustee profiles were noted. The only exception to this was a vislight trend in Southern Alberta to have fewer female trustees as compared with Northern and Central Alberta.

#### HAPTER V

ROLE AND FUNCTION OF ALBERTA SCHOOL TRUSTEES

The role and function of school trustees in the province of Alberta is in a state of flux. Recent trends toward increasing provincial control of education concurrent with growing demands for community involvement and participatory management, have forced school trustees to operate within an increasingly political milieu with growing pressures and demands for a re-definition of their roles. As a result, the questions, "What do trustees actually do, and what should they be doing?" have taken on a new significance.

This portion of the study provides partial answers to these questions. Trustee perceptions of their actual functions as well as their views on who should exercise major authority in selected educational decision areas, are surveyed and reported. In addition, an analysis of differences between actual and preferred function is undertaken.

#### TRUSTEE ACTIVITIES

To determine the frequency of trustee involvement in a number of board related activities, a five category response scale was employed. Trustees were asked to indicate the frequency of their involvement as follows: (5) monthly or more often, (4) quarterly, (3) semi-annually, (2) once annually, and (1) never. The responses were totalled and the means calculated to provide a composite of trustee activities.

It should be noted that, as a result of the limited time spent in office, many of the newly elected trustees indicated that they could not realistically respond to questions related to actual trustee function; and those that did respond, tended to indicate extremely limited involvement. As a result, it was necessary to analyze the sections on actual trustee functions primarily on the basis of the responses provided by trustees with one year of experience or more. Table XX presents a summary of the mean responses of both newly elected and more experienced trustees in order of decreasing frequency.

Inspection of the table reveals that trustees generally attended committee meetings on a monthly basis; had personal conferences with the superintendent four times annually; participated in orientation and inservice, made political contacts, met with school teacher personnel, and attended ad hoc meetings of parent groups on a semiannual basis; and prepared the board agenda, attended administrators' association meetings, attended school staff meetings, met with local and provincial governmental authorities, and made speeches on behalf of the board once annually.

In addition to the activities identified in Table XX, school trustees attended a large number of board meetings. Over 90 percent. of the respondents indicated that their boards met in excess of twelve times annually, and over half indicated that their boards met more than nineteen times yearly. These meetings appear to be extremely well attended; 64 percent of the respondents indicated that they had never missed a meeting; and 99 percent indicated that they were in attendance at over three-fourths of all the meetings held.

## TABLE XX

## Trustee Activities

÷.

e

y.

|   | Mean I      | lesponse      |
|---|-------------|---------------|
| Activity  | Experienced | Newly Elected |
| 1. Attending committee meetings.  | 4.46        | 4.53          |
| 2. Personal conferences with the superintendent.                              | 3.70        | 3.28*         |
| 3. Attending ad hoc meetings of<br>parent groups and advisory'<br>committees. | 2.98        | 3.16          |
| 4. Personal conferences with school teachers. •                               | 2.96        | _ 3.43*       |
| 5. Attending professional conferences.  | 2.71        | 2.48*         |
| 6. Making contacts with politicians.  | 2.65        | 2.49          |
| 7. Participating in orientation and inservice.                                | 2.58        | 2.64          |
| 8. Meeting with governmental department officers.                             | • 2.50`     | 1.98*         |
| 9. Making speeches on behalf of the board.                                    | 2:46        | 1.88*         |
| 10. Meeting with local authorities<br>(town council, etc.)                    | 2.38        | 2.22,         |
| 11. Attending school staff meetings.  | 2.22        | 2.42          |
| 12. Preparing the board agenda.   | 2.14        | 1.57*         |
| 13. Attending administrators'<br>association meetings.                        | 2.11        | 1.76*         |
| 말했다. 김 승규는 것은 것은 것이 같아요. 것이 나라요.  | a           | <b>O</b> 100  |

\*Indicates a significant t-value at P ≤ .05 or less. 

÷

1

•

66

.

## TRUSTEE INVOLVEMENT IN DECISION MAKING

67

Clarification of trubtee involvement in decision making, relative to 23 topic areas commonly considered by school boards, was also sought. Respondents were asked to categorize their decision making functions in terms of (1) Decided, (2) Reviewed and Advised, (3) Approved or Confirmed, and (4) No Involvement. The responses were summed up and the means calculated to provide a ranking of topics in order of decreasing trustee involvement in the decision making process. The results are presented in Table XXI. A mean score of 1.50 or less indicates direct trustee involvement in the decision area; a mean score of between 1.51 and 2.50 indicates a review and advisory function; and a score between 2.51 and 3.50 indicates pro forma involvement.

The data suggests that trustees generally saw themselves as directly involved in the decision-making process relative to administrative appointments, setting non-teaching staff wage scales, and budget development and allocation. With regard to items 5 through 19 inclusive, boards viewed themselves as having a review and advisory function. Board involvement relative to architectural drawings, designing library services, course changes, evaluating instructional methods, and student invited speakers was generally regarded as proforma -- that is, they approved or confirmed a decision that could not be changed substantially at that point in time.

To summarize, these findings suggest a significant degree of trustee involvement in the area of financial management. Direct involvement in budget development, budget allocation, and setting non-teaching staff wage scales, combined with review and advisory responsibilities

## TABLE XXI

.

Trustee Involvement in Decision-making

| •               | Decision Area                  | Me   | an Respons    |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|--|---------------|
| 1.              | Administrative appointments    | میں<br>ب   | 1.43          |
| 2.              | Non-teaching staff wage scales | <i>4</i>   | 1,43          |
| •               |                                |  | 1.46          |
| 3.              | Budget allocation              |  | •             |
| . 4.            |                                |  | 1.49          |
| 5.              | Tuition and fees               |  | 1.76          |
| 6.              | Decision-making structures     | and the second | <b>1.78</b> 9 |
| <sup>;</sup> 7. | Sabbatical policies            |  | 1.82          |
| 8.              | Teacher salary agreement       |  | 1.87          |
| 9.              | Student disciplinary action    | •  | 1,89          |
| 10.             | Institutional goals            |  | 1.90          |
| 11.             | Student conduct regulations    |  | 1.99          |
| 12.             | Selection of an architect      | τ  | 2.07          |
| 13.             | Building site selection        |  | 2.10          |
| 14.             | Governmental contracts         |  | 2.19          |
| 15.             | Admissions policies            |  | 2.23          |
| 16.             | Teacher conduct disputes       |  | 2.28          |
| 17.             | Program review and development |  | 2.33          |
| 18.             | Faculty appointments           |  | 2.34          |
| 19.             | Architectural distance         | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •  | 2.37          |
| 20.             | Library services               | 4.<br>   | 2.58          |
| 21.             | Specific course changes        |  | 2.62          |
| 22.             | Instructional methods          |  | ° 3.01        |
| 23.             | Student invited speakers       |  | 3.46          |

with regard to septing tuition and fees and stermining teacher selary agreements, are strong indicators that one of trustees' primary decision-making functions relate to economic affairs.

In addition to fiscal management, trustees perceived themselves as actively involved in making administrative appointments and establishing decision-making structures for their respective school districts. Conversely, trustees had more limited involvement in instruction related issues such as designing library services, evaluating instructional methods, and instituting specific course changes.

## PREFERRED AUTHORITY STRUCTURE

Hodgson (1976:370) in a critical evaluation of the administra-

Every piece of school legislation in this country testifies to the board the overwhelming powers of the Minister and his Department of Education. The same legislation spells out the little authority accorded to school boards.

He goes on to state that in spite of the increasing erosion of the authority of local school boards, trustees have seemed "unwilling to organize counteractions" (p. 371). Is this lack of action indicative of trustee satisfaction with the status quo relative to locus of authority? What changes, if any, would trustees like to see in their involvement in the decision-making process?

Part of the answer to these questions is found in the data presented in Tables XXII and XXIII. Trustees were asked to indicate their opinions concerning which group or groups should exercise major decision-making authority relative to 23 topic areas commonly considered

|    | 1.1  |          |               |     |
|----|------|----------|---------------|-----|
| Se | 5.1  | TAP      | <br>          |     |
|    |      | - TF & H | <br>- X · E • | 1 L |
|    |      | . 1.51   |               |     |
|    | 2.12 |          | <br>          |     |

|  |                                     | Frequenc                 | y (7);                |                                   |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Who should exercise major<br>authority in the Following<br>decision making areas?<br>Decision Area | Administration<br>and/or Board only | Faculty .<br>Involvement | Student<br>Involement | Dept. of Education<br>Involvement |
| 1. Wage scales for non-teaching personnel  | 99                                  |                          |                       |                                   |
| 2. Naking teacher appointments   | 93                                  | 7                        | -                     |                                   |
| 3. Administrative Appointments   | 92                                  | 3                        |                       | 5.                                |
| 4. Atlocating finances within the district   | 89. 🕈                               | 5                        | 2                     | <b>4</b>                          |
| *5. Determining tuition and fees   | 89                                  | 4                        | 1                     | 6                                 |
| 6. Establishing school district<br>budget  | • 89                                | 7                        |                       | 4                                 |
| 7. Developing contacts with<br>sovernment offices  | . 88                                | . 1                      | 1                     | 10                                |
| 8. Selecting an architect  | 88                                  | 1                        | 1                     | 10                                |
| 9. Acquiring new sites and property.   | 87                                  | 3                        | 1                     | 10                                |
| 10. Establishing school district<br>administrative structure                                       | 84                                  | . 6                      | 1                     | <b>10</b>                         |
| 11. Appointing the district  | -83                                 | 4                        | 2                     | 11                                |
| 12. Policies regarding faculty<br>asbaticals   | 82                                  | 17                       |                       | 3 •                               |
| 13. Desiding the future of a teacher   |                                     | 9.                       | 1                     | 12                                |

## TABLE XXII (Cont.)

17 21<sub>61</sub> 1

٩.

3

ł

en à 1912

. . .

**ð**.

1.1

71

a. ( j

## 7 Preferred Locus of Authority

|  | •••                             |                                      | Frequenc               | <b>,(3</b> ) (-        |                                   |         |
|--|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|
| Who should exercise m<br>authority in the follo<br>decision making areas |                                 | Administration<br>and/or Boards only | Faculty<br>Involvement | B¢udent<br>Tayolyement | Dept. of Education<br>Involvement |         |
| Decision And<br>16. Adding or deleting                                   | 8 <b></b>                       | . 52                                 | 34                     | 10                     |                                   |         |
| 17. Adding or deleting   |                                 | <b>*</b><br>47                       | 39                     | °<br>9                 | .6                                |         |
| 18. Eveluating instru  |                                 |                                      | 39                     | 10                     | 6<br>13                           |         |
| 19. Determining insti<br>20. Designing library                           | ويجدد والمراجع المراجع والمراجع | 42,                                  | 27<br>44               | 18<br>• 10             | 3-,                               |         |
| 21. Establishing rule<br>student conduct                                 |                                 | 35                                   | <b>N</b><br>34         | 31:                    |                                   |         |
| 22. Taking discipling<br>against a student<br>on an examination          | : for cheating                  | 31                                   | 68                     | 9                      |                                   |         |
| 23. Selecting speaker<br>sponsored activit                               | rs for student                  | , 15                                 | • 20                   | <b>6</b> 5             | <b>.</b>                          |         |
|  |                                 | · .                                  |                        |                        | •                                 | 「たち」の住宅 |
|  |                                 |                                      |                        | • <b>•</b> • <b>4</b>  |                                   |         |
|  |                                 |                                      |                        |                        |                                   |         |

by boards. (Apart from minor differences relative to wording and order of presentation, the topic areas were identical to those presented earlier in Table II.

The data are highly indicative of trustee support for a hierarchical authority structure with major power residing with the board and/or administration. On 12 of the 23 items over 80 percent of the trustees advocated that major decision-making authority should reside the board or administration; and on 16 of the 23 items over half of the trustees advocated similar board and administrative control.

Trustees did not support a high level of staff involvement in the decision-making process. Of the 23 items, trustees felt that staff should be involved significantly in decision-making on only two; these being taking disciplinary action against a student accused of cheating on an exam, and designing library services. Only 39 percent of trustees felt that the staff should have some input into adding or deleting specific courses and evaluating instructional methods. Similarly, only 34 percent of trustees favored faculty involvement in establishing rules concerning student conduct and adding or deleting a specific program.

Trustees were even less willing to allow student involvement in decision-making. Apart from selecting guest speakers for student sponsored activities, the overwhelming majority of trustees favored little of so shudent involvement. Ninety percent of the trustees surveyed did not favour major student involvement in decision-making on 21 of the do items.

Similarly, respondents generally preferred to see the

interment of Alucat firms

ting the no role in decision week

relative to education. Fewer than 40 percent of the trustees favourer, major Department involvement in decision-making on 20 of the 23 items; and more than 80 percent of the trustees were opposed to Departmental involvement in all 23 of the decision-making areas.

These findings strongly suggest that trustees were concerned with acquiring and maintaining board and administrative power. They generally did not endorse the concept of participatory management for either staff or students. Conversely, they felt that the board and administration mould have major authority on issues related to finances, personnel, physical plant, curriculum and instruction, and external contacts.

To provide another perspective on the issue of locus of authority, a rank order correlation between perceived decision-making functions and preferred locus of authority was derived. The results are presented in Table XXII. The ranking of perceived functions was obtained by a rank order of the mean responses of trustees as reported in Table XXI; the ordering of decisions relative to preferred locus of authority was obtained by ranking of trustee responses that favored board involvement. A minus difference indicates that trustees would prefer less involvement than they presently have. A positive difference indicates that trustees prefer greater board involvement in the decision area.

The correlation indicates that trustees would prefer to spend Lags thus dealing with student disciplinary sation, satting institutional goats, student conduct regulations and siministrative appointments then these productly do. Copyenedy, thereased prefer to be some

No.

|   |                             |   | 1                                     |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|
| Trustas Decisión I  |                             | Forder of Mee                             |                                       |
|   |                             |   |                                       |
| Decision Area   | Pracedynd                   | Prefarred                                 | ° Difference                          |
| 1. Non-teaching staff vage  |                             | ······································    | - / 0                                 |
| 2. Addinistrative appointment   | <b>*:</b> 2 <sup>10-1</sup> | <b>8</b>                                  | <b>~0</b>                             |
| 3. Budget allocation  | 1.2.                        | · · · · · 2.                              |                                       |
| 4. Budget development   |                             | 3   |                                       |
| 5. Tuition and fees   |                             | 6   | 1                                     |
| 6. Decision making structures   |                             | • ? ?                                     | <b>+3</b>                             |
| <ul> <li>7. Sabbatical policies/</li> <li>8. Student disciplinary action</li> </ul> |                             |   | , v.<br>⇒13. o                        |
| 9. Institutional goals  |                             | ت<br>16                                   | ***                                   |
| 10. Student conduct regulations   |                             | 18  |                                       |
| 11. Selection of an architect   | •, <b>n</b>                 | 5)  | 1                                     |
| 12. Building site selection   | <b>12</b>                   | •   |                                       |
| 13. Governmental contacts   | <b>B</b> .                  | <b>12</b>                                 | * • <b>*</b>                          |
| 14. Admissions policies   | 14                          | .14                                       | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 15. Teacher conduct disputes  | • <b>₽</b><br>(_)           | . <b></b>                                 | 5.                                    |
| development .   | 16                          | \$  | <b>P</b> 1                            |
| 17. Figulty appointments  | ŢŢ,                         | 6 <b>4</b> 13                             | 4                                     |
| 18. Architectural drawings  |                             | 41.<br>                                   |                                       |
| 20. Specific outre Danses   |                             | 44 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 |                                       |
|   |                             | A. 2.                                     |                                       |

an the second second

Sector Warn word involved in selection of buildinger and an another selection description of the architectural descines, teachermoneyer disposes and family appendix pents. The respondence appeared to the schargelin agriculture the

determining sampation! policies, demonstration and determined A ROADE AND A DAMAGE AND A "devernining cuition and feats metric government for any second and Traview and development and deal point Througe sarviess. The Prostnan Rank Order correlation costincies of 0.718, however, suggests that

trustees were exceptied, with the destroy and damage in decision-making.

STIMMARY " Public school trustees in Alberta have traditionally played a

significant part in the siministration of selection is this province-However, recent evenie toward increases provingial control of the statut concurrent, wath growing descents and some set of community asyo years of the School savenience here accounted as the states the states

The second s

entrat of chains investvement in setting territoriation appearing states.

pairs full his to a st

required and suction of the second se THE MERIAYES ARAMANY THE VEL tion.

> WINT AUTOR AND AND AND AUTOR DECEMBER DECEMBER

as well as administrative structure and Eppointments. They say themselves as freest involved with Restruction related incluse such as designing library service and insuluting specific couple changes.

a scrong preference for an bleffichton structure with sejor decision-

did not favor having the separtment of Education play a significant role in any of the 23 metision areas. Similarly, trustess did not endorse the philosophy of participatory management relative to either favority , or condents.

comparison of actual and preferred lotus of authority we a also undertaken. The data revealed that actual trustee involvement in decision-making and preferred involvement was positively correlated (rhe 0.713), suggesting that trustees were generally satisfied with their priorities and functions.

In conclusion, it should be noted, that the data presented in this chapter desit only with the frequency of trustees' involvement and crustees' perceptions of the nature of their specific involvement. No measure of the guality of the involvement, or the accuracy of trustees' perceptions relative to the involvement, or the accuracy of trustees' perceptions relative to the nature of their involvement; was available. The second solution provides some empirical measurement of these whiles mould allowing the detailed analysis of trustee functions.

and mer will be sport purpling in facure and les.

## CHAPTER VI

#### TRUSTEE ATTITUDES ON SELECTED ISSUES.

The attitudes and predispositions that individuals bring into desision making situations will invariably days a profound influence of the nature and quality days decisions wide. It follows there there a investigation into the attitudes and opinions held by school trustees.

should provide some interenting insights into the administration of education in the province; and, it is toward this end that the magnet focus of this chapter is directed.

The data presented are both descriptive and comparative in nature. Survey data relative to trustee attitudes on: (1) selection and composition of school boards, (2) prefetted characteristics for prospective trustees, (3) selection of a superintendent, and (4) a variefy of educational issues related to student affairs, faculty affairs, and general educational philosophy, are presented in addition, the general educational philosophy, are presented in addition, and appendent of trustees, and their attitudes on selection of a superintendent, student affairs, faculty affairs; and educational philosophy,

UBURLIT

ROANT CORPOSITION

Asheet and the short the

"" / Establishing the most equitable and educationally defansible

method of truspes selecteds at governing boards, continues to be an indiana conternance of the selected selected at the selected selected selected at the selected selected at the selected selected selected selected at the selected provide some insight into how public school trustees viewed these arrangements an investigation into trospense preferences with reveal to their selection was undertakened. Trustess were said to express their opinions regarding board and composition on a five category response agels tanging from (1) Strongly Agree, to (5) Strongly Disagree 

a tanking of striguidual variables for of decreasing trustee STATISTICS STATISTICS agreement. The results are proget Analys of the data revealed generator of interesting findings. Board members were very sdament in the in belief that frustees should be locally elected. Over 98 percention il respondents agreed or strongly 6 agrand with this postrion? and one whit of three trustees wrote additioner comments at rongly emphasizing the importance of local dections and local autonomy.

Gorrespondingly, strong negative views regarding any increase in provincial control of education were reflected in the survey questions and waitten commenter fighty-nine percent of all respondents found the concept of provincially cominated beard member exprasore prable; 82 percent were not in favor of heving forel nominating committees aubmit nominations for provincial appointment; and 98 percent were opposed to the concept of governmental appointers for local school boards. With reverse to meets involvement in decision-making at the

calculated fo provide

board levers similar apposition ses encountered. This was evidenced by the fact that 90 percenterent tratees were not prepared moretye a anche auperingentient: 89 percent were unwilling to have a voting and 77 parties ware support to OI Sepresentar -

## TABLE XXIV

## Truster Attitudes on Board Composition

79

|           |  | Z Agraeing  | 2 Disagreeing |
|-----------|--|-------------|---------------|
| <b>1.</b> | Trustees should be locally elected.  | <b>98</b>   | 1             |
| 2,        | High school students should have non-<br>voting representative on the board.                     | 32          | 91            |
| 3.        | Non-academic support staff should be represented.  | 9           | 77            |
| 24.       | Parent advisory committees should be represented   | 9           | 7.8           |
| 5.        | Local committees should submit nomina-<br>tions to the minister for appointment<br>to the board. | ج<br>ح<br>ح | 82            |
| 6.        | The superintendent should be a voting member.  |             | 88            |
| 7.        | Teachers should be represented.  | • 4         | 88            |
| 8.        | Some members should be elected and others appointed.   | 6           | 90            |
| 9.        | A provincial committee should submit<br>nominations to the minister for board<br>appointment.    | ر<br>ع      | 89            |
| 10.       | Board members should be government<br>gappointees.   |             | -<br>98       |

interesting to note that trustees were generally more adamant in their opposition to having a voting teacher representative, than they were to having a voting non-academic support staff representative. (Only 39 percent of the trustees atrongly disagreed with having a non-academic support staff representative, while 62 percent were surongly opposed to having a teacher representative, and 57 percent strongly disagreed with having a voting superintendent.) Consistent with these fundings was trustee disagreement (70%) with the statement that there should be more professional educators on school boards. These statistics are mildly suggestive of a somewhat anti-teacher or anti-formal education bias on the part of Alberta trustees.

Similarly, trustees were not prepared to relinquish any decision making authority to parent advisory groups. Eighty percent of the respondents were not in favor of having parent advisory committee. representatives on the board; and 7 percent of the respondents included comments to the effect that "if advisory committees want representation on the board, they should run a member in the local school board elections."

In summary, trustees appeared to favor the status quo with regard to board composition. They were strongly opposed to provincial appointments and firmly committed to the democratic principle of local elections and local representation. Similarly, they did not endorse the concept of shared decision-making with staff or parent groups at the board level.

These findings were in direct contrast to Konrad's (1975) findings in his study of community college trustees in Alberta. Seventysix percent of the trustees in Konrad's study favored having a voting teacher representative; 51 percent favored having a voting nonacademic support staff representative; and the rest majority of trustees expressed strong satisfaction with the concept of provincially appointed community college trustees. Part of the explanation for these differences probably resides in the fact that the selection practices supported by the community college trustees on the one hand, and the public school trustees on the other, were those which were operational in their respective selections to the board of trustees. In addition, public school trustee selection by local constituencies was facilitated to a great extent by the fact that, unlike community colleges, school jurisdictions have clearly defined boundaries.

## PREFERRED CHARACTERISTICS OF TRUSTEES

A survey of trustee opinions concerning the relative importance of 16 personal characteristics for prospective trustees was conducted. Trustees were asked to rate the characteristics on a five category response scale ranging from (1) highly desirable to (5) highly undesirable. The responses were totalled and the mean responses calculated to provide a rating of the relative importance that trustees ascribed to each characteristic. The results are reported in Table XXV in order of decreasing desirability.

Among the characteristics that trustees rated as very desirable for prospective board members were: interest in education, time to devote to board activities, and understanding of educational issues. Items 4 to 11 inclusive were identified as desirable; and religious affiliation and familiarity with other board members were generally regarded as unimportant. A middle-of-the-road point of view and involvement in party politics were viewed as undesirable

characteristics.

## Trustee Rating of Personal Characteristics

,

TAB

ç.

| غبيب الا |   |              |
|----------|---|--------------|
|          |   | lean Respons |
| 1.       | Interest in education ,                       | 1.24         |
| 2.       | Time to devote to board activities            | 1.45         |
| .3.      | Understanding of educational issues           | 1.55         |
| • 4.     | Vision to move ahead with new ideas           | 1.77         |
| 5.       | Involvement in community affairs              | 1.94         |
| 6.       | Business knowledge                            | 2.00         |
| 7.       | Stature within the community                  | 2.02         |
| 8.       | Stature in chosen vocation                    | 2.30         |
| 9.       | Having own children in school in the district | 2.35         |
| 10.      | Length of time spent in the community         | 2.39         |
| 11.      | Level of formal concession attained.          | 2:45         |
| 12.      | Strong views on most issues                   | 2.64         |
| 13.      | Religious affiliation                         | • 2.67       |
|          | Generally known to other board members        | 2.87 🗲       |
| 15.      | A middle-of-the-road point of view            | 3.29         |
| 16.      | Involvement in party politics                 | 3.47         |

8

82

#### SELECTION OF A SUPERINTENDENT

Since the district superintendent plays such a vital fule in determining the direction that education will take in an area, it has often been suggested that the most important decision that a school board makes is in the selection of a superintendent. Trustees were invited to indicate their feelings regarding the significance of 13 characteristics in the selection of a chief executive officer for their district. Their responses were recorded on a five category scale ranging from (1) absolutely essential to (5) highly undesirable. The mean responses were computed to provide a rating of the 13 characteristics in order of decreasing desirability (Table XXVI).

Successful teaching experience, experience in public school administration, and established leadership ability were viewed by trustees as absolutely essential for a superintendent, Of importance also were leadership in education, an earned M.Ed., business experience, leadership in the community, polished personal style, academic scholarship, and a personal life free from "complications."

Religious affiliation and sex were generally dentified as irrelevant. A comparison of trustee attitudes regarding the importance of these 13 characteristics relative to the formal educational level of the respondents was undertaken. Trustees were grouped into three educational categories and the F-test was applied. The results are summarized in Table XXVII.

Significant différences between groups were identified with 4 of 13 characteristics and trends toward significance were observed

# Rating of Personal Characteristics of a Superintendent

3

..... ÷

.

. •

TABLE XXVI

84

5. **"** 

.

. ''

...

|          | Characteristics   | Mean Response |
|----------|---|---------------|
| 1.       | Successful teaching experience  | 1.54          |
| 2.       | Experience in public school administration                                      | 1.55          |
| 3.       | Established leadership ability  | 1.59          |
| <b>4</b> | Evidence of past leadership in education (i.e. professional organization, etc.) | 1.87          |
| 5.       | Holder of an earned M.Ed.   | 2.15          |
| 6.       | Experience in business management   | 2.23          |
| 7.       | Evidence of past leadership in community affairs                                | 2.23          |
| 8.       | Polished personal style   | 2.38          |
| 9.       | Academic scholarship  | 2.40          |
| 0.       | Personal life free from "complications"   | 2.45          |
| 1.       | Familiarity with the district   | 2.55          |
| 2.       | Religious affiliation   | 2.69          |
| 3.       | Sex   | 3:05          |
|          |   |               |

. . .

. d

.,

. . . . . .

a

## TABLE XXVII

Variations Between Educational Groups and Attitudes Regarding Desirable Characteristics of Superintendents

Ú.

1.

| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·         |                      | •       | <u>8</u> 4         |         |
|---|----------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|
| 1. Successful teaching                        | Group 1ª             | 1.56    |                    |         |
| experience                                    | Group 2 <sup>b</sup> | 1.53    | 0.55               | 0.578   |
|   | Group 3 <sup>C</sup> | 1.50    |                    |         |
|   |                      | 1.58    |                    |         |
| 2. Experience in public school administration | Group 1<br>Group 2   | 1.50    | 0.86               | 0.422   |
|   | Group 2<br>Group 3   | 1.52    |                    | •••     |
|   |                      |         |                    |         |
| 3. Established leadership                     | Group 1.             | 1.65    | •                  |         |
| ability D'                                    | Group 2              | . 1.57  | 3.07               | 0.047*  |
|   | Group 3              | 1.50    |                    |         |
| . Evidence of leadership                      | Group 1              | 1.88    |                    |         |
| in education (prof.                           | Group 2,             | 1.85    | 0.09               | 0.913   |
| organization, etc.)                           | Group 3              | 1.87    |                    |         |
| 5. Holder of an earned                        | Group 1              | \$ 2.04 |                    |         |
| M.Ed.   | Group 2              | 2.12    | 9.33               | 0.0001* |
|   | Group 3              | 2:38    |                    |         |
| 6. Experience in business                     | Group 1              | 2.20    |                    |         |
| management                                    | Group 2              | , 2.13  | 4.99               | 0.012*  |
|   | Group 3              | 2:37    |                    |         |
| 7. Evidence of community                      | Group 1              | 2.25    | •                  |         |
| leadership 4                                  | Group 2              | 2.22    | .09                | 0.367   |
|   | Group 3              | 2.17    | <b>,</b><br>,<br>, | ص       |

## TABLE XXVII (Cont.)

| Variations Between  | Educational Groups | and Attitudes   |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Regarding Desirable | Characteristics of | Superintendents |

| ·                                      |         |                              |   |       |
|--|---------|------------------------------|---|-------|
| Variable                               | Group   | Group Mean                   | Firatio   | Prob. |
| 8. Polished personal                   | Group 1 | 2.43 '                       | 1 - Angel 1<br>Angel 1 - Angel 1 - An<br>Angel 1 - Angel 1 - An |       |
| <b>style</b>                           | Group 2 | 2.32                         | 1.12  | 0.076 |
| ······································ | Group 3 | 2.36                         |   |       |
| 9. Academic scholarship                | Group 1 | . 2.40                       |   |       |
| <b>3</b>                               | Group 2 | 2.44                         | 0.62  | 0.539 |
|  | Group 3 | and the second second second |   | •     |
| 0. Personal life free                  | Group 1 | 2,40                         |   |       |
| from complications                     | Group 2 | 2.39                         | 3.06  | 0.013 |
|  | Group 3 | 2.59                         |   |       |
| 1. Familiarity with                    | Group 1 | 2.48                         |   |       |
| the district                           | Group 2 | 2.57                         | 2.85  | 0.059 |
|  | Group 3 | 2.67                         |   |       |
| 2. Religious                           | Group 1 | 2.69                         |   |       |
| Affiliation                            | Group 2 | 2.63                         | 0.90  | 0.408 |
|  | Group 3 | 2.78                         | ·   | (     |
| 3. Sex                                 | Group 1 | 3.08                         | 1   |       |
|  | Group 2 | 2.98                         | 0.78  | 0.457 |
|  | Group 3 | 3.08                         |   |       |

<sup>a</sup>Group 1 includes all trustees who have not gone beyond high school. <sup>b</sup>Group 2 includes trustees who have attended technical school, college or some university.

<sup>c'</sup>Group 3 includes trustees with university degrees or higher. \*P  $\leq 0.05$  on two other variables ( $P \le .05$ ). Trustees with higher levels of formal education placed significantly less value on degree qualifications, experience in business management, and a personal life free from "complications," than did other trustees. Conversely, the higher the formal educational level of the trustees surveyed, the greater the value they ascribed to established leadership ability.

The t-test was utilized to determine whether recently elected trustees had significantly different views with regard to the preferred characteristics of a superintendent, than did all other trustees. The only significant difference between the two groups related to established leadership ability. Recently elected trustees placed significantly less importance on this characteristic than did other trustees (significance level = 0.014). The complete results of the t-tests are reported in Table XXVIII.

Trustee attitudes were also examined relative to sex and occupation (occupation was analyzed in terms of professional or nonprofessional status as indicated in Table IX). Apart from the fact that female trustees placed significantly less value (significance level = 0.000) on "a personal life free from complications," no major differences in the response patterns of male as opposed to female trustees were observed. With regard to professional or nonprofessional status, the only significant differences related to experience in business management. Nonprofessionals placed significantly more importance on this characteristic than did the professionals. The results of the t-test relative to sex and occupation are presented in Tables XXIX and XXX, respectively.

## TABLE XXVIII

ς.

O

## Trustee Experience Relative to Preferred Characteristics for a Superintendent

.

.

|                        | Variable   | Group                | Group Mean | t-value | Prob.  |
|------------------------|--|----------------------|------------|---------|--------|
|                        | Successful teaching                              | Group 1 <sup>a</sup> | 1.60       | *       |        |
|                        | experience                                       | Group 2 <sup>b</sup> | 1.49       | 1.95    | 0.051  |
| 2.                     | 2. Experience in public<br>school administration | Group 1              | 1.48       | -1.92   | 0.055  |
|                        |  | Group 2              | 1.58       | -1.92 ( |        |
| 3. Established leader- | Group 1  | 1.67                 | 0.16       | •, •    |        |
|                        | ship ability                                     | Group 2              | 1.54       | 2.46    | 0.014* |
| 4.                     | Evidence of Leader-<br>ship in Education         | Group 1              | 1.93       | 1.74    | 0.082  |
|                        | / /  | Group 2              | 1.83       | ±•/-    | 0.002  |
| 5.                     | Holder of in earned<br>M.Ed.                     | Group 1              | 2.22       | 1.57    | 0.118  |
|                        |  | Group 2              | 2.11       | a .     |        |
| 6.                     | Experience in business management                | Group 1              | 2.19       | -0.85   | 0.398  |
| ·                      |  | Group 2              | 2.24       |         |        |
| 7.                     | Evidence of community<br>leadership              | Group 1              | 2.18       | -1.20   | 0.230  |
|                        |  | Group 2              | 2.24       | -1.20   |        |
| 8.                     | Polished personal                                | Group 1              | 2.37       |         | 0.654  |
|                        | style (  | Group 2              | 2.39       | -0.45   |        |
| 9.                     | Academic Scholarship                             | Group 1              | 2.40       |         |        |
| <br>                   |  | Group 2              | 2.39       | 0.15    | 0.877  |
| 0.                     | Personal life free                               | Group 1              | 2.40       |         |        |
| • .                    | from complications                               | Group 2              | 2.42       | 0.90    | 0.371  |

S

•

## TABLE XXVIII (Cont.)

89

## Trustee Experience Relative to Preferred Characteristics for a Superintendent

| Group   | Group Mean  | t-value  | Prob.  |
|---------|---|--|--|
| Group 1 | 2.49  |  |  |
| Group 2 | 2.59  | · · · ·  | 0.125  |
| Group 1 | 2.62  | •  |  |
| Group 2 | 2.73  | <b>-1.30</b> .   | 0.194  |
| Group 1 | 3.11  |  | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •  |
| Group 2 | 3.02  | 1.22   | 0.224  |
|         | Group 1<br>Group 2<br>Group 1<br>Group 2<br>Group 1 | Group 1       2.49         Group 2       2.59         Group 1       2.62         Group 2       2.73         Group 1       3.11 | Group 1 2.49<br>Group 2 2.59<br>Group 1 2.62<br>Group 2 2.73<br>Group 1 3.11<br>1.22 |

<sup>a</sup>Group 1 includes trustees who have been in office for less than 1 year.

<sup>b</sup>Group 2 includes trustees who have been in office 1 year or more.

\*P ≤ 0.05

## TABLE XXIX

 $\mathfrak{O}$ 

å

Variations In Trustee Attitudes, Reporting Desirable Characteristic of Superinterdents Relative to Sex

|                                      | Variable  | Group  | Group Mean | t-value                               | Prob.  |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------|------------|---------------------------------------|--------|--|
| 1. Successful teaching<br>experience |   | Female | 1.54       | -0.05                                 | 0.956  |  |
|                                      | Male ,  | 1.54   |            |                                       |        |  |
| •                                    | Experience in public                            | Female | 1.51       | -0.77                                 | 0.441  |  |
|                                      | school administration                           | Male   | 1.56       |                                       |        |  |
| •                                    | Established leader-                             | Female | 1.55       | 0.04                                  |        |  |
| 1                                    | ship ability                                    | Male   | 1.60       | -0.96                                 | 0.338  |  |
| •                                    | Evidence of leadership                          | Female | 1.86       |                                       | 0.778  |  |
|                                      | in education (prof.<br>,organization, etc.)     | Male   | 1.88       | -0.28                                 |        |  |
| . Holder of an earned                |   | Female | 2.14       |                                       | 0.890  |  |
|                                      | M.Ed.   | Male   | 2.15       | -0.14                                 |        |  |
|                                      |   | Female | 2.28       | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 0.271  |  |
|                                      | Management                                      | Male   | 2.21       | 1.10                                  |        |  |
|                                      | Evidence of community                           | Female | • 2.20     |                                       |        |  |
|                                      | leadership                                      | Male   | 2.23       | -0.37                                 | 0.711  |  |
|                                      | · · -   | Female | 2.44       | <br>ر                                 |        |  |
|                                      | style   | Male   | 2.34       | <b>\.</b> 37                          | 0.171  |  |
|                                      | Academic Scholarship                            | Female | 2.39       | 0 <b>.</b> 03                         |        |  |
|                                      |   | Male   | 2.40       |                                       | 0.979  |  |
|                                      | Personal life free                              | Female | 2.69       |                                       |        |  |
|                                      | <pre>from "complications" (divorce, etc.)</pre> | Male   | 2.35       | 4.47                                  | 0.000* |  |

Ê5

## TABLE XXIX (Cont.)

a J

91 ,

3.2

Variations In Trustee Attitudes Regarding Desirable Characteristic of Superintendents Relative to Sex

ĥ

/

|     | Variabl                     | e | Group          | Group Mean     | t-value | Prob. |
|-----|-----------------------------|---|----------------|----------------|---------|-------|
| 11. | Familiarity<br>the district |   | Female<br>Male | 2.63<br>2.52   | 1.58    | 0.115 |
| 2.  | Religious<br>Affiliation    |   | Female<br>Male | ° 2.68<br>2.70 | -0.22   | 0.830 |
| 3.  | Sex                         | ) | Female<br>Male | 3.12<br>3.03   | 1.38    | 0.169 |

## TABLE XXX

Þ

5

en ar pa

٦

## Variation Between Trustee Attitudes Concerning Characteristics of Superintendents Relative to Professional or Nonprofessional Status 13

.

|     | 'Variable  | Group           | Group Mean | t-value | Prob.     |  |
|-----|--|-----------------|------------|---------|-----------|--|
| 1.  | . Successful teaching  | Nonprofessional | 1.54       | 1.54    | 0 450     |  |
|     | experience   | Professional    | 1.50       | 0.74    | 0.459<br> |  |
| 2.  | Experience in<br>public school<br>administration                       | Nonprofessional | 1.54       |         | ø         |  |
|     |  | Professional    | 1.55       | -0.18   | 0.855     |  |
| 3.  | Established<br>leadership  | Nonprofessional | 1.61       |         |           |  |
|     | ability  | Professional    | 1.50       | 1.92    | 0.055     |  |
|     | Evidence of<br>leadership in<br>education (prof.<br>organization etc.) | Nonprofessional | 1.89       |         |           |  |
| e   |  | Professional    | 1.79       | 1.34    | 0.181     |  |
| ;.  | Holder of an earned M.Ed.  | Nonprofessional | 2.12       | -1:66   | 0.097     |  |
|     |  | Professional    | 2.26       |         |           |  |
| • * | Experience in<br>business<br>management                                | Nonprófessional | 2.17       |         | <b>1</b>  |  |
|     |  | Professional    | 2.40       | -2.97   | 0.003*    |  |
| •   | Evidence of<br>community<br>leadership                                 | Nonprofessional | 2.24       |         |           |  |
|     |  | Professional    | . 2.13     | 1.71    | 0.088     |  |
| •   | Polished<br>personal   | Nonprofessional | 2.39       |         |           |  |
|     | style  | Professional    | 2.33       | 1.00    | 0.318     |  |
| •   | Academic<br>Scholarship  | Nonprofessional | 2.39       |         | ·         |  |
|     |  | Professional    | 2.40       | -0.08   | 0.939     |  |

`92

l

## TABLE XXX (Cont.)

Variation Between Trustee Attitudes Concerning Characteristics of Superintendents Relative to Professional or Nonprofessional Status

| Variable                       | Group           | Group Mean | t-value       | Prob.       |
|--------------------------------|-----------------|------------|---------------|-------------|
| 10. Personal life<br>free from | Nonprofessional | 2.42       | -1.74         | 0.082       |
| complications                  | Professional    | 2.56       | -1./4         |             |
| 11. Familiarity<br>with the    | Nonprofessional | 2.54       | <br>,<br>1 10 |             |
| district ',                    | Professional    | 2.62 🧹     | -1.19         | 0.237       |
| 12. Religious<br>affiliation   | Nonprofessional | 2.69       |               |             |
|                                | Professiónal    | 2.70       | -0414         | 0.884<br>.* |
| 13. Sex                        | Nonprofessional | 3.07       | 1 00          |             |
| ÷ - •                          | Professional    | 2.99       | 1.09          | 0.279       |

**★**P ≤ 0.05

### ATTITUDES TOWARD EDUCATIONAL ISSUES

Trustees were asked to respond to 27 additional variables related to specific educational issues by indicating their level of agreement on a five category response scale ranging from (1) strongly agree to (5) strongly disagree. Morton Rauh in 1969, using a similar questionnaire to survey the attitudes of community college trustees, suggested grouping these additudinal variables into three categories: student related affairs, faculty related affairs, and educational philosophy in general. To facilitate a more cogent discussion of the findings, these categories were adopted.

### Student Affairs

As a group school trustees appeared to be somewhat conservative and restrictive with regard to student affairs. Seventy-nine percent of the respondents advocated suspension or expulsion of students who disrupted the functioning of the school. Similarly, 67 percent felt that all guest speakers allowed in the school should be subject to some official screening process; and 59 percent agreed that the administration should exercise control over the contents of the student newspaper.

Although 74 percent of the trustees surveyed indicated that there was a need for greater discipline, they were generally unwilling (70 percent) to involve the school in disciplinary action against a student involved in civil disobedience off the school premises. A detailed summary of trustee responses is provided in Table XXXI. The attitudinal variables are arranged in order of decreasing trustee agreement with the statement.

## Faculty Affairs

The trustees surveyed appear to subscribe to the classical liberal tradition relative to freedom of expression. Sixty-five percent of the trustees felt that the teaching staff should have the right to express their opinions about any issue through the various channels of communication open to them, including the classroom student newspaper, etc., without fear of reprisal.

A somewhat anti-academic bias was reflected in trustee responses regarding teacher qualifications. Over half of the respondents felt that degree qualifications should receive less emphasis as a criterion
## TABLE XXXI

Student Related Issues

| ,          | Attituninal Statement  | % Agreeing | 7 Disagreeing |
|------------|--|------------|---------------|
| 1.         | Students who actively disrupt the<br>functioning of a school by demon-<br>strating, sitting in, or otherwise<br>refusing to obey the rules should<br>be expelled or suspended. | 78         |               |
| 2.         | There is a need for greater<br>discipline in schools.  | 76         | 13            |
| 3.         | Attendance at public school should be regarded as a privilege, not a right.  | 67         | 25            |
| 4.         | All school speakers should be subject<br>to some official screening process.   | 64         | 17            |
| 5.         | The administration should exercise<br>control over the contents of the   | 59         | 23            |
| 6 <b>.</b> | Students involved in civil disobedience<br>off the school premises should be<br>subject to discipline at school as well<br>as by local authorities.                            | 17         | 70            |

in teacher recruitment. Similarly, 70 percent of the trustees were in disagreement with the statement that there should be more professional educators on the board.

It was interesting to note that 56 percent of the trustees surveyed indicated a preference for local as opposed to regional bargaining. This finding is somewhat inconsistent with the historical position taken by the majority of school boards in the province, as evidenced by the fact that most boards in the province have opted for regional bargaining. To determine whether the opinions of newly elected trustees were responsible for this apparent inconsistency, the t-test was applied. A t-value of -0.53 with a probability of 0.59 was observed; thus indicating that there were no significant differences in the response patterns of newly elected trustees as compared with trustees with one or more years of experience. A more detailed outline of trustee responses relative to faculty related items is provided in

Table XXXII.

#### TABLE XXXII

#### Faculty Related Issues

|    | Attitudinal Statement                        | % Agreeing | Disagreeing |     |
|----|--|------------|-------------|-----|
| 1. | Teaching staff should have the right         | ÷.         | - <u> </u>  | . * |
|    | to express their opinions about any          | •          | 4           | •   |
|    | issue in the various channels of             |            | · ·         |     |
|    | communication, including: student            | j s        |             | •   |
|    | newspaper, classroom, etc. without           |            |             | 39  |
|    | fear of reprisal.                            | 67         | 27້         |     |
| 2  |  | ,<br>,     | ,           |     |
| 2. | Collective bargaining between                | <b>-</b>   |             |     |
|    | teachers and boards should be done           | · · ·      |             |     |
|    | at the local rather than the regional level. |            |             |     |
|    | TEACT.                                       | 56         | 29          |     |
| 3. | The value of degree qualifications           | 4          | × · · ·     |     |
|    | in recruiting teachers should receive        | ,          |             | ,   |
|    | less emphasis                                | 52         | 38          | τ.  |
|    |  | •          | · · ·       |     |
| 4. | The typical high school curriculum           |            | ن<br>ب      |     |
|    | suffers from the specialization of °         |            |             |     |
|    | the teaching staff.                          | 38         | 38          |     |
| 5. | Thora should be more professed               |            |             |     |
|    | There should be more professional            | 10         |             |     |
| ۰. | educators on school boards.                  | • 12       | 70 ^        | ,   |
|    |  |            | · · ·       |     |
|    |  |            |             | 3   |

Trustee attitudes relative to general educational philosophy were analyzed from three perspectives. These included: admissions .

and standards, instructional focus, and administrative policy.

Admissions and standards. While a majority of trustees (58%) appeared to subscribe to the position that socially disadvantaged students who appear to have potential should be given special consideration relative to entrance requirements, it was nevertheless apparent that they were concerned with standards. This was evidenced by the fact that 59 percent of the trustees advocated a return to departmental examinations; and 55 percent favored greater emphasis on basic skills rather than vocational programs. Conceivably, their responses could have been influenced to some extent by the recent publicity given the "back-to'basics" commentary; however, this concern with standards was not inconsistent with the basic conservatism noted earlier.

Institutional focus. With regard to institutional focus, 86 percent of the respondents advocated a broad based curriculum designed to accommodate a wide diversity of ability levels and interests. Similarly, school involvement with the development of the personal values of students, as well as their intellectual development, was endorsed by 92 percent of the trustees surveyed. Strong support for the concept of school facilities serving the larger community was also reflected in the data. With regard to the role that the school should play in the resolution of contemporary social problems, the trustees seemed somewhat ambivalent. Forty percent were in agreement with the statement that the schools should be actively engaged in solving contemporary social problems; 35 percent were in disagreement; and 25

percent were undecided.

<u>`97</u>

Administrative policy. Among the general findings with respect to administrative policy reflected in the data were the following:

1) Trustees generally (78%) felt that school boards were effective and did increase the efficiency of school management. It was interesting to note that 68 percent of the respondents likened school district management to running a large business;

2) Boards generally advocated open meetings (92% support); and 62 percent of the trustees surveyed indicated that parent advisory, groups to advise the board on educational matters should be established;

3) Trustees were, for the most part, opposed to increased provincial control of education. Similarly, 65 percent were not in favor of having education funded entirely from provincial sources; and

4) There was substantial support (82%) for the concept of the locally appointed district superintendent. Trustees also felt that the superintendent should function as a leader rather than a mediator.

Table XXXIII provides a detailed summary of trustee responses relative to educational philosophy in order of decreasing agreement with the statement.

#### Attitudes Relative to Formal Education

The relationship between trustee attitudes on the selected educational issues and their level of formal education was investigated by the application of the F-test. Trustees were grouped into three educational categories including: group #1 -- trustees with a high school education or less, group #2 -- trustees with technical school, college or some university, and group #3 -- trustees with a university degree or higher. The F-test revealed significant differences between

#### TABLE XXXIII

# Trustee Attitudes Regarding Educational Philosophy

• •

Ċ

| Attitudinal Variable   | % Agreeing | % Disagreeing |
|--|------------|---------------|
| 1. Admissions and Standards:   |            |               |
| a) Socially disadvantaged students<br>who appear to have potential<br>should be admitted to high school<br>programs even when they do not          |            |               |
| meet normal entrance require-<br>ments.  | ,57        | 23            |
| b) Schools should place more<br>emphasis on basic skills<br>rather than vocational programs.   | 55         | 31            |
| c) Departmental exams should be reinstated.  | - 49       | 23            |
| 2. Institutional Focus:  |            |               |
| a) The school facilities and<br>buildings should be available<br>for community use.  | 93         | 3             |
| b) Schools should be as concerned<br>with the personal values of its<br>students as it is with their<br>intellectual development.                  | 92         | 5             |
| c) The curriculum should be<br>designed to accommodate a wide<br>diversity in student ability<br>levels and educational<br>vocational aspirations. | 85         | 8             |
| <ul> <li>d) The schools should be actively<br/>engaged in solving contemporary<br/>social problems.</li> </ul>                                     | 40         | 35            |

ŝ

# Trustee Attitudes Regarding Educational Philosophy

1

| Attitudinal Variable  | % Agreeing       | % Disagréeing |
|---|------------------|---------------|
| Administrative Policy:  |                  |               |
| a) Except for matters of a<br>confidential nature, all board<br>business should be discussed<br>fully in open sessions.   | ,• 92            | 5             |
| b) School boards increase the<br>effectiveness of school<br>management.   | 79               | 5             |
| c) Running a school division is<br>basically like running a big<br>business.  | 68               | 26            |
| <ul> <li>d) Parent advisory groups to advise<br/>the board on educational matters<br/>should be established for each<br/>school.</li> </ul>                                 | 61               | 17            |
| e) School districts should be<br>funded entirely from provincial<br>sources rather than having to<br>rely partially upon a local<br>educational property tax<br>assessment. | 27               | 65            |
| f) All decisions regarding<br>curriculum should be made at the<br>local district level.   | <u>ء</u> -<br>20 | 64            |
| g) The superintendent should act as<br>a mediator rather than a leader<br>in the school district.   | s 24             | 76            |
| h) Increased provincial support of<br>public education should mean<br>increased provincial control.   | •17              | 77-           |
| i) The district superintendent<br>should be provincially appointe   | d. 12            | 82            |

۰. ک

Ø

the response patterns of the groups on 15 of 27 attitudinal variables and trends toward significance on two other variables. The complete results are reported in Table XXXIV. To facilitate a more cogent discussion, the findings are analyzed in groupings of student affairs, faculty affairs, and educational philosophy.

<u>Student affairs</u>. Regardless of the level of formal education trustees appear to be somewhat restrictive with regard to student activities. There were, however, significant differences between groups in the degree of restrictiveness advocated on five of the six attitudinal statements. Generally, the higher the level of formal education, the lower the degree of control advocated. For example, trustees with higher levels of formal education were less adamant in their stand that students who actively disrupted the school by demonstrating, sitting in, etc. should be expelled or suspended. Similar findings were apparent in the areas of student discipline, control of the student newspaper, and the issue of education being a right or a privilege. No significant differences between the responses of the different trustee groups were noted with respect to the screening of school guest speakers -- generally all groups advocated official screening.

Faculty affairs. In the area of faculty affairs two significant findings were noted. Specifically, these were:

1) Trustees with a university degree or higher were significantly less in agreement with the statement that degree qualifications should receive less emphasis in recruiting teachers, than were all other trustees; and 2) The higher the level of formal education, the less the disagreement with the statement that there should be more professional educators on school boards.

Educational philosophy. With regard to educational philosophy significant differences between groups were noted on 8 of 16 attitudinal variables. Among the conclusions and generalizations reflected in the data were the following:

Ð

1) Trustees with lower levels of formal education were in significantly greater agreement with the argument that departmental exams should be reinstated.

2) The higher their level of formal education the greater the willingness of trustees to make the school facilities and buildings available for community use.

3) A broad based curriculum designed to accommodate a wide diversity of student interests and abilities was more strongly advocated by trustees with a university degree or higher, than by all other trustees.

4) Trustees with a high school education or less were significantly more in agreement with the statement that school boards increase the effectiveness of school management, than were other trustees.

5) The lower the formal level of education of trustees, the greater was their agreement with the argument that running a school division was like running a big business.

6) A The higher their level of formal education, the greater was trustee support for a functioning parent advisory committee for each school.

7) The higher the formal educational level of trustees, the stronger was their opposition to complete local control over curriculum, and total provincial funding for education.

#### TABLE XXXIV

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Education

|   |  |   | 1                     | <u></u> /                             |
|---|--|---|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Attitudinal Statement                                 | Group                                      | Group<br>Mean   | F-value               | Prob.                                 |
| I. Student Affairs                                    |  | ¢   | •<br>                 | φ≥¢<br>                               |
| 1. Students who actively                              | Group 1 <sup>a</sup>                       | 1.89  |                       |                                       |
| disrupt the functioning of a school by demon-         | Group 2 <sup>b</sup>                       | 2.07  | 7.93                  | 0.0004*                               |
| strating, sitting in,<br>or otherwise refusing        | Group 3 <sup>c</sup>                       | 2.30  | 6                     |                                       |
| to obey the rules should<br>be expelled or suspended. | ·<br>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |   | e                     |                                       |
| 2. There is a need for                                | Group 1                                    | 1.98  |                       |                                       |
| greater discipline in schools.                        | Group 2                                    | 2.20  | 6.60                  | 0.0015*                               |
|   | Group <sup>'</sup> 3                       | 2.14  | ·                     |                                       |
| 3. Attendance at public                               | Group 1                                    | 2.17  |                       |                                       |
| schools should be                                     | Group 2                                    | 2.45  | 6.83                  | 0.0012*                               |
| regarded as a privilege,<br>not a right.              | Group 3                                    | 2.70  |                       |                                       |
| 4. All school speakers                                | Group 1                                    | 2.47  | Ċ.                    |                                       |
| should be subject to                                  | Group 2                                    | 2.36  | 0.85                  | • 0.4271                              |
| some official screen-<br>ing process.                 | Group 3                                    | 2.50  |                       |                                       |
| 5. The administration                                 | Group 1                                    | 2.45  |                       |                                       |
| should exercise control                               | Group 2                                    | 2.54  | 4.55                  | 0.0110*                               |
| over the contents of<br>the student newspaper.        | Group 3                                    | 2.79  |                       |                                       |
|   |  | a de la companya de l | and the second second | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |

a includes trustees with a high school education or less.

<sup>b</sup>includes trustees with technical school, college or some university.

<sup>c</sup>includes trustees with a university degree or higher.

#### Group. Prob. F-value Mean Attitudinal Statement Group 3.56 Group 1 6. Students involved in civil disobedience of 2.82 0.0600 3.53 Group 2 the school premises 3.80 Group 3 should be subject to discipline from the school as well as local authorities. ц. II. Faculty Affairs Group 1 3.39 1. Teaching staff should 0.1287 have the right to express 2.06 Group 2 2.62 their opinions about any 2.56 Group 3 issue in various channels of communication, including student newspaper, classroom, etc. without fear of reprisal. G. 2.66 Group 1 2. Collective bargaining. 0.0785 between teachers and . 2.56 2.75 Group 2 boards should be done at 2.40 Group 3 the local rather than regional level. \_\_\_\_\_ 2.71 Group 1 3. The value of degree 0.0019\* qualifications in 6.33 2.72 Group 2 recruiting teachers 3.12 Group 3 should receive less emphasis. Group 1 2.88 4. The typical high school 0.1229 curriculum suffers from. 2.11 3.02 Group 2 the specialization of 3.08 Group 3 teaching staff.

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Education

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Education

| Attitudinal Statement   | Group  | Grou<br>Mean  | • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   | Prob.   |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| There should be more  | Group 1  | 3.85  | •   | •   |
|   | Group 2  | 3.70  | . 9.94  | 0.0000*   |
| on school boards.   | Group 3  | ·   |   | and the second  |
|   | • · ·  | 4   |   |   |
| . Educational Philosophy  |  |   | 2   |   |
| Admissions and Standards  |  |   | °   |   |
| Departmental exams should   | Group 1  | 2.35  | •   | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •   |
| be reinstated.  | . –  |   | 8.91  | 0.0002*   |
|   | Group 3  | 2.86  | •   |   |
| Socially disadvantaged  | Group 1  | 2.67  |   |   |
| students who appear to  | Group 2  | 2.64  | 0.27  | 0.7656  |
| be admitted, to shigh   | Group 3  | 2.59  |   | , .<br>,  |
| school programs even<br>when they do not meet<br>normal entrancé require-<br>ments. | -<br>-   | æ.  | •<br>•  | ·   |
| Schools should place  | Group 1  | 2.58  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·   |   |
| more emphasis on basic<br>skills rather than  | Group 2  | 2.73  | 1.86 ,  | 0.1572  |
| vocațional programs.  |  |   |   |   |
| Institutional Focus   |  |   |   |   |
| The school facilities   | Group 1  | 1.79  |   | •   |
| =   | Group 2  | 1.64  | 5.37  | 0.0049*   |
| ISE.  | Group 3  | 1.53  |   |   |
| Schools should be as  | Group 1  | 1.78  |   |   |
|   | Group 2  | 1.76  | 0.21  | 0.8073  |
| students as it is with<br>their intellectual  | Group 3  | 1.82  |   |   |
|   | professional educators<br>on school boards.<br>Educational Philosophy<br>Admissions and Standards<br>Departmental exams should<br>be reinstated.<br>Socially disadvantaged<br>students who appear to<br>have potential should<br>be admitted to high<br>school programs even<br>when they do not meet<br>normal entrance require-<br>ments.<br>Schools should place<br>more emphasis on basic<br>skills rather than<br>vocațional programs.<br>Institutional Focus<br>The school facilities<br>and building should be<br>available for community<br>use.<br>Schools should be as<br>concerned with the<br>personal values of its<br>students as it is with | professional educators<br>on school boards.<br>Group 3<br>. Educational Philosophy<br>Admissions and Standards<br>Departmental exams should<br>be reinstated.<br>Socially disadvantaged<br>students who appear to<br>have potential should<br>be admitted to high<br>school programs even<br>when they do not meet<br>normal entrancé require-<br>ments.<br>Schools should place<br>more emphasis on basic<br>skills rather than<br>vocational programs.<br>Institutional Focus<br>Che school facilities<br>and building should be<br>available for community<br>use.<br>Schools should be as<br>concerned with the<br>personal values of its<br>students as it is with<br>their intellectual | professional educators<br>on school boards.<br>Group 2 3.70<br>Group 3 3.43<br>. Educational Philosophy<br>Admissions and Standards<br>Departmental exams should Group 1 2.35<br>Group 2 2.53<br>Group 3 2.86<br>. Socially disadvantaged Group 1 2.67<br>students who appear to<br>have potential should Group 2 2.64<br>be admitted to high Group 3 2.59<br>school programs even<br>when they do not meet<br>normal entrancé require-<br>ments.<br> | professional educators<br>on school boards.<br>Group 2 3.70 9.94<br>Group 3 3.43<br>. Educational Philosophy<br>Admissions and Standards<br>Departmental exams should Group 1 2.35<br>be reinstated.<br>Group 2 2.53 8.91<br>Group 3 2.86<br>Socially disadvantaged Group 1 2.67<br>students who appear to<br>have potential should Group 2 2.64 0.27<br>be admitted the high Group 3 2.59<br>school programs even<br>when they do not meet<br>normal entrance require-<br>ments.<br>Schools should place Group 1 2.58<br>more emphasis on basic<br>skills rather than<br>vocational programs.<br>School facilities Group 1 2.73 1.86 .<br>Yocational programs.<br>Institutional Focus<br>The school facilities Group 1 1.79<br>and building should be<br>available for community<br>ise.<br>Schools should be as Group 1 1.78<br>croup 3 1.53<br>Schools should be as Group 1 1.78<br>croup 2 1.76 0.21<br>students as it is with Group 3 1.82 |

ç

 $^{\circ}$ 

-7

# Trustee Attactudes Relative to Education

| ,      | Attitudinal Statement   | Group        | Group<br>Mean | F-value            | (<br>Prob.                            |
|--------|---|--------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|
| •      | The curriculum should   | Group 1      | 2.04          | •                  |                                       |
|        | be designed to<br>accommodate a wide  | Group 2      | 2.08          | 3.33               | 0.0367*                               |
| ,      | diversity in student  | Group 3      | 1.85          |                    |                                       |
|        | ability levels and<br>educational vocational<br>aspirations.  |              | •             |                    |                                       |
| ,<br>• | The schools should be   | Group 1      | 3.03          |                    | •                                     |
|        | actively engaged in   | Group 2      | 3.03          | 2.41               | 0.0911                                |
| •      | solving contemporary social problems.   | Group 3      | 2.81          |                    |                                       |
| •      | Administrative Policy   | n            |               |                    |                                       |
|        | Except for matters of a   | م<br>Group 1 | 1.76          | •                  | <b>,</b> .                            |
| •      | Except for matters of a<br>confidential nature, all<br>board business should be<br>discussed fully in open<br>sessions. | Group 2      | 1.71          | 0.83               | 0.4353                                |
|        |   |              | 1.65          | 0.05               |                                       |
| >      |   | Group 3      | 1.03          |                    |                                       |
| •      | School boards increase  | Group 1      | 2.02          |                    | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
|        | the effectiveness of school management.   | Group 2      | 2.19          | 4.05               | 0.0180                                |
|        | school management.  | Group 3      | 2.23          |                    |                                       |
| •      | Running a school  | Group 1      | 2.31          |                    | •                                     |
|        | division is basically<br>like running a big   | Group 2      | 2.48          | 9.20               | 0.0001                                |
|        | business.   | Group 3      | 2.82          |                    |                                       |
| •      | Parent advisory   | Group 1      | 2.59          |                    |                                       |
|        | committees to advise<br>the board on educational  | Group 2      | 2.37          | 4.12               | 0.0168                                |
|        | matters should be estab-<br>lished for each school.   | Group 3      | 2.31          | •                  |                                       |
|        | School districts should   | Group 1      | 3.31          |                    |                                       |
|        | be funded entirely from provincial sources.   | Group 2      | 3.21          | 5.19               | 0.0058                                |
|        | provincial sources.   |              | · · · c       | , <b>, , , , ,</b> | 0.0000                                |
|        |   | Group 3      | 3.65          |                    | ><br>                                 |

. · ·

#### Trustee Attitudes Relative to Education

|    |   |         | v                |         | 1                                     |
|----|---|---------|------------------|---------|---------------------------------------|
|    | Attitudinal Statement   | Group   | Group<br>Mean    | F-value | Prob.                                 |
| 6. | All decisions regarding curriculum should be                                | Group 1 | 3.40             |         |                                       |
|    | made at the local<br>district level.  | Group 2 | 3.37             | 5.40    | 0.0048*                               |
|    |   | Group 3 | 3.70             |         |                                       |
|    | The superintendent  | Group 1 | 3.46             |         | · · · ·                               |
|    | should act as a mediator<br>rather than a leader in<br>the school district. | Group 2 | 3.56             | 1.62    | 0.1991                                |
|    |   | Group 3 | 3.67             |         |                                       |
| 5. | <b>F-0</b>  | Group 1 | 3.87             |         | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| -  | support of public<br>education should mean                                  | Group 2 | 3.67 B           | 1.58    | 0.2062                                |
|    | increased provincial control.   | Group 3 | 3.84             |         |                                       |
| ): | The district superin-   | Group 1 | 3.95             |         | · • • • • • • • • • • • • • •         |
|    | tendent should be<br>provincially   | Group 2 | 4.0 <sup>3</sup> | 0, 37   | <b>~</b> 0.6898                       |
|    | appointed.  | Group 3 | 4.02             | - , (   | $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$                      |

\* P ≤ 0.05

 $\bigcirc$ 

Attitude Relative to Sex

To determine whether any significant difference existed between the sex of trustees and the attitudes held by them on the selected issues, t-test scores were derived. Significant differences were noted on 9 of 27 attitudinal statements. The findings are discussed in terms of student affairs, faculty affairs and educational philosophy.

<u>Student affairs</u>. Significant differences between the responses of male and female trustees were observed on 5 of 6 variables and a strong trend toward significance (p = 0.051) was observed on the sixth

#### statement.

Generally, female trustees were significantly less restrictive than were male trustees with regard to student affairs. For example, female trustees advocated less control over the selection of school guest speakers, and less censorship of the student newspaper. Similarly, they were more reluctant to expell or suspend students who actively disrupted the school, and they generally felt that discipline was a lesser problem, than did their male counterparts. It was also notable that, although both male and female trustees were not willing to involve the school in disciplining students involved in civil disobedience off the school premises, female trustees were significantly more adamant (p = 0.008) in their opposition to this practice. Table XXXV provides a listing of the t-test scores examining differences between trustee attitudes based upon sex.

Faculty affairs. With regard to faculty affairs, there were no significant fifferences between the response patterns of male and female trustees. The majority of trustees advocated free expression for teaching staff, less emphasis on degree qualifications in recruiting staff, and local as opposed to regional bargaining. Conversely, the majority were not in favor of increasing the number of professional educators on school boards.

Educational philosophy. Few significant differences between the attitudes held by male as opposed to female trustees were noted in the area of educational philosophy. Significant differences were observed on only 4 of 16 attitudinal variables.

The most notable differences observed related to admissions

# TABLE XXXV

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Sex

| · · ·  |                |               | s,       |        |
|--|----------------|---------------|----------|--------|
| J<br>Attitudinal Statement   | Group          | Group<br>Mean | ´t-value | Prob.  |
| I. Student Affairs   | ۰<br>۵         | •             | <b>,</b> | U ·    |
| . Students who actively<br>disrupt the functioning<br>of a school by demon-<br>strating, sitting in,<br>or otherwise refusing<br>to obey the rules should<br>be expelled or suspended. | Female<br>Male | 2.30<br>1.95  | 3.48     | 0.001* |
| 2. There is a need for<br>greater discipline<br>in schools.  | Female<br>Male | 2.36          | 3.09     | 0.002* |
| 3. Attendance at public<br>schools should be<br>regarded as a privilege,<br>not a right.   | Female<br>Male | 2.57<br>2.32  | 1.95     | 0.051  |
| • All school speakers<br>should be subject to<br>some official screening *<br>process.   | Female<br>Male | 2.67<br>2.36  | 3.20     | 0.002* |
| 5. The administration<br>should exercise control<br>over the contents of the<br>student newspaper.   | Female<br>Male | 2.83          | 3.58     | 0.000* |
| 5. Students involved in<br>civil disobedience off<br>the school premises<br>should be subject to<br>discipline by the<br>school as well as by the<br>local authorities.                | Female<br>Male | 3.79<br>3.54  | 2.66     | 0.008* |

ι\_

0

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Sex

| Attitudinal Statement  | Group  | Group<br>Mean | t-value                               | Prob.        |
|--|--------|---------------|---------------------------------------|--------------|
| I. Faculty Affairs   |        |               |                                       |              |
| . Teaching staff should have the right to  | Female | 2.57          | 0.86                                  | 0.392        |
| express their opinions<br>about any issue in   | Male   | 2,47          | ه<br>ب                                |              |
| various channels of communication, including   |        | đ             | ⊷                                     | ۰<br>د       |
| student newspaper, class-<br>room, etc. without fear<br>of reprisal.                   |        |               | •                                     |              |
| Collective bargaining  | Female | 2.58          |                                       | · · · ·      |
| between teachers and<br>boards should be done  | Male   | 2.63          | -0.38                                 | 0.702        |
| at the local rather<br>than regional level.  | :<br>  |               | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | \$           |
| The value of degree<br>qualifications in<br>recruiting teachers<br>should receive less | Female | 2.71          |                                       | 0 1 2 7      |
|  | Male   | 2.88          | -1.49                                 | 0.137        |
| emphasis.  |        |               |                                       |              |
| • The typical high school curriculum suffers from *                                    | Female | 3.06          | 1.24                                  | •<br>• 0.217 |
| the specialization of teaching staff.  | Male   | 2,94          |                                       |              |
| . There should be more   | Female | 3.75          | 0.95                                  |              |
| professional educators<br>on school boards.  | Male   | 3.68 😁        | 0.85                                  | 0.397        |
| III. Educational Philosophy  |        |               |                                       |              |
| A. Admissions and Standards  |        | 20<br>20      |                                       |              |
| . Departmental exams   | Female | 2.87          |                                       | 0.000        |
| should be reinstated.  | Male   | 2.41          | 4.18                                  | 0.000*       |

'n

3

Trustee Attitudes Relative to Sex

| Attitudinal Statement   | Group          | Group<br>Mean     | t-value    | Prob.  |
|---|----------------|-------------------|------------|--------|
| 2. Socially disadvantaged<br>students who appear to<br>have potential should be<br>admitted to high school<br>programs even when they<br>do not meet normal<br>entrance requirements. | Female<br>Male | 2.61<br>2.65      | -0,47      | 0. 638 |
| 3. Schools should place<br>more emphasis on basic<br>skills rather than<br>vocational programs.   | Female<br>Male | 2.84<br>2.61      | 2.10       | 0.036* |
| <ul> <li>B. Institutional Focus</li> <li>I. The school facilities<br/>and building should be<br/>available for community<br/>use.</li> </ul>  | Female<br>Male | 1.67<br>1.68      | -0.16      | 0.873  |
| 2. Schools should be as<br>concerned with the<br>personal values of its<br>students as it is with<br>their intellectual<br>development.   | Female<br>Male | 1.77<br>1.80      | -0.41<br>¢ | 0.680  |
| 3. The curriculum should be<br>designed to accommodate<br>a wide diversity in<br>student ability levels<br>and educational<br>vocational aspirations.                                 | Female<br>Male | 1.95<br>2.02<br>{ | -0.92      | 0.358  |
| <ol> <li>The schools should be<br/>actively engaged in<br/>solving contemporary<br/>social problems.</li> </ol>   | Female<br>Male | 3.02<br>2.96      | 0.62       | 0.536  |

Trustee Attitudes Relative to Sex

| Attitudinal Statement  | Group  | Group<br>Mean | í<br>t-value | Prob.  |
|--|--------|---------------|--------------|--------|
| C. Administrative Policy   |        |               | •            | 9      |
| 1. Except for matters of a confidential nature, all  | Female | 1.69          | -0.49        | 0.624  |
| board business should be<br>discussed fully in open<br>sessions.   | Male   | 1.73          |              | •      |
| 2. School boards increase<br>the effectiveness of  | Female | 2.17          | 。<br>0.88    | 0 378  |
| school management.   | Male   | 2.11          |              | 0.378  |
| 3. Running a school  | Female | 2.69          |              |        |
| division is basically<br>like running a big<br>business.   | Male   | 2.41          | 2.54         | 0.011, |
| 4. Parent advisory groups  | Female | 2.35          |              | 0.149  |
| to advise the board on<br>educational matters<br>should be established<br>for each school.   | Male   | 2.50          | -1:45        |        |
| 5. School districts should   | Female | 3.30          |              |        |
| be funded entirely from<br>provincial sources rather<br>than having to rely<br>partially upon a local<br>educational property tax<br>assessment. | Male   | 3.40          | -0.80        | 0.426  |
| • All decisions regarding  | Female | 3.33          |              |        |
| curriculum should be<br>made at the local<br>district level.   | Male   | 3.33          | -2.08        | 0.038* |
| • The superintendent should act as a   | Female | 3.40          | -1.91        | 0.056  |
| mediator rather than a<br>leader in the school<br>district.  | Male   | 3.60          | -1.71        | 0.030  |

| Attitudinal Statement                                     | Group  | Group<br>Mean | -value | Prob. |
|---|--------|---------------|--------|-------|
| 8. Increased provincial support of public                 | Female | 3.84          | 0.35   | 0.723 |
| education should mean<br>increased provincial<br>control. | Male   | 3.80          |        | đ     |
| 9. The district superin-<br>tendent should be             | Female | 4.05          | 0.92   | 0.357 |
| provincially appointed.                                   | Male   | 3.97          |        |       |

### Trustee Attitudes Relative to Sex

 $* P \leq 0.05$ 

and standards. Female trustees were significantly less supportive (p = 0.000) of the argument that departmental exams should be reinstated than were male trustees. Similarly, they were less concerned with increasing the emphasis on the development of basic skills as opposed to vocational education. Both male and female trustees supported an admissions policy that granted special concessions for socially dis-advantaged students.

With regard to institutional focus, no significant differences were noted. Both male and female trustees equally supported: community use of the school facilities, emphasis on the development of personal values of students as well as intellectual development, and a broad based curriculum designed to accommodate a wide diversity of student ability levels and vocational aspirations.

In the area of administrative policy, differences were noted on only 2 of 9 variables. Male trustees were significantly more supportive of the statement that "running a school division is basically like running a big business"; and significantly more were opposed to having all curricumum decisions made at the local level.

#### Attitudes Relative To Age

The relationship between trustee attitudes on student related issues, faculty affairs and educational philosophy relative to age were examined by the application of the F-test. For purposes of this analysis trustees were grouped into five age categories: under 30, 30 to 39, 40 to 49, 50 to 59, and 60 or over. Significant differences between groups were observed on 10 of 27 attitudinal statements. The Sheffe procedure was utilized to determine the nature of these differences. The results of the F-tests and the probability matrices for Sheffe multiple comparison of means for each significant variable are presented in Tables XXXVI and XXXVII, respectively.

<u>Student affairs</u>. Significant differences between groups were observed on 3 of 6 attitudinal statements related to student affairs. Analysis revealed that trustees in the 60 or over group were generally more restrictive and control oriented relative to student activities than were other groups of trustees. For example, the older trustees were significantly stronger advocates of both greater discipline in schools, and expulsion or suspension of students who disrupted the normal functioning of the institution. Conversely, there was a tendency for younger trustees to be more strongly opposed to involving the school in disciplinary action against a student involved in civil disobedience off the school premises. Similarly, trustees who were under 30 also differed significantly from all other groups in that they did not feel that there

## TABLE XXXVI

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Age

| Attitudinal Statement  | Age Group                 | Group<br>Mean | f-value                   | Prob.  |
|--|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|--|
|  |                           | بو (          |                           | alar ang |
| I. Student Affairs   |                           |               |                           |  |
| . Students who actively<br>disrupt the functioning<br>of a school by demon-<br>strating, sitting in, | 1. under 30               | 2.00          |                           |  |
|  | 2. 30-39                  | 2.17          | •                         |  |
|  | 3. 40-49                  | 2.07          | 3.18                      | 0.014*                                       |
| or otherwise refusing<br>to obey the rules should  | 4. 50-59                  | 2.11          | c.                        |  |
| be suspended or expelled.  | . 5. 60 or over           | 1.66          |                           |  |
| 2. There is a need for   |                           |               |                           |  |
| greater discipline in the schools.   | 1. under 30               | 3.05          |                           |  |
|  | 2. 30-39                  | 2,04          |                           |  |
|  | 3. 40-49                  | 2.12          | 7.49                      | 0.012*                                       |
|  | 4. 50-59                  | 2.23          |                           |  |
|  | 5. 60 or over             | 1.83          |                           |  |
| /  | 1. under 30               | 2.71          |                           |  |
| schools should be  | 2. 30-39                  | 2.50          | <b>6</b>                  |  |
| regarded as a privilege,<br>not a right.   | 3, 40-49                  | 2.48          | 2.36                      | 0.053  |
|  | 4. 50-59                  | 2.32          |                           |  |
|  | 5. 60 or over             | 1.96          |                           |  |
| ·  | 1. under 30               | 2.48          |                           |  |
| 4. All school speakers<br>should be subject to   | 2. 30-39                  | 2.46          |                           |  |
| some official screening  | 2. 30-39<br>3. 40-49      | 2.43          | 1.47                      | 0.211  |
| process.   | 4. 50-59                  | 2.58          |                           |  |
|  | 4. 50-59<br>5. 60 or over | 2.30          |                           |  |
|  | UU UL UVEL                |               | • • • • • • • • • • • • • |  |
| 5. The administration  | 1. under 30               | 2.71          |                           |  |
| should exercise control<br>over the contents of  | 2. 30-39                  | 2.67          |                           |  |
| the student newspaper.   | 3. 40-49                  | 2.43          | 1.86                      | 0.116  |
|  | 4. 50-59                  | 2.69          |                           |  |
|  | 5. 60 or over             | 2.44          | <b>y</b>                  |  |

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Age

. .

| ttitudinal Statement  | Age Group       | Group<br>Mean | f-value                               | Prob.   |
|---|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| . Students involved in  | 1. under 30     | 4.05          |                                       |   |
| civil disobedience off<br>the school premises   | 2. 30-89        | 3.77          |                                       |   |
| should be subject to  | 3. 40-49        | 3.64          | 2.87                                  | 0.023*  |
| discipline by the school<br>as well as by the local   | 4. 50-59        | 3.51          |                                       |   |
| authorities.  | 5. 60 or over   | 3.34          |                                       |   |
|   | <b>c</b>        |               | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |   |
| I. Faculty Affairs  |                 |               |                                       |   |
| Teaching staff should   | 1. under 30     | 2.14          |                                       |   |
| have the right to<br>express themselves about   | 2. 30-39        | 2.83          |                                       |   |
| any issue in the various<br>channels of communica-<br>tion, including student<br>newspaper, classrooms, | 3. 40-49        | 2.56          | 4.89                                  | 0.0007*   |
|   | 4. 50-59        | 2.28          |                                       |   |
|   | 5. 60 or over   | 2.32          |                                       |   |
| etc. without fear of reprisal.  | $\sim$          |               |                                       |   |
| • Collective bargaining   | 1. undér 30     | 2.09          |                                       |   |
| between teachers and<br>boards should be done   | 2. 30-39        | 2.39          |                                       | 2   |
| at the local rather than  | 3. 40-49        | 2.66          | 3.33                                  | 0.010*  |
| regional level.   | 4. 50-59        | 2.63          |                                       |   |
|   | 5. 60 or over   | 3.05          |                                       |   |
| The value of degree   | 1. under 30     | 2.76          |                                       | <b></b>   |
| qualifications in recruiting teachers   | 2. 30-39        | 2.93          |                                       |   |
| should receive less   | 3. 40-49        | 2.83          | 0.60-                                 | 0.665   |
| emphasis.   | 4. 50-59        | 2.72          |                                       | Harrison († 1930)<br>1970 - Arrison († 1945)<br>1970 - Arrison († 1945) |
|   | 5. 60 or over   | 2.88          |                                       | <i>"</i>  |
| The typical high school   | 1. under 30     | 2.76          |                                       |   |
| curriculum, suffers from  | 2. 30-39        | 3.15          |                                       |   |
| the specialization of teaching staff.   | <b>3.</b> 40–49 | `2.99         | 1.45                                  | 0.217   |
|   | 4. 50-59        | 2.90          | <b>L • T J</b>                        | 0.21/   |
|   | 5. 60 or over   | 2.86          |                                       |   |

Second

Trustee Attitudes Relative to Age

| Attitudinal Statement                                     | Age Group     | Group<br>Mean | f-value   | Prob.  |
|---|---------------|---------------|-----------|--------|
| 5. There should be more                                   | 1. under 30   | 3.00          |           |        |
| professional educators<br>on school boards.               | 2. 30-39      | 3.67          | · · · · · | 4      |
|   | 3. 40-49      | 3.72          | 4.53      | 0.001* |
|   | 4. 50-59      | 3.84          | <b>O</b>  |        |
|   | 5. 60 or over | 3.62          |           |        |
| III. Educational Philosop                                 | hy ·          |               |           |        |
| A. Admissions and Standar                                 | ds            | ,             |           |        |
| 1. Departmental exams                                     | 1. under 30   | 3.00          |           | . • ·  |
| should be reinstated.                                     | 2. 30-39      | 2.73          |           | · .    |
|   | 3. 40-49      | 2.38          | - 3.47    | 0.008* |
|   | 4. 50-59      | 2.61          |           | · · ·  |
|   | 5. 60 or over | 2.28          |           |        |
| 2. Socially disadvantaged                                 | 1. under 30   | 2.67          | •         | •      |
| students ) who appear to                                  | 2. 30-39      | 2.82          |           |        |
| have potential should<br>be admitted to high              | 3. 40-49      | 2.64          | 1.72      | 0.145  |
| school programs even                                      | 4. 50-59      | 2.51          | •         |        |
| when they do not meet<br>normal entrance<br>requirements. | 5. 60 or over | 2.54          |           |        |
| 3. Schools should place                                   | 1. under 30   | 2.52          |           |        |
| <pre>more emphasis on basic skills rather than</pre>      | 2. 30-39      | 2.90          |           |        |
| vocational programs.                                      | 3. 40-49      | 2.59          | 2.81      | 0.025* |
|   | 4. 50-59      | 2.74          |           |        |
|   | 5. 60 or over | 2.38          |           |        |
|   | ی<br>         |               |           |        |

Trustee Attitudes Relative to Age

| ttitudinal Statement                                 | Age Group     | Group<br>Mean                         | f-value | "<br>Prob.                          |
|--|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------|-------------------------------------|
| . ' Institutional Focus                              |               | ··· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |         | -                                   |
| . The school facilities                              | 1. under 30   | 1.81                                  |         | м.<br>• с                           |
| and building should be<br>available for community    | 2. 30-39      | 1.63                                  |         | •                                   |
| use.   | 3. 40-49      | 1.62                                  | 1.40    | 0.234                               |
|  | 4. 50-59      | 1.79                                  | - स्व   |                                     |
|  | 5. 60 or over | 1.64                                  | 1       |                                     |
| Schools should be as                                 | 1. under 30   | 2.09                                  |         |                                     |
| concerned with the                                   | 2. 30-39      | 1.72                                  | ÷       | •                                   |
| personal values of its<br>students as it is with     | 3. 40-49      | 1.80                                  | 1.65    | 0.160                               |
| their intellectual development.                      |               |                                       | 4       |                                     |
| . The curriculum should                              | 1. under 30   | 2.191                                 |         |                                     |
| be designed to                                       | 2. 30-39      | 1.93 🐨                                |         | ÷                                   |
| accommodate a wide<br>diversity in student           | 3. 40-49      | 1.96                                  | 1.02    | 0.397                               |
| ability levels and                                   | 4. 50-59      | 2.08                                  | 1.04    | · · · · · · · · ·                   |
| educational vocational aspirations.                  | 5. 60 or over | 2.01                                  |         | 1999)<br>1999 - 1999<br>1999 - 1999 |
| . The schools should be                              | 1. under 30   | 2:76                                  |         |                                     |
| actively engaged in                                  | 2. 30-39      | 2.77                                  | •       |                                     |
| solving contemporary social problems.                | 3. 40-49      | 2.96                                  | 2.59    | 0.036                               |
|  | 4. 50-59      | 3.12                                  | *       |                                     |
|  | 5. 60 or over | 3.13                                  |         | ч.<br>1                             |
| Administrative Policy                                |               |                                       |         |                                     |
| . Except for matters of a                            | 1. under 30   | 1.81                                  |         | ъ                                   |
| confidential nature, all<br>board business should be | 2. 30-39      | 1.70                                  |         |                                     |
| discussed fully in open                              | 3. 40-49      | 1.71                                  | 1.77    | 0.133                               |
| sessions.  | 4. 50-59      | 1.62                                  |         |                                     |
|  | 5. 60 or over | 1.94                                  |         |                                     |

| Trustee | Attitudes | Relative. | to Age |
|---------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| LLUDLCC |           | VCTUCTAC  | LU MAG |

| tt                                   | itudinal Statement   | Age Group     | Group<br>Mean | f-value                               | Prob.                     | 1       |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------|
| •                                    | School boards increase   | 1. under 30   | 2.36          |                                       |                           |         |
|                                      | the effectiveness of school management.                                      | 2. 30-39      | 2.20          | •                                     | ·                         | o       |
|                                      | school management.   | 3. 40-49      | 2.12          | 1.41                                  | 0.228                     | .t      |
|                                      |  | 4. 50-59      | 2.01          | /                                     |                           |         |
|                                      | •  | 5. 60 or over | 2.16          |                                       |                           |         |
| •                                    | Running a school<br>division is basically<br>like running a big<br>business. | 1. under 30   | 2.52          |                                       | a<br>a                    |         |
|                                      |  | 2. 30-39      | 2.41          | · · ·                                 | •                         | :       |
|                                      |  | 3. 40-49      | 2.49          | 0.73                                  | 0.572                     |         |
|                                      |  | 4. 50-59      | 2.60          |                                       | 21 <sup>11</sup> -        | •       |
|                                      |  | 5. 60 or over | 2.90          |                                       |                           |         |
| •                                    | Parent advisory groups<br>to advise the board on                             | 1. under 30   | 2.38          |                                       |                           |         |
|                                      |  | 2. 30-39      | 2.15          | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | a management of the state |         |
|                                      | educational matters<br>should be established                                 | 3. 40-49      | 2.40          | 6.57                                  | 0.0000*                   |         |
|                                      | for each school.   | 4. 50-59      | 2.60          |                                       | 2                         |         |
| _                                    |  | 5. 60 or over | 2.90          | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |                           |         |
| •                                    | School districts should  | 1. under 30   | 2.81          |                                       |                           |         |
| •                                    | be funded entirely from  | 2. 30-39      | 3.27          | н .<br>• де                           |                           | t.      |
| _                                    | provincial sources rather<br>than having to rely                             | 3. 40-49      | 3.43          | 1.78                                  | 0.1317                    | , · · · |
|                                      | partially upon a local   | 4. 50-59      | 3.49          |                                       |                           | •       |
| educational property tax assessment. | 5. 60-69   | 3.37          | v<br>19       | •                                     |                           |         |
| • All decisions regarding            |  | 1. under 30   | 3.62          |                                       | 4                         |         |
|                                      | curriculum should be   | 2. 30-39      | 3.54          | •                                     |                           | ۰.      |
|                                      | made at the local district level.  | 3. 40-49      | 3.45          | 0.41                                  | 0.803                     | `       |
|                                      |  | 4. 50-59      | 3.46          |                                       |                           |         |
|                                      |  | 5. 60-69      | 3.39          |                                       | . •                       |         |

120

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Age

| Attitudinal Statement                              | Age Group       | Group<br>Méan   | f-value                       | Prob.  |
|--|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|--------|
| . The superintendent                               |                 | 3.00            |                               |        |
| should act as a mediato<br>rather than a leader in | /               | 3.55            |                               | · v    |
| the school district.                               | 3. 40-49        | 3.55            | 1.83                          | 0.1216 |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·              | 4. 50-59        | 3.66            | · · · .                       |        |
| 6  | 5. 60-69        | 3.49            |                               |        |
| . Increased provincial                             | 1. under 30     | 4.00            | •                             |        |
| support of public<br>education should mean         | 2. 30-39        | 3.93            |                               |        |
| increased provincial                               | 3. 40-49        | 3.80            | 1.83                          | 0.1214 |
| control.   | 4. 50-59        | 3.83            |                               |        |
| *  | , 5. 60 or over | 3.49            | ب<br>ب من من خر مر ب بند بر . |        |
| . The district superin-                            | 1. under 30     | 3.90            | •                             |        |
| tendent should be provincially appointed.          | 2. 30-39        | 4.09            | به<br>ب<br>ب                  |        |
| provincially appointed.                            | 3. 40-49        | 4.07            | 1.27                          | 0.281  |
|  | 4. 50-59        | .3.88           |                               |        |
|  | 5. 60 or over   | 3.83            |                               | • .    |
|  |                 | 4 C - C - C - C |                               |        |

\*\P ≤ 0.05

#### TABLE XXXVII

# Probability Matrices for Scheffe Multiple Comparison of Means

#### STUDENT AFFAIRS

1. Students who actively disrupt the functioning of a school by demonstrating, sitting in or otherwise refusing to obey the rules should be suspended or expelled. (Significance at 0.14 level)

#### PROBABILITY MATRIX

|   | 2     | 3     | 4     | 5      |     |
|---|-------|-------|-------|--------|-----|
| 1 | 0.965 | 0.998 | 0.992 | 0.733  |     |
| 2 | δ     | 0.951 | 0.993 | 0.024* | . 1 |
| 3 | •     |       | 0.998 | 0.081* | K   |
| 4 | •     | . •   |       | 0.053* |     |

2. There is a need for greater discipline in schools. (Significance at 0.12 level)

#### PROBABILITY MATRIX

|     | 2   |          | 3      | 4      | . 5    |
|-----|-----|----------|--------|--------|--------|
| . 1 | 0.0 | 00*      | 0.001* | 0.067* | 0.000* |
| 2   | •   |          | 0.974  | 0.607  | 0.749  |
| 3   |     | <b>A</b> |        | 0.887  | 0.382  |
| 4   |     |          |        | ່,<br> | 0.102  |

# Probability Matrices for Scheffe Multiple Comparison of Means

| leve | 1.      | ner than regional 1 | evel. (Significa | nce at 0.010) |
|------|---------|---------------------|------------------|---------------|
|      | ۰.      | PROBABILITY I       | MATRIX           | •             |
| ,    |         |                     |                  | c             |
|      | 2       | ° 3 '               | 4                | 5             |
| 1    | 0.920   | 0.474               | 0.540            | 0.082*        |
| 2    | . = .   | 0.598               | 0.729            | 0.047*        |
| 3    |         |                     | 0.999            | 0.428         |
| 4    |         |                     |                  | 0.382         |
| •    | · · · · |                     |                  |               |

PROBABILITY MATRIX

3

0.011\*

0.995 م

<u>.</u> 4

0.002\*

0.682

0.847

Ņ

່ພ

2

0.030\*

4.

1 .

- 2

3

•

5

0.085\*

0.997.

0.971

0.641

#### Probability Matrices for Scheffe Multiple Comparison of Means

5. Students involved in civil disobedience off the school premises should be subject to discipline by the school as well as local officials. (Significance at 0.023 level)

#### PROBABILITY MATRIX



#### FACULTY AFFAIRS

1

2

3

4

1. Teaching staff should have the right to express themselves about any issue in the various channels of communication open to them, including student newspaper, the classroom, etc. without fear of reprisal. (Significance at 0.007 level)

#### PROBABILITY MATRIX



#### Probability Matrices for Scheffe Multiple Comparison of Means

# EDUCATIONAL PHILOSOPHY

1

1. Departmental exams should be reinstated. (Significance at 0.008 level)

#### PROBABILITY MATRIX

. .

|     |       | '     |       |       |
|-----|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|     | 2 *   | . 3   | 4     | 5     |
| 1   | 0.962 | 0.214 | 0.694 | 0+173 |
| 2   |       | 0.162 | 0.953 | 0.192 |
| 3 j |       | ۵     | 0.523 | 0.989 |
| 4   |       |       |       | 0.478 |

2. Schools should place more emphasis on basic skills rather than vocational programs. (Significance at 0.025 level)

#### PROBABILITY MATRIX

2

0

|     |       | <i>n</i> . |               |                  |
|-----|-------|------------|---------------|------------------|
|     | 2     | 3          | 4             | 5                |
| 1   | 0.697 | 0.999      | 0,939         | ° 0 <b>.99</b> 3 |
| 2   | с.,   | 0.236      | 0.867         | 0.066            |
| 3 , |       | •          | 0.812         | 0.820            |
| 4   |       |            | <b>)</b><br>- | 0.331            |

'3

Å

#### Probability Matrices for Scheffe' Multiple Comparison of Means

Ŷ

The schools should be actively engaged in solving contemporary social problems. (Significance at 0.036)

#### PROBABILITY MATRIX

| .2    | 3                                     | 4     | 5     |
|-------|---------------------------------------|-------|-------|
| 1.000 | 0.839                                 | 0.654 | 0.683 |
|       | 0.642                                 | 0.107 | 0.256 |
|       | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 0.755 | 0.848 |
|       |                                       | 0.735 | 1,000 |

Parent advisory groups to advise the board on educational matters should be established for each school. (Significance at 0,000)

#### PROBABILITY MATRIX

| 2                     | 3  | 4              | . 5             |
|-----------------------|--|----------------|-----------------|
| 0.915                 | 1.000<br>0.383   | 0.926<br>0.015 | 0.362<br>0.000* |
| $\mathbf{\hat{s}}$    |  | 0.553          | 0.024*          |
| <ul> <li>◆</li> </ul> | <b>5</b><br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10<br>10 |                | 0.420           |

\*P ≤ 0.10

1

2

3

ъ

1

2

3

4

was a need for greater discipline in schools.

Faculty affairs. Relative to faculty related issues, significant differences between the response patterns of different age groups were noted on 3 of the 5 variables. Trustees in the under 30, the 50 to 59, and 60 or over age categories were significantly more in favor of freedom of expression for staff members than were trustees in the 30 to 39 and 40 to 49 age categories. With respect to collective bargaining trustees in the 60 or over age category favored regional, as opposed to local negotiations significantly more than did trustees under 39 years of age. Trustees in the under 30 age group differed significantly from all other trustees with regard to their perceptions of the desirability of having more professional educators on boards. Younger trustees were generally undecided on this issue while all other trustees were strongly opposed.

Educational philosophy. In terms of general educational philosophy, analyses revealed significant differences between groups on only 4 of 16 variables. Trustees in the 60 or over age category favored the return of Departmental exams to a considerably greater extent than did trustees in the under 30 age group. Similarly, trustees in the 60 or over group placed significantly more emphasis on basic skills as opposed to vocational programs than did trustees in the 30 to 39 age category. The only other significant difference in the area of educational philosophy related to the advocacy of parent advisory groups. Older trustees, particularly those in the 60 or over age category, were considerably more ambivalent about the desirability of parent advisory groups than were trustees in the 30 to 39 and 40 to 49 age groups.

## Attitudes Relative to Professional Status

To determine whether significant differences existed between the attitudes held by trustees and their status as professionals or nonprofessionals, the t-test was applied. Trustees were categorized as professional or nonprofessional as indicated in Table IX. Of the 27 attitudinal statements analyzed, significant differences were observed on only 5 variables (Table XXXVIII).

<u>Student affairs</u>. In the area of student affairs nonprofessionals appeared to be more restrictive and control oriented than were the professionals. For example, nonprofessionals were significantly more in agreement with the argument that there was a need for greater discipline in schools (p = 0.036). Similarly, nonprofessional trustees were more inclined to view attendance at public schools as a privilege rather than a right (p = 0.005). Supportive also of the above was the strong trend toward significance (0.068) noted relative to expulsion or suspension of disruptive students; nonprofessionals were generally more supportive of expulsion or suspension than were professionals. These findings are suggestive of a greater concern with student discipline and control on the part of nonprofessional trustees.

Faculty affairs. With respect to faculty affairs, very few differences between groups were noted. Both groups were undecided regarding the impact that specialization of the teaching staff had on the high school curriculum, and both groups advocated freedom of expression for the teaching staff. The only significant difference noted related to board composition. Nonprofessional trustees were more adamant in their opposition to increasing the number of professional

# TABLE XXXVIII

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Professional or Nonprofessional Status

| <u>At</u>  | titudinal Statement  | Group           | Group<br>Mean | 't-value       | Prob.  |
|--|--|-----------------|---------------|----------------|--------|
| I.   | Student Affairs  |                 |               |                |        |
| 1.   | Students who actively<br>disrupt the function-   | Nonprofessional | 2.00          | -1.84          | 0.068  |
|  | ing of a school by<br>demonstrating, sitting<br>in, or otherwise<br>refusing to obey the<br>rules should be<br>expelled or sus-<br>pended. | Professional    | 2.22          |                |        |
| <br>2.   | There is a need for  | Nonprofessional | 2.10          |                | 0.036* |
|  | greater discipline<br>in schools.  | Professional    | • 2.31        | -2.10          |        |
| 3.   | Attendance at public schools should be   | Nonprofessional | 2.31          |                |        |
|  | regarded as a<br>privilege, not a<br>right.  | Professional    | 2.71          | 2.84           | 0.005* |
| 4.   | All school speakers<br>should be subject to  | Nonprofessional | 2.46          | 0.48           | 0.633  |
|  | some official screen-<br>ing process.  | Professional    | 2.41          | • • • • •<br>• |        |
| and the second | The administration should exercise   | Nonprofessional | 2.54          | -0.47          | 0.334  |
|  | control over the<br>contents of the<br>student newspaper.  | Professional    | 2.65          |                |        |
| school as well as  |  | Nonprofessional | 3.59          |                | 0.000  |
|  | obedience off the<br>school premises   | Professional 、  | 3.69          | -0.85          | 0.396  |

-

0

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Professional or Nonprofessional Status

с. <del>.</del>

| Attitudinal Statement  | Group .                      | Group<br>Mean | t-value | Prob.          |
|--|------------------------------|---------------|---------|----------------|
| M. Faculty Affairs   | e<br>                        |               | (       |                |
| Teaching staff should have the right to  | Nonprofessional              | 2.49          | -0.66   | 0.512          |
| express their<br>opinions about any<br>issue in various<br>channels of communi-<br>cation, including<br>student newspaper,<br>classroom, etc. with-<br>out fear of reprisal. | Professional                 | 2.57          |         |                |
| 2. Collective bargain-<br>ing between teachers   | Nonprofessional              | 2.62          | -0.21   | 0.835          |
| and boards should be<br>done at the local<br>rather than regional<br>level.  | Professional                 | 2.65          | -0-21   | <b>V-0-3-3</b> |
| 3. The value of degree qualifications in   | Nonprofessional              | 2.78          | -1.92   | 0.056          |
| recruiting teachers<br>should receive less<br>emphasis   | Professional                 | 3.02          |         |                |
| 4. The typical high school curriculum  | Nonprofessio <del>na</del> 1 | 2.97          | -0.35   | 0.724          |
| suffers from the<br>specialization of<br>teaching staff.   | Professional                 | 3.01          | -0-33   | 0.724          |
| There should be more professional educa-   | Nonprofessional              | 3.78          | <br>2   | 0.000          |
| tors on school boards.   | Professional                 | 3.41          | 3.22    | 0.002*         |

.

## Trustee Attitudes Relative to Professional or Nonprofessional Status

...

| Attitudinal Statement   | Group               | Group<br>Mean | t-value    | Der-1-           |
|---|---------------------|---------------|------------|------------------|
|   | Group               | mean          | <u> </u>   | Prob.            |
| III. Educational Philoso  | phy                 | ۲.            | <b>S</b> . |                  |
| Admissions and Standa   | rds                 |               |            |                  |
| . Departmental exams should be reinstated.  | Nonprofessional     | 2.40          | -2.47      | 0.014            |
|   | Professional        | 2.78          |            | 0.014            |
| . Socially disadvan-<br>taged students who  | Nonprofessional     | 2.64          | -0.25,     | 0.802            |
| appear to have<br>potential should be<br>admitted to high                                 | Professional        | 2.66          |            | 0.002            |
| school programs even<br>when they do not meet<br>normal entrance                          |                     | •             |            |                  |
| requirements.   |                     |               |            |                  |
| • Schools should place more emphasis on   | Nonprofessional     | 2.65          | -0.99      | می<br>9<br>0.322 |
| basic skills rather<br>than vocational<br>programs.                                       | <b>Professional</b> | 2.77          | -0.37      |                  |
| . Institutional Focus   |                     |               |            |                  |
| • The school facili-<br>ties and building   | Nonprofessional     | 1.70          | 0.99       | 0.325            |
| should be available<br>for community use.   | Professional        | 1.62          |            |                  |
| <ul> <li>Schools should be as<br/>concerned with the</li> </ul>                           | Nonprofessional     | 1.80          | 0.60       | <br>0 552        |
| personal values of<br>its students as it<br>is with their<br>intellectual<br>development. | <b>Professional</b> |               |            | 0.552            |

5
## TABLE XXXVIII (Cont.)

## Trustee Attitudes Relative to Professional or Nonprofessional Status

| Att | titudinal Statement  | Group           | Group<br>Mean | t-value                               | Prob.    |
|-----|--|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|----------|
| 3.  | The curriculum should<br>be designed to  | Nonprofessional | 2.03          | 1.67                                  | 0.095    |
|     | accommodate a wide<br>diversity in student<br>ability levels and                             | Professional    | 1.89 '        | •                                     |          |
|     | educational vocational aspirations.  |                 | الحجر بر      | ,                                     |          |
| 4.  | The schools should be actively engaged in  | Nonprofessional | 3.02          | 1.83                                  | 0.067    |
|     | solving contemporary<br>social problems.   | Professional    | 2.82          |                                       |          |
| с.  | Administrative Policy  |                 | 1             | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • | <i>"</i> |
| 1.  | Except for matters of a  | Nonprofessional | 1.72          | -0.17.                                | 0.865    |
|     | confidential nature,<br>all board business<br>should be discussed<br>fully in open sessions. | Professional    | 1.73          |                                       | 0.005    |
| 2.  | School boards increase   | Nonprofessional | 1.80          |                                       | 0.552    |
|     | the effectiveness of school management.  | Professional    | 1.75          | 0.60                                  | 0.552    |
| 3.  | Running a school   | Nonprofessional | 2.35          | · E\ 70                               | 0.000*   |
|     | division is basically<br>like running a big<br>business.                                     | Professional    | 3.02          |                                       |          |
| 4.  | Parent advisory<br>groups to advise the  | Nonprofessional | 2.48          | 0.79                                  | 0.429    |
|     | board on educational<br>matters should be<br>established for each<br>school.                 | Professional    | 2.39          |                                       |          |

)

## TABLE XXXVIII (Cont.)

## Trustee Attitudes Relative to Professional or Nonprofessional Status

| Attitudinal Statement  | Group               | Group<br>Mean | t-value | Prob. |
|--|---------------------|---------------|---------|-------|
| 5. School districts<br>should be funded  | Nonprofessional     | 3.34          | -1.38   | 0.168 |
| entirely from provin-<br>cial sources rather                                   | Professional        | 3.52          |         |       |
| than having to rely<br>partially upon a<br>local educational                   |                     |               | / =     |       |
| property tax assess-<br>ment.  |                     |               | •<br>•  |       |
| 5. All decisions regard-   | Nonprofessional     | 3.47          | -0.31   | 0.757 |
| ing curriculum should<br>be made at the local<br>district level.               | <b>Professional</b> |               | -0.JT   | 0.151 |
| 7. The superintendent<br>should act as a                                       | Nonprofessional     | 3.52          | -1.08   | 0.279 |
| mediator rather than<br>a leader in the school<br>district.                    | Professional        | 3.65          | -1.00   | 0.279 |
| 3. Increased provincial  | Nonprofessional     | 3.80          | -0.20   | 0 0 0 |
| support of public<br>education should<br>mean increased<br>provincial control. | Professional        | 3.83          | -0.20   | 0.840 |
| 9. The district superin-<br>tendent should be                                  | Nonprofessional     | 3.97          | -0.91   | 0.363 |
| provincially<br>appointed.   | Professional        | 4.08          | -0.91   | 0.303 |

\* P ≤ 0.05

132

ډ,

educators on school boards than were professional trustees (p = 0.002).

Educational philosophy. Regarding educational philosophy, significant differences were noted on only 2 of 16 statements. Professionals generally were not as supportive of reinstating Departmental exams (p = 0.014). Further, professionals were undecided relative to the issue of whether or not running a school division was like running a big business, while nonprofessionals agreed with this position (p = 0.000).

#### Attitudes Relative to Experience

To determine whether there were significant differences in the attitudes of newly elected as opposed to more experienced trustees the t-test was applied. Trustee attitudes were analyzed in terms of two experience categories: (1) trustees with less than one year of experience, and (2) trustees with one year of experience or more. The results are presented in Table XXXIX.

<u>Student and Maculty affairs</u>. Analysis revealed that, apart from stronger opposition by more experienced trustees to increasing the number of professional educators on school boards, there were no significant differences between the response patterns of newly elected and experienced trustees relative to student or faculty affairs.

<u>Educational philosophy</u>. In terms of educational philosophy significant differences were observed on 6 of 16 variables. Recently elected trustees were significantly more strongly supportive of: (1) a broad based curriculum; (2) school involvement in solving contemporary social problems; and (3) establishing parent advisory groups to advise the board on educational issues. More experienced

#### TABLE XXXIX

## Trustee Attitudes Relative to Experience

| Attitudinal Statement   | Experience<br>Group   | Group<br>Mean | t-value  | Prob.    |
|---|---|---------------|--|----------|
|   |   |               | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·          |          |
| I. Student Affairs  |   |               |  | . 1      |
| 1. Students who actively  | Less than one year  | 2.15          |  |          |
| disrupt the function-   | Hess than one year  |               | ,1.68  | 0.093    |
| ing of a school by  | More than one year  | 2.00          | ۲.<br>۲  | . عر     |
| demonstrating, sit-   |   | , <i>i</i>    | •  |          |
| Sting in, or otherwise<br>refusing to obey the  |   |               |  |          |
| rules should be   |   |               |  | ·<br>• • |
| expelled or suspen-   | C   |               |  | •        |
| ded.  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                                   |               | <i>с</i>                                       | •        |
|   | Tage then one wear  | 2.08          | ;  | -        |
| 2. There is a need for greater discipline   | Less than one year  | 2.00          | -1.13  | 0.258    |
| in schools.   | More than one year  | 2.18          |  | र        |
| ہ تو تو ہو ہو ہو بد خذ ہے ہو نو ہو   | ہے جب سے بنا ہے جب سے نے جب سے جب بنا ہے ہے جب بنا ہ                    |               |  |          |
| 3. Attendance at public   | Less than one year  | 2.41          | ·  |          |
| schools should be   | None then one week  | 2.39          | 0.15   | 0.884    |
| regarded as a privilege, not a  | More than one year  | 2.37          |  |          |
| right.  |   |               |  |          |
| ہ جو جو ملہ بنا جن ہوا ہو، دن بڑا لیڈ بنا ہو، این جو جو جو زند جو ہو اور اور اور اور اور اور اور اور اور او |   |               | ۵۵ ماد وبه همه <u>م</u> ه منه مع مع مع بدو بين |          |
| 4. All school speakers  | Less than one year  | 2.48          | 0.64   | 0 505    |
| should be subject to some official screen-  | More than one year  | 2.42          | 0.64   | 0.525    |
| ing process.  | fore chair one year   | 2.44          |  |          |
|   | است. بین که است بین است می سن است می می این سر که بین بین بین بین این ا |               |  |          |
| 5. The administration   | Less than one year  | 2.61          | 2  |          |
| should exercise   |   | 0.55          | 0.60   | 0.549    |
| control over the contents of the  | More than one year  | 2.55          | •  |          |
| student newspaper.  |   |               | ÷ .  | ż        |
| د هم الله خارج الله الله الله الله الله الله الله الل   |   |               |  |          |
| 6. Students involved  | Less than one year  | 3.67          | н <sup>с</sup>                                 |          |
| In civil dis-   | •   | ·             | 0.78   | 0.436    |
| obedience off the   | More than one year  | 3.59          |  | N A S    |
| school premises<br>should be subject  |   |               | Q  | •        |
| to discipline by  |   |               |  | ÷        |
| the school as well  |   |               |  |          |
| as by the local   |   |               |  | Ň        |
| authorities.  |   |               |  |          |

a 7

## TABLE XXXIX (Cont.)

15

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Experience

|  | Experience           | Group      |                                      |  |
|--|----------------------|------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Attitudinal Statement                                      | Group                | Mean       | t-value                              | Prob.  |
| II. Faculty Affairs  |                      |            | •                                    |  |
| 1. Teaching staff should<br>have the right to              | Less than one year   | 2.56       | 0.85                                 | 0.395  |
| express their opinions about any                           | More than one year   | 2.47       | •                                    | · .  |
| issue in various<br>channels of communi-                   | /.<br>               |            |                                      |  |
| cation, including<br>student newspaper,<br>classroom, etc. |                      | •          |                                      | s .  |
| without fear of reprisal.                                  | ê                    | 59<br>1. 9 | • • • • •                            |  |
| 2. Collective bar-<br>gaining between                      | • Less than one year | 2.57       |                                      |  |
| teachers and boards<br>should be done at                   | More than one year   | 2.63       | -0.51                                | 0.608  |
| the local rather<br>than regional level.                   |                      |            |                                      | с.<br>С. С. С |
| 3. The value of degree qualifications in                   | Less than one year   | 2.82       | -0.13                                | σ<br>0.894                                     |
| recruiting teachers should receive less                    | More than one year   | 2.83       |                                      |  |
| emphasis.  |                      |            |                                      |  |
| 4. The typical high school curriculum                      | Less than one year   | 2.96       | -0.37                                | 0.700  |
| suffers from the<br>specialization of<br>teaching staff.   | More than one year   | 2.99       | -0.37                                | 0.700  |
|  |                      |            | ،<br>جو جو جه هد هم من فت حق که که م |  |
| 5. There should be more professional                       | Less than one year   | 3.55       | -2.88                                | 0.004*   |
| educators on school<br>boards.                             | More than one year   | 3.79       | • • • • • • • • •                    |  |
|  | •                    |            |                                      |  |

# Table XXXIX (Cont.)

٩,

40.

# Trustee Attitudes Relative to Experience

| At       | titudinal Statement   | Experience<br>Group                      | Group<br>Mean | t-value | Prob. | *       |
|----------|---|--|---------------|---------|-------|---------|
| II<br>A. | I. Educational Philos<br>Admissions and Stand   | ,  | •             |         |       |         |
| 1.       | Departmental exams<br>should be re-<br>instated.  | Less than one year<br>More than one year | 2.55<br>2.54  | 0.14    | 0.891 | •       |
| 2.       | Socially disadvan-<br>taged students who<br>appear to have poten-   | Less than one year<br>More than one year | 2,62          | -0.39   | 0.696 | · · · · |
|          | tial should be<br>admitted to high<br>school programs even<br>when they do not meet<br>normal entrance<br>requirements. |  | ́л            | •       |       | Y       |
| 3.       | Schools should place<br>more emphasis on basic<br>skills rather than<br>vocational programs.                            | Less than one year<br>More than one year | 2.69<br>2.67  | 0.18    | 0.857 |         |
| в.       | Institutional Focus   |  |               |         |       | •       |
|          | The school facilities<br>and building should<br>be available for<br>community use.                                      | Less than one year<br>More than one year | 1.66<br>1.69  | -0.43   | 0.669 |         |
|          | Schools should be as  | Less than one year                       | 1.75          |         |       |         |
|          | concerned with the<br>personal values of<br>its students as it is<br>with their intellec-<br>tual development.          | More than one year                       | 1.82          | -0.95   | 0.340 | •       |

136<sub>1</sub>

## TABLE XXXIX (Cont.)

. ~.

## Trustee Attitudes Relative to Experience

.

| Attitudinal Statement  | E: | xperience<br>Group   | 2           | Group<br>Mean | t-value                     | Prob.  |
|--|----|----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------------------|--------|
| 3. The curriculum should<br>be designed to<br>accommodate a wide<br>diversity in student<br>ability levels and<br>educational voca-<br>tional aspirations. | ,  | than one<br>than one | •           | 1.88<br>2.08  | -2.59                       | 0.010* |
| <ol> <li>The schools should<br/>be actively engaged<br/>in solving contem-<br/>porary social<br/>problems.</li> </ol>                                      |    | than one             |             |               | -2.04                       | 0.042* |
| C. Administrative Polic  | :у |                      | ,<br>,<br>, | <b></b>       | • • • • • • • • • • • • • • |        |
| 1. Except for matters<br>of a confidential<br>nature, all board<br>business should be<br>discussed fully in<br>open sessions.                              |    | than one             |             |               | 0.94                        | 0.350  |
| <ol> <li>School boards<br/>increase the effect-<br/>iveness of school<br/>management.</li> </ol>   |    | han one<br>han one   |             |               | .2.47                       | 0.014* |
| 3. Running a school<br>division is basically<br>like running a big<br>business.  |    | han one'<br>han one' |             |               | -0.93                       | Q.352  |
| <ol> <li>Parent advisory<br/>groups to advise the<br/>board on educational<br/>matters should be<br/>established for each<br/>school.</li> </ol>           |    | han one<br>han one   |             | 2.33<br>2.54  | -2.26                       | 0.024* |
| ، سے بہت ہوا سے سے سے سنا سنا کے دور سے من من کو کہ اور اس من اور  |    |                      |             |               | <del>-</del>                |        |

## TABLE XXXIX (Cont.)

•1

ĆŲ

Trustee Attitudes Relative to Experience

.,

.

| Attitudinal Statement  | Experience<br>Group                      | Group<br>Mean | t-value        | Prob.  |                |
|--|--|---------------|----------------|--------|----------------|
| • School districts<br>should be funded<br>entirely from                | Less than one year<br>More than one year | 3.23          | -2.09          | 0.037* |                |
| provincial sources 👻   | ibre than one year                       | 3441          |                | •      | -              |
| to,rely partially<br>upon a focal educa-                               | 6  |               |                | . 13   | *****<br>***** |
| tional property tax assessment.  |  |               |                |        |                |
| 6. All decisions   | Less than the year                       | 3.39          | •              | ,      | •              |
| regarding curriculum<br>should be made at the<br>local district level. | More that the year                       | 3.53          | -1.60          | 0.104  | •              |
| • The superin-<br>tendent should act                                   | Less than one year                       | 3.27          | -4.53          | 0.000* |                |
| as a mediator rather<br>than a leader in the<br>school district.       | More than one year                       | 3.71          | - <b>4.</b> 33 | 0.000  |                |
| ······································                                 |  |               |                | ۍ<br>  |                |
| . Increased provin-<br>cial support of                                 | Less than one year                       | 3.88          | 1.13           | 0.258  | ۵.<br>         |
| public education<br>should mean increased<br>provincial control.       | More than one year                       | 3.77 .        | · •            |        | .•             |
| <br>• The district super-<br>intendent should be                       | Less than one year                       | 3.96          | -0.70          | 0.484  | •              |
| • 44   | More than one year                       | •             | - U • 7 U      | V• 404 | ,              |
| · · ·  |  |               |                |        | ÷              |

trustees were in significantly greater opposition to: (1) complete provincial funding of education, and (2) having the superintendent act as a mediator rather than a leader. As might be expected, recently elected trustees were also significantly less certain that school boards increased the effectiveness of school district management.

#### SUMMARY

This chapter has had a twofold focus. Survey results outlining trustee attitudes toward board composition, selection of trustees, selection of a superintendnet, student affairs, faculty affairs, and educational philosophy, were presented. Further, the relationship between the age, sex, occupation, education and experience of trustees relative to selected educational issues were portrayed.

#### Board Composition and Selection

2

Analyses revealed that trustees generally supported the status quo regarding board composition. They strongly favored local election of trustees as opposed to provincial appointment; and they did not endorse the concept of participatory management involving staff and parents if it represented shared authority at the board level.

Interest in education, time to devote to board activities and an understanding of educational issues were seen by trustees as the most desirable characteristics for prospective trustees. It was interesting to note, however, that many trustees in their written comments indicated that the only real prerequisite for tructeeship was that the person be elected.

### Selection of the Superintendent

With regard to the selection of a superintendent, successful teaching experience, experience in public school administration, and established leadership ability were identified as absolutely essential characteristics. Investigation of trustee attitudes relative to education, experience, sex and occupation revealed the following insights:

1) Trustees with higher levels of formal education placed significantly more value on established leadership ability, and significantly less value on the importance of degree qualifications, experience in business management, and a personal life free from complications in selecting a superintendent, than did trustees with lower levels of formal education;

2) Experienced trustees placed significantly more value on established leadership ability than did recently elected trustees;

3) Female trustees placed significantly less value on a personal life free from complications than did males; and

4) Professionals placed less value on business management experience than did nonprofessionals.

#### Student Affairs

With regard to student affairs, trustees as a group were somewhat restrictive and control oriented. They generally advocated greater discipline in schools, administrative control over student newspapers and student guest speakers, and suspension or expulsion of students who disrupted the operation of the school. Analysis of the student related variables did, however, reveal significant differences between the attitudes held by different groups of trustees by age, sex, education, and occupation. These differences are summarized below.

1) The higher the level of formal education of trustees, the lower the degree of student control and restriction advocated;

2) Female trustees were significantly less adamant in their support of firm and extensive student discipline and control than were their male counterparts;

3) Trustees in the 60 or over age category were generally stronger advocates of increased control and restriction of student activities. Conversely, trustees in the under 30 age category did not feel that there was a need for greater discipline;

4) Trustees who were identified as nonprofessionals were significantly more supportive of greater student discipline than were the professionals; and

5) No significant differences between the response patterns of recently elected and more experienced trustees, relative to student affairs, were noted.

#### Faculty Affairs

In the area of faculty related affairs trustees were generally supportive of freedom of expression for teachers and local as opposed to regional bargaining. They tended to feel that degree qualifications in recruiting staff should receive less emphasis and they strongly disagreed with the statement that there should be more professional educators on school boards. Other findings relative to faculty affairs included:

1) Trustees with a university degree or higher generally felt that degree qualifications should not receive less emphasis in recruiting staff, while trustees with lower levels of education advocated less emphasis. Similarly, the lower the level of formal education, the greater the opposition to increasing the number of professional educators on boards.

2) Trustees in the 60 or over age group were significantly more supportive of freedom of expression for teachers. Trustees in the under 30 group were generally undecided on the issue of increasing the number of professional educators on boards, while all other age groups were opposed.

3) No significant differences concerning faculty affairs were noted between the attitudes of female and male trustees.

4) The only difference between the views of professional as opposed to nonprofessional trustees was found in greater opposition by nonprofessionals to increasing the number of professional educators on boards.

5) Similarly, the only difference noted with regard to faculty issues relative to trustee experience was the significantly stronger opposition by more experienced trustees to increasing the number of professional educators on boards.

#### Educational Philosophy

The majority of trustees generally favored an open admissions policy that permitted special consideration for socially disadvantaged students. Similarly, a broad based curriculum designed to meet a wide diversity of student interests and ability levels, emphasis on personal values as well as intellectual development, and community use of school facilities were generally advocated.

With regard to administrative policy, trustees, for the most part, equated school division management with running a large business, felt. the school boards increased the effectiveness of school district management, supported open meetings, favored local appointment of superintendents and were generally opposed to increased provincial control of education.

With regard to the relationships between trustees' age, sex, occupation, experience and education and trustee attitudes relative to educational philosophy, the following generalizations were reflected in the data.

1) Higher levels of formal education were generally associated with greater willingness on the part of trustees to make school facilities available for community use; stronger support for the concept of parent advisory groups for each school; greater support for a broad based curriculum; and stronger opposition to complete local control of curriculum and complete provincial funding of education. Lower levels of formal education were generally associated with stronger support for reinstating Departmental exams; greater trustee confidence in the effectiveness of school boards in increasing the efficiency of school district management; and strong support for the argument that running a school division was like running a large business.

Y

2) Few significant differences between the attitudes of males and females relative to educational philosophy were noted. Females were less supportive of reinstating Departmental exams, and less concerned with increasing the emphasis on basic skill development than were males. , 3) Trustees in the 60 or over age group generally advocated greater support for reinstating Departmentals and increasing the emphasis on the "basics," and less support for parent advisory groups than did other trustees.

4) Apart from the fact that professionals were significantly less supportive of reinstating Departmental exams, and did not agree that running a school district was like running a big business, there were no significant differences in the attitudes of professional as opposed to nonprofessional trustees in the area of educational philosophy.

5) Recently elected trustees were significantly more supportive of a broad based curriculum, school involvement in solving contemporary social problems, and establishing parent groups to advise the board on educational issues. More experienced trustees were in significantly greater opposition to complete provincial funding of education, and having the superintendent and as a mediator rather than a leader.

In summary trustee attitudes generally reflected a conservative perspective with regard to student affairs, faculty affairs, and educational philosophy. In terms of board selection and composition, trustees appeared to be quite satisfied with the status quo. However, it was apparent that trustees' attitudes were significantly related to their age, sex, educational level, occupation, and experience. The implications of these and other findings will be discussed in the following chapter.

#### CHAPTER VII

## SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

This chapter reviews and summarizes the research problems, the methodology employed, and the results of the study. In addition, conclusions and implications of the findings are discussed and some directions for further research are suggested.

#### SUMMARY

Locally elected school trustees have traditionally played an important part in the administration of education in this province. However, despite the significance of their roles, precious little is known about them. This study sought partial resolution of this problem in terms of an investigation into the backgrounds, roles, and educational attitudes of Alberta trustees. Among the major areas explored were the demographic and social characteristics of board members, trustee roles and functions, and trustee attitudes relative to locus of authority, selection of a superintendent, board composition, trustee selection, student related issues, faculty affairs, and educational philosophy in general. In addition, the relationships between trustee characteristics and attitudes were explored.

A review of the literature and research relative to trustees was undertaken with specific emphasis upon the historical evolution of school boards, the roles and functions of trustees, trustee selection, board composition, and trustee attitudes and opinions. The search revealed a paucity of Canadian literature on trusteeship,

Ģ

however, and number of relevant American studies were noted.

Generally, the literature (1) emphasized the traditional role of lay representation in school administration; (2) identified the typical trustee as: middle aged, male, financially well off, and employed in the professional or business fields; (3) viewed the role of the school board relative to decision-making as becoming less important as a result of governmental control and trustee deference to educational expertise; and 4) identified social status variables as related to trustee attitudes, opinions and effectiveness.

The data for the study were collected by the distribution of a 16 page questionnaire that represented a revision of an instrument used by Konrad (1975) in his study of community college trustees in Alberta, British Columbia, and Quebec. Input from trustees, ASTA officials, school superintendents, and secretary-treasurers was sought in the modification of the instrument.

The entire population of public school trustees in the province of Alberta was invited to participate in the study. In total 488 usable responses out of a possible 953 were received for a return rate of 51.3 per cent. The response was generally representative of the province relative to both jurisdiction size and geographic location.

The data were compiled and analyzed with the assistance of the University of Alberta's computer services and the SPSS and DERS computer programs. Both parametric and non-parametric procedures were employed; however, where possible preference was given to parametric procedures. Survey data relative to trustee characteristics, functions, and attitudes were reported by the use of means and/or relative frequencies. Determination of differences between the responses of trustee groups relative to continuous variables was accomplished primarily by the application of t-tests, F-tests and the Scheffe'procedure. The chi square was employed to compare non-continuous variables such as sex by geogrpahic location; and a Spearman rank order correlation provided a comparison of trustee responses relative to actual and preferred locus of authority.

The data analyses were organized into three general categories; these being the profile of the Alberta School Trustee, the roles and functions of the Alberta school trustee, and trustee attitudes and opinions on selected issues. The various data analyses revealed the following findings.

The trustee profile. Data analyses relative to sex, age, socio-economic status, political preferences and experience revealed that:

1. Trustees in Alberta were predominantly male (71%). An analysis of sex distribution by jurisdiction size indicated that jurisdiction size and the percentage of female trustees were positively related (46% of the respondents from the large urban centres were females compared with 19% for rural areas). Similarly, Southern Alberta had the fewest female trustees (23% compared with 27% for Northern Alberta and 34% for Central Alberta).

2. The majority of trustees (61%) were in the 40-49 age groups. Very few trustees (4%) were under 30 years old.  $^{\prime}$ 

3. Sex distribution relative to age was similar across the various age groups with one exception. In the 60-69 year age group there were disproportionately fewer females.

4. In terms of level of formal education trustees presented an interesting profile. Approximately half (47%) had not gone beyond high school (22% of these did not complete high school). One out of four respondents (28%) had a University degree or higher and the remaining 27 percent had attended college, technical school or some university.

5. Larger jurisdictions recorded a significantly higher proportion of well educated trustees than did the smaller areas. Similarly, the larger the jurisdiction, the greater the percentage of professionals on school boards.

6. With regard to occupation, 29 percent of the trustees were farmers; 20 percent were businessmen and 17 percent were housewives. Only 21 percent were employed in a professional field.

7. Financially trustees appeared to be extremely well off. Over half (62%) indicated annual family net incomes in excess of , \$20,000 and 32 percent had incomes in excess of \$30,000 annually.

8. In terms of political ideology or leaning the majority of trustees (53%) viewed themselves as moderates; 28 percent identified themselves as conservatives, and 19 percent as liberals.

9. The Progressive Conservative Party was identified by 55 percent of the trustees as their provincial political party preference; with the remaining trustees variously distributed among the Social Credit, NDP and Liberal parties.

10. The larger the size of the jurisdiction represented the greater the proportion of trustees who identified their political ideology as liberal. Similarly, in terms of provincial party preferences,

stronger Liberal support at the expense of the Social Credit party was noted in large urban centres. Conversely, Social Credit support was significantly greater in small towns and rural (farm) areas.

11. Extensive trustee experience on school boards, other than the present one on which they were members, was not common; however, trustees were extremely active in community affairs. More than 75 percent of the respondents had served on 3 or more community boards in addition to the school board in the past 5 years.

12. Over one third (37%) of the trustees were recently elected (less than one year of experience). Newly elected trustees were significantly younger, better educated, and more supportive of the NDP at the expense of the Social Credit Party.

Trustee role and function. The survey of trustee perceptions concerning actual function, involvement in decision-making, and preferred locus of authority suggest that:

1. Above all other functions, trustees attended meetings. These included committee meetings, board meetings, meetings with administrative and teacher personnel, and meetings with parent groups.

2. Trustees perceived themselves as having major decisionmaking authority relative to financial and economic affairs, administrative structure, and administrative appointments. They viewed themselves as least involved in student affairs and instruction related a.

3. Trustees indicated a strong preference for an hierarchical authority structure with major decision-making authority vested in the board and/or administration. Similarly, they preferred a minimum of Department of Education, faculty, on student involvement in the vast majority of decision-making areas.

Trustee Attitude on selected issues. Trustee attitudes and opinions were surveyed relative to board selection and composition, selection of a superintendent, student affairs, faculty affairs, and educational philosophy. The findings indicated that:

I. Trustees were overwhelmingly in favor (98%) of local elections as a means for selecting school trustees. Strong opposition (90%) to the concept of governmental appointment was also noted.

2. Trustees did not endorse the philosophy of participatory management. They were strongly opposed to having voting representatives from the teaching staff, the student body, and the non-academic support staff. Similarly, they were not in favor of giving a vote to the superintendent.

3. Trustees identified interest in education, time to devote to board activities, and an understanding of educational issues as the most desirable prerequisites for school trustees. A middle-of-theroad point of view, and involvement in partisan politics were viewed as least desirable characteristics.

4. With regard to the most important characteristics of a perspective superintendent trustees identified successful teaching experience, experience in public school administration, and established leadership ability as absolutely essential. Religious affiliation and sex were seen as irrelevant. Female trustees placed significantly less value on the importance of a personal life free from complications than did their male counterparts; and nonprofessionals valued business

experience significantly more than did professionals.

5. Trustees as a group were generally restrictive and control oriented with regard to student affairs, advocating greater discipline in schools, administrative control of the student newspaper, screening of student guest speakers, and suspension or expulsion of disruptive students. Some differences in attitude relative to age, sex, occupational status and level of formal education were observed. Trustees who were over 60 were generally stronger advocates of increased control and discipline of students. Conversely, trustees in the under 30 age group did not feel that greater discipline was warranted. In addition, trustees who were female, members of a profession, or who had higher levels of formal education, were significantly less supportive of increased student discipline and control than were their respective counterparts. No significant differences between the response patterns of recently elected and more experienced trustees were noted.

6. With regard to faculty affairs, trustees as a group were generally supportive of freedom of expression for teachers. They also felt that degree qualifications should receive less emphasis; and they strongly disagreed with the statement that there should be more professional educators on school boards. Some differences in attitudes relative to education, occupation and experience were noted. Trustees with a university degree or higher felt that degree qualifications were important and should continue to receive emphasis in teacher fectuitment. Trustees with lower levels of education favored significantly less emphasis on degree qualifications. Similarly, greater trustee experience, lower levels of formal education, and membership in the momptofessional

group were associated with significantly greater opposition to increasing the number of professional educators on school boards. No significant differences between the response patterns of male and female trustees were noted in the area of faculty affairs.

7. With respect to admissions and institutional focus trustees favored an open admissions policy and a broad based curriculum designed to accommodate a wide range of student interests and abilities. They also emphasized both the moral and cognitive development of the students. 8. Trustees as a group equated running a school district to running a big business. They favored local appointment of superintendents, open meetings, and felt that school boards increased the effectiveness of school district management. They were strongly opposed to any , measures that would result in increased provincial control over education.

9. Significant relationships between trustee attitudes on issues concerning educational philosophy and trustees age, sex, occupation, education, and experience were noted. The most significant differences related to the educational levels of trustees. Higher levels of formal education were generally associated with greater willingness on the part of trustees to make school facilities available for community use, stronger support for the use of parent advisory groups, greater support for a broad based curriculum, and stronger opposition to complete local control of curriculum and complete provincial funding of education. Lower levels of education were associated with greater trustee support for reinstating Departmental exams, greater trustee confidence in the effectiveness of school boards, and stronger support for the argument that running a school district was like running a big business.

Few significant differences between attitude by sex and occupation were observed in the area of educational philosophy. Females and professionals were less supportive of reinstating Departmental exams, and less concerned with increased emphasis on basic skill development. In addition professionals did not believe that running a school district was the same as running a big business.

Trustees in the 60 or over age group generally advocated greater support for reinstating Departmental exams and increased emphasis on basic skill development than did other age groups. They were also significantly less supportive of the concept of parent advisory groups for each school.

Recently elected trustees were more supportive of a broad based ' curriculum, school involvement in solving contemporary social problems, and establishing parent groups to advise on educational issues. Experienced trustees were significantly more opposed to complete provincial funding of education.

#### CONCLUSIONS

Implicit in the research data are a number of generalizations and conclusions. These conclusions, which are outlined below, represent tendencies rather than immutable statements of fact; it is not the intention of the writer to suggest that they hold true without exception. Further, since the population surveyed resided entirely in Alberta and consisted only of public school trustees, these findings should be generalized beyond, these parameters with extreme caution, if at all.

1. The profile of the Alberta school trustee derived from the study is generally consistent with the stereotype typical school trustee identified by Counts (1927) and reaffig the National Education Association in 1946 and 1974. There is, however, one significant difference between the Alberta profile and the profiles identified in other studies; and this resides primarily in the area of trustee occupational status. The Counts (1927) and National Education Association Studies (1946 and 1974) indicated that the vast majority of trustees came from the professional and business field and, consequently, labour groups and lower status groups were not represented. In Alberta this does not appear to be the case; only 21 percent of the trustees were professionals, and only 20 percent were businessmen. A large percentage were farmers (29%) and housewives (17%), with the remaining 13 percent variously distributed among other nonprofessional occupations This would suggest that, while some segments of Alberta society are still underrepresented (e.g. females and the young), Alberta trustees are more representative of the total population than were the trustees surveyed in the previous studies cited.

2. When educational standing and occupational status are accepted as indices of socio-economic status, it would appear that large urban centres attracted a larger proportion of higher status trustees than did smaller areas. Similarly, trustees in larger urban centres tended to be more liberal with regard to both their political ideology and their educational attitudes.

3. While trends cannot be validly established on the basis of one study, it would appear that newly elected trustees were significantly

different from their experienced counterparts wigh respect to age, level of formal education, and political preferences.

4. Alberta trustees perceived themselves as having significantly more involvement in direct decision-making than the review of the literature would suggest. They identified economic management, administrative structures, and administrative appointments as the primary areas where they exercised direct control.

5. The data reflected considerable trustee pre-occupation with maintaining authority and control, and a general reluctance to apply management philosophies that promote direct staff or community involvement in the decision-making process.

6. Alberta trustees as a group strongly objected to any proposals or practices that would result in increased provincial control over education. Similarly, their preferences relative to locus of authority suggested that they would prefer an extremely limited decisionmaking role for the Department of Education.

7. Trustees favored the status quo with regard to their selection. They overwhelmingly endorsed both the concept of lay representation and election by local constituencies. Conversely they indicated strong disapproval of other types of selection procedures.

8. With minor exceptions, outlined in the summary, Alberta trustees, regardless of age, sex, occupation, experience and education, had very similar views on what constitutes desirable characteristics for a superintendent.

9. Taken as a whole, trustee responses on the majority of educational issues included in the survey reflected a significant degree

of conservatism and a general hesitancy to disrupt the status quo.

10. When formal education and occupation were accepted as an index of social status, trustee attitudes on educational issues were significantly-related to social status. The most discernable patterns relative to level of formal education were present in the areas of educational philosophy and faculty affairs. With regard to occupational status, differences were noted primarily in the area of educational , philosophy.

11. Discernable patterns in the responses of trustees relative to sex and age appeared in the area of student affairs; very few differences were observed relative to faculty affairs and administrative philosophy.

#### IMPLICATIONS

The results of this study, in combination with the insights derived from other studies reviewed herein, suggest some implications for both practice and research. However, given the paucity of Canadian research addressing the issue of public school trusteeship, the formulation of these implications was undertaken with considerable caution.

#### Implications for Practice

Representativeness. Beginning with the initial work of Counts (1927), and drawing upon numerous subsequent studies of school board composition, the conventional wisdom suggests that our democratic philosophy is given best expression by a school board that is representative of all segments of the constituency that it serves. It is argued that the function of representing the community to the school is facilitated to the greatest extent by a representative board. The under representation of some segments of the Alberta population suggests that existing trustee selection procedures have not completely met the ideal of equal representation of all segments and strata of the population. However, it was also obvious from the data, that trustees were extremely reluctant to consider government appointments or any other method that did not involve local elections.

One possible alternative to the problem of representativeness might be the establishment of local nominating committees for each jurisdiction charged with the responsibility for soliciting the candidacy of individuals for board positions, in accordance with established criteria that would better assure the representation of the total constituency, at least during the election. To prevent the committee from becoming elitist or totally dominating the nomination proceedings, the option would have to be left open for individual candidates to seek office by having a specified number of electors sign their nomination form.

This arrangement would have the advantage of involving community leaders more directly in education related affairs, result o in the development of more specific criteria for office than now exist, and lead to a deliberate search for leadership talent--something which presently is left largely to chance, while still honoring the basic tenants of representative democracy.

<u>Inservice training</u>. Increasing provincial incursions into areas of board jurisdiction, pressures for faculty and community involvement in the decision-making process, and demands for improved educational services concurrent with increasing fiscal constraints, attest to the

fact that school trustees can expect to face significant challenges in the next dedade.

The increasing complexity of the administrative task combined with the relative inexperience of a significant number of trustees gives testimony to the need for effective ongoing inservice programs. The Alberta Trustees' Association, Superintendents' Associations, and Administrators' Associations would be well advised to involve their trustees in regular inservice programs focusing upon major educational issues.

Trustees have a need to understand the issues surrounding such controversial subjects as participatory management, student unrest, the back to the basic argument, and the community school concept. An understanding of these and other issues and the development of policies relative to them in the absence of crisis is essential if trustees wish to avoid intemperate action precipitated by crisis-induced decisions.

Inservice programs should also focus upon the proper role of the trustee. According to Cistone (1972:9), trustee confusion with respect to role often results in strained teacher-administrator-board relations. He captured the essence of the problem rather succinctly when he stated:

The function of the trustee should be to interpret the will of the people about their society to those who must organize formal learning in that society. Too often one finds that it is the non-elected experts who carry this out. And, conversely you have trustees involved in the detail of the systems' organization and administration--the very functions for which trustees have little training and experience. Much of the abrasion that goes on between teachers, administrators, and trustees revolves about this confusion of function.

Thus it is apparent that there is a need for some role clarification relative to trustee function. Government, administrators and board

members should re-examine the trustees' role in the light of current practices and problems and formulate role descriptions that have practical utility. For must be a clear understanding of the purposes, functions and responsibilities of both the school board and the administrative staff. This mutual understanding is imperative if boards and administrators are to successfully develop and implement educational policy commensurate with societal requirements and expectations.

## Implications for Further Research

Because of the limited amount of empirical research dealing with public school trusteeship in either Canada or Alberta, there is some justification in recommending that similar studies be conducted to provide either verification or refutation of the conclusions of this study. Future research in the area-of public school trusteeship would probably be most productive if, in addition to the areas already explored in this study, some of the following issues were examined.

1. Studies that investigate the relationships between trustee attitudes and functions relative to school district administrative structure would be valuable. This would facilitate an analysis of the merits or lack thereof of the County, Divisional or Independent School District structures.

2. An analysis that permits the comparison of trustees' backgrounds, roles and attitudes relative to their representation of Separate as opposed to Public school jurisdictions might prove to be a fruitful area for further research.

3. There is also a need to refine the research instrumentation relative to the role and function of trustees in such a manner as to permit the analysis of the quality of trustee functions as well as the frequency of trustee functions. Part of the solution to this research problem may reside in incorporating a scale that permits board members, superintendents, and other school administrators to assess the quality of trustee functions.

4. An examination of the perception of other groups (such as superintendents, Department of Education administrators, school administrators and parents) with regard to trustees' roles and functions would also be of value.

5. While the data presented in this study identify some discernable patterns between demographic and social status variables, and trustee attitudes, further investigation of these relationships is required before definitive statements about them can be made. Incorporating an accepted standardized social belief and attitude scale (Harper's for example) into the questionnaire would serve to provide additional perspective relative to trustee attitude.

6. And finally, investigations into trustee effectiveness relative, to both the administrative structure of the jurisdiction, and trustees backgrounds would be worthy of further investigation.

#### SELECTED REFERENCES

Arnett, Claude E. Social Beliefs and Attitudes of American School Board Members. Emporia, Kansas: Emporia Gazette Press, 1932.

- Beck, Hubert. Men Who Control Our Universities. New York: Kings Crown Press, 1947.
- Bergen, J. J. "Central and Local Control of Governance of Education in the Province of Alberta." In Hodgson, Bergen, and Bryce. <u>The Organization and Administration</u> of Education in Canada. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1976.
- Bernd, C. M. "The Community Junior College Trustee: Some Questions About Representation." <u>Unpublished Paper</u>. 1973, 13 pp. (ED 086279).
- Boyd, William L. "School Board-Administrative-Staff Relationships." In Cistone, Pater. Understanding School Boards. London: Lexington Books, 1975.

"Community Status and Conflict in Suburban School Politics." Sage Professional Papers in American Education. New York: Sage Publishing, 1975.

- Burns, Gerald P. Trustees in Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Independent College Funds of America, Inc., 1966.
- Callahan, Raymond E. "The American Board of Education." In Cistone, Peter. <u>Understanding School Boards</u>. London: Lexington Books, 1975.

Cistone, Peter <u>Understanding School Boards</u>. London: Lexington Books, 1975.

> School Boards and the Political Fact. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1972.

"Municipal Political Structures and Role Allocation in Educational Decision Making: An Exploration of One Linkage." Ubran Education, 1971, 6(213): 147-65.

"The Ecological Basis of School Board Member Recruitment." In Education and Urban Society 1974, 564): 439-440.

, and Hennessy, B. "School Board Members Attitudes and Administrative Forms: An Exploration of Public-Regardingness." <u>Midwest Journal of Political Science</u>, 1971, 15(3): 587-94. Foleman, Peter The School Trustee and the Administration of Education. Winnipeg: The Manitoba Association of School Trustees, 1973.

Counts, George S. The Social Composition of Boards of Education; A Study in the Social Control of Public Education. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1927.

Crain, R. L. The Politics of School Desegregation. Chicago: Aldine Press, 1978. /

Cronon, J.M. The Control of Urban Schools. New York: Free Press, 1973.

Decision Making Information Canada Ltd. School Trustee Study. Edmonton: Decision Making Information Ltd., 1974.

Duster, Troy "The Aims of Higher Learning and the Control , of Universities." Berkeley: University of California, 1966 (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation as cited in Pattridge, J.G. Boards of Trustees: Their Decision Making Patterns. Berkeley: University of California, 1973).

Dykes, Archie R. <u>School Board and Superintendent</u>. Danville, III.: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1965.

Enns, Frederich. The Legal Status of the Canadian School Board. Toronto: The MacMillan Co. of Canada Ltd., 1963.

"School Law and the Board." In Hodgson, Bergen, and Bryce. The Organization and Administration of Education in Canada. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1976.

Flower, G. E. "The Larger School Unit in Canada: In Hodgson, Bergen and Bryce. <u>The Organization and Administration</u> <u>of Education in Canada</u>. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1976.

Gilliland, Richard and Nunnery, M. "Florida Trustees: Characteristics and Opinions." <u>Educational Leadership</u>, 1970 pp. 25 - 29.

Goldhammer, K. The School Board. New York: Centre for Applied Research in Education, 1964.

Government of Alberta, The School Act. Sections 30, 31 and 65, 1970.

Government of Britain, British Statutes, 30 Victoria, C. 111, Sections 55, 56 and 57.

Gross, N. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: Wiley, 1958.

Hartnett, Rodney T. <u>College and University Trustees: Their</u> <u>Backgrounds</u>, Roles and Educational Attitudes. Princeton: Educational Testing Services, 1969.

Heilbron, Louis H. <u>The College and University Trustee</u>. London: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1973.

Henon, Orley R. The Role of the Trustee. Scranton: International Textbook Company, 1969.

Hill, Johnny R. "The Members of Governing Boards of Historically Black Public Colleges and Universities in Profile." July, 1977 (ED. 142155).

Hodgkinson, Harold L., and Meeth, Richard L. <u>Power and Authority</u>. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc. Publishers, 1971.

 $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{q}}$ 

Hodgson, E.D. "A Politician, Me?" In Hodgson, Bergen, and Bryce. <u>• The Organization and Administration of Education in Canada</u>. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1976.

Hodgson, E.D., Bergen, J.J. and Bruce, R.C. <u>The</u> Organization and Administration of Education in Canada. Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1976.

Houwing, J.F. and Kristjanson, A.M. <u>Composition of Governing Boards</u> of Canadian Universities and Colleges. Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 1975.

Iannaccone, L. <u>Politics in Education</u>. New York: Centre for Applied Research in Education, 1967.

Johnson, Robert H. and Hartman, Wm. <u>The School Board and Public</u> <u>Relations</u>. New York: Exposition Press Inc., 1964.

Ken, N.D. "The School Board as an Agency of Legitimation." <u>Sociology</u> of Education, 1964 38(1): 34-59.

Kirst, M.W. The Politics of Education at the Local, State and Federal Levels. Berkeley: McCutchan Press, 1970.

Konrad, A.G. "Community College Trustees Examine Their Role: The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 16(2), November 1976.

"Community College Boards: A Canadian Perspective." New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. 13, 1976, pp. 1-10.

"A Profile of Community College Trustees." <u>Canadian</u> Journal of Education, Vol. 2(2); 1977. , and Kelly Gerald O. College Governance: Participation in Decision Making. Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1972.

Lipham, L.M., and Gregg, R.T. The School Board as an Agency for Resolving Conflict. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1967.

Martonana, S.V. College Boards of Trustees. Washington, D.C.: Centre for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1963.

Masotti, L.H. Education and Politics in Suburbia. Cleveland: Press of Western Reserve University, 1967.

McCarthy, D.J. "School Board Membership". Administrator's Notebook, 1959 8(1).

Milbrath, L.W. <u>Political Participation</u>. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1965.

Mills, Peter K. "Community College Trustees: A Survey." in <u>The Two Year College Trustee: National Issues and</u> <u>Perspectives</u>. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1972.

Miklos, E. "Focus Affecting Decentralization of Decisions." In Decentralizing Decision-Making Within School Systems. Edmonton: Dept. of Educational Administrations, University of Alberta, 1974.

Minar, D.W. "Community Characteristics, Conflict and Power Structures." In Cahill and Hencley. The Politics of Education in the Local Community. Danville, Ill.: Interstate Publisher, 1967.

National Education Association. <u>National Education Association</u> <u>Proceedings: 1895-6</u>. Evanston, Ill.: National Education Association, 1896.

. Women on School Boards. Evanston, Ill.: The National Education Association, 1974

"Status and Practices of Boards of Education", NEA Research Bulletin, XXIV, April, 1946.

174

Pattridge, James G., Hurst, J., and Morgan, A. <u>Boards of</u> <u>Trustees: Their Decision Patterns</u>. Berkeley: University of California, 1973.

Perkins, J. "Conflicting Responsibilities of Governing Boards". In Perkins, J.A. <u>The University as an Organization</u> New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973. Polk, Charles "Trustee Selection: Who Gets What, Who Pays What?" New Directions for Community Colleges. Vol. 15, Aut, 1975.

Popham, James W. Educational Statistics.' New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1967.

Proudfoot, Alexander J. A Study of the Socio-economic Status of Influential School Board Members in Alberta as Related to Their Attitudes Toward Certain Common problems Confronting School Boards. University of Oregon: University Microfilms, Inc., 1962.

Rauh, Morton. The Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

"The College Trustee - Past, Present and Future." Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 40, 1969 pp. 430-42.

Reber, Donald D. "A Study of the Social Composition and Attitudes of California School Board Members" Unpublished Ed. D. dissertation, University of California, 1959.

Scribner, J.O. "A Functional-Systems Framework for Analyzing School Board Action." Educational Administration Quarterly, 1966, 2(3): 204-15.

Stapley, Maurice E. <u>School Board Studies</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957.

Strayer, George. <u>The Structure and Administration of Education</u> <u>In American Democracy</u>. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1938.

Teal, Hal C. "Attitudes of Selected School Board Members Concerning Problems Facing Public Education." Unpublished. Dissertation, University of Pittsburg, 1956

Tiedt, Sidney W. "Oregon School Board Members in the Willanette Valley: Selected Demographic Data, General Educational Values, Curriculum Beliefs, and the Interrelationships Among These Data." <u>Unpublished</u> Ed.D. dissertation, University of Oregon, 1962 as cited in Proudfoot, A.J. op. cit.

Usdan, Michael "The Future Viability of the School Board." In Ciston, P. Understanding School Boards. London: Lexington Books, 1975.

White, Alpheus L. Local School Boards: Organization and Practices. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962. Wilson, Richard E and Harper, Wm. A. <u>Trustee Papers</u>. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1973.

T.

. ظ

Zeigler, Harmon L. and Jennings, Kent M. Governing American Schools: Political Interaction in Local School Districts. Massachusetts: Duxbury Press, 1974. 166

J

 $\diamond$ 

 $\mathcal{O}$






## INSTRUCTIONS:

This questionnaine is designed to provide a profile of members of governing boards of public schools with respect to their background, educational attitudes, and role perceptions. Please complete every item to the best of your ability:

YOUR RESPONSES ARE REGARDED AS CONFIDENTIAL AND WILL BE USED FOR STATISTICAL PURPOSES ONLY. THEY WILL NOT BE RELEASED IN ANY WAY THAT WILL ALLOW THEM TO BE IDENTIFIED WITH YOU OR YOUR SCHOOL DISTRICT. PART I

2.

6 .

Please answer the following questions by circling the number in front of the appropriate answers.

2. Male 1. Female 1. Sex: Age at last birthday: "

| $\cdot$ |    | 00 |    | undas |   |                 | 1    | 50 to     | 50   |
|---------|----|----|----|-------|---|-----------------|------|-----------|------|
| 6       | •  | 27 | OR | under | 6 | والمراثبة المعر |      |           |      |
|         | Ζ. | 30 | to | 39    |   |                 |      | 50 to     |      |
|         | 3. | 40 | to | 49    |   |                 | 6. 7 | 10. or    | over |
| 3.      |    |    |    |       |   |                 |      | i sin Ara |      |

3. How long have you resided in this province?

1. Less than 4 years 2. At the st 4 years, but less than 8 3. Atmost 8 years, but less than 1 2. At 3. Atm st 8 years, but less than 12 4. 12 or more years

Please estimate your total family income last year. Consider annual income from att sources before taxes.

 

 1. Less than \$6,000
 6. \$30,000 ±0
 \$39,000

 2. \$6,000 to \$9,999
 57. \$50,000 ±0
 \$74,000

 3. \$10,000 to \$14,999 8. \$75,000 10 \$99,999 4. \$15,000 to \$19,999 9. \$100,000 or more 5. \$20,000 to \$29,999

which of the following best describes your political 5. ideology or leaning?

2. Moderate 1. Conservative

What is your provincial political party preference?

4. Social Credit 1. Progressive Conservative 5. Other 2. Liberal 3. NDP

Please indicate the amount of formal education that 7. you have. Check only the highest level (i.e. mark only one alternative).

- 1. Did not complete secondary school
- 2. Graduated from a secondary school 3. Graduated from a technical institute

  - 4. Some college on university, did not obtain diploma
  - 5. Graduated from college (earned diploma)

Continued.

[3. Liberal ;

Comput onty

116 C. Fox

CC

1-4

0

10

11.12

171

.0

| :      | 172   |       |
|--------|---|-------|
|        |   | CC    |
|        | 6. Graduated from University learned bacculaureate<br>'degree'  |       |
|        | 7. Attended professional or graduate school but   |       |
|        | did not attain a professional graduate degree<br>8. Attained masfer's degree (i.e. M.A.,M.Ed.,M.B.A.)   |       |
|        | 9. Attained a professional degree li.e. D.D.S., L.L.B.,   |       |
|        | M.D.)<br>10. Attained a doctorate degree (i.e. Ed.D., Ph.D.)  |       |
|        | 2월 19일 - 1928년 2월 19일 - 19일 19일 <b>2월 2</b> 월 19일 - 19일<br>- 19일 - 19   | 13    |
| •      | How long have you been a member of the board of this county or school district?   |       |
|        | 1. Less than 1 year 4. 8 years but Less   |       |
|        | 2. 1 year but less than 4 than 12<br>3. 4 years, but less than 8 5. 12 year <b>board</b>  |       |
| ۰<br>۱ |   | 14.15 |
| •      | Indicate the ONE Category which best describes the second |       |
|        | occupation.) 🝆 🖙  |       |
|        | 1°. Artist, entertaíner<br>2. Professional athlete  |       |
|        | 3. Clerical (secretary, boy the bank teller, clerk)   |       |
|        | 4. Clergy on religious order  |       |
|        | 5. Farm owner or farm managers<br>Sovernment official or administrator (including   |       |
|        | hospital and educational administrator)   |       |
|        | 7. Health professional (dentist, nurse, pharmacist, physician, veterinarian)  |       |
|        | 8. Homemaker  |       |
|        | 9, Labourer<br>10. Lawyer, judge, notary'   |       |
|        | 11. Machine operator (e.g. factory or metal worker,   |       |
|        | heavy equipment, etc.)  |       |
|        | 12. Manager or owner of a small Musiness<br>13. Manager or owner of a medium sized business   |       |
|        | 14. Manager, owner, or executive in a large   |       |
|        | grganization (e.g. banking industry, large<br>départment store, insurance company, etc.   |       |
|        | 15. Paraprofessional (e.g. computor programmer,<br>draftsman, studio operator, surveyor, technician)  |       |
|        | 16. Physical science professional le.g. architect,  |       |
|        | biologist, engineer, physicist) -   |       |
|        | 17. Protective service (fire fighter, police, armed forces)   |       |
|        | 18. Sales linsurate, real estate, advertising   |       |
|        | 19. Service worker [e.g. taxi driver, hair dresser,<br>waitress)  |       |
|        | 20. Skilled craftsman (carpenter, electrician,  |       |
|        | machinist, mechanic, plumber, etc.)   |       |
|        | Continued:3   |       |
|        |   | • •   |

173 21. Social Science professional (e.g. economist, CC psychologist, social worker) 22. Student 23. Teaching Professional 24. Other (Please specify: 1411 On how many school boards (in other parts of the province) have you previously served exclusive of your present board membership? 1. None 4. Three 5. Four 6. Five on more 2. One 3. Two 17 Exclusive of school district boards, of how many other 1 t 🚬 boards have you been a member over the past five years le.g. provincial, corporation, municipal, cultural affairs, scouts, church, community service, etc. )? 4. Three 5. Four 1. None 2. One 6. Five or more 3. 400 18 12. Please indicate the actual and preferred length of your term of office on the board: 19 Actual Preferred 20 Please indicate the stud and preferred size of your 13. board: 21 \* Actual Preferred Please indicate the extent of your familiarity with the publications listed below. Use the key below in responding: 1 = Have read completely 4 = Know of the book, but haven't seen it 2 = Have read portions 3 = Have briefly examined = Have never heard of it 22 5 Porter. Towards 2000 2 3 5. 23 Worth, A Choice of Futures 3 The School Superintendency Downey, 24 3 in Alberta, 1976 .5 25 -3 Alberta Education, The Minister's 1 Committee on School Finance 5 26 Schein, E., The Psychology of **7** - 1 2 3 · Organizational Behavior 27 Local School Board Policy Handbook 1 2 3 Continued...4

|            | 17   |     |
|------------|--|-----|
|            | what is the extent of your familiarity with the<br>educational periodicals listed below? Use the key<br>below in responding:   |     |
|            | <ol> <li>Read regularly</li> <li>Read, but not regularly</li> <li>Read, but not regularly</li> <li>Have read only several articles from this periodical which were brought to my attention</li> <li>Am familiar with this periodical but have never need it</li> <li>more not familiar with this periodical</li> </ol>                   |     |
|            | "Phi Delta Kappan" 1 2 3 4 5   | 29  |
| 95.<br>195 | "The Actors School Trustee" 1 2 3 4 5  | 30  |
|            | "Alberta Journal of Educational 12345<br>Research"   | ·31 |
| х.         | "The A.T.A. Magazine"  | 32_ |
| •          | "Challenge" 1 2 3 4 5  | 33  |
|            | "The Canadian Administrator" 🗰 1 2 3 4 5   |     |
| N*         | "The National School Boards' Journal" 1 2 3 4 5  | 35_ |
| 5.         | Which of the following best describes the jurisdiction in which you serve as a board member:   | 36  |
|            | <ol> <li>A large urban centre (population in excess<br/>of 100,000).</li> <li>A smaller urban centre (population in excess<br/>of 25,000 but less than 100,000).</li> <li>A large town (population between 5,000 to<br/>24,999).</li> <li>A small town on village (population under<br/>5,000).</li> <li>A rural (farm) area.</li> </ol> |     |
| 7.         | Which of the following best describes the area of the province in which you serve as a board member?   | 37_ |
|            | 1. North-eastern Alberta area<br>2. North-western Alberta area<br>3. Central Alberta area<br>4. South-eastern Alberta area<br>5., South-western Alberta area   |     |
| ART        | <u>-11</u>   |     |
| L : -      | section consists of questions about your activities as   |     |
| nrs        | section consists of questions about your account   |     |

----

|                |   | ubi<br>Alexan  |                          | ••                                  | •       | •           |                           | ,,  | •                    |
|----------------|---|----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------|-------------|---------------------------|---|----------------------|
|                |   | t t            | м <sup>на</sup>          |                                     | e.      | • 24        | 1                         | L75   | ала<br>1 с. т. с. с. |
| a. m           | ember of the board of THIS school dis   | trict.         |                          |                                     |         |             |                           | Г   | CC.                  |
|                |   |                | •                        |                                     |         |             |                           |   |                      |
| 1.             | How many times did your board meet d<br>calendar year (January, 1976 through                      |                |                          |                                     |         |             | ÷                         |   | 38                   |
|                | 1. Less than 12 times   | 1.<br>1.<br>1. | entra da<br>A<br>Attacka |                                     | i       |             | •                         |   |                      |
|                | \$2. 13. to 15 times<br>3. 19 to 24 times   |                | -                        |                                     |         |             | •                         |   |                      |
|                | 4. more than 24 times   | •              | •                        |                                     |         |             |                           |   |                      |
| 2.             | What percentage of the regular board<br>attended since you prcade a member?                       | meetin         | gs .                     | hav                                 | e y     | ou<br>S     |                           |   | 39                   |
| 4              | 1. ALL 🛉 👞  |                | •                        | 1999.<br>1997 - 1997<br>1997 - 1997 |         |             |                           |   | •                    |
|                | 2. more than 75%<br>3. 50% to 75%<br>4. fewer than Malf   |                |                          |                                     |         |             |                           |   |                      |
|                | 4. fewer schan male   |                |                          |                                     |         |             |                           |   |                      |
| App            | roximately how often do you engage in<br>rd-related activities? Use the key b                     | each o         | 6 t                      | he                                  | fol     | Lowin       | g                         |   | 15                   |
| 004            |   | •              | <br>                     | opu                                 | 11.11.4 | <i></i> g . |                           |   |                      |
|                | T. Usualky never 4. Qua<br>2. Once Annually 5. Non  |                |                          |                                     |         |             | ی<br>جو کار در<br>در در د |   |                      |
| 5              | 3. Semi-Annually  |                |                          |                                     |         |             |                           |   |                      |
|                | Preparing the board agenda  |                | 2                        |                                     |         | 5<br>5      |                           |   | 40                   |
|                | Attending committee meetings<br>Participating in orientation and                                  |                | 2                        |                                     | 1.0     |             | •                         |   | · 42                 |
|                | inservice <b>j</b> .  |                |                          |                                     |         |             |                           |   |                      |
| 6.             | Attending ad hoc meetings of parent groups and advisory councils                                  | 1              | 2                        | 3                                   | 4.      | 5           |                           |   | 43,                  |
| 7.             | Attending professional conferences  | 1              | 2                        | 3                                   | 4       | 5           |                           |   | 44                   |
| 8.             | Making speeches on behalf of the board  | 1              | 2                        | 3                                   | 4       | 5           |                           | 'n  | 45                   |
| 9.             | Personal conferences with the super-  | السر           | 2                        | 3                                   | 4       | 5           |                           |   | 46                   |
| 4.4            | intendent   |                | 2                        | 2                                   |         | 5           |                           |   | 47                   |
| 10.            | Attending school staff meetings on invitation   |                | 4                        |                                     | •       |             |                           | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1 |                      |
| 11.            | Attending administrators association meetings   | <b>. 1</b>     | 2                        | 3                                   | 4       | 5           |                           |   | 48                   |
|                | Meeting with the elected members of<br>the local district taxing authority<br>(i.e. town council) | 1              | 2                        | 3                                   | 4       | 5           |                           |   | 49                   |
| en state de la | Meeting with governmental department<br>officers  | ŕ              | 2°,                      | 3                                   | 4       | 5           |                           |   | 50                   |
| 14.            | Making contacts with politicians  | $\sum$ i       | 2.                       | 3                                   | 4       | : 5         |                           |   | 51                   |
| 15.            | Personal conferences with school teacher personnel  | . <b>1</b>     | 2                        | 3                                   | 4       | 5           |                           | ŀ   | 52                   |

0

Continued

Listed below are a series of topics commonly considered by boards. You are asked to indicate the degree to which you have been involved in such topics up to this date. Mark the highest level of involvment whether as an individual, a member of a committee, or a member of the entire board. Check only one response for each item, using the following definitions as a guide:

<u>Decided</u>: You were directly involved in the decisionmaking process. Alone, with others, you examined the data and decided on a course of action.

Reviewed and Advised (R & A): You considered proposals made by others (usually administrators or teachers in the school district). You reviewed these proposals and advised those who were in the process of making them.

<u>Approved or Confirmed (A or C)</u>: You took a pro-forma action on decisions already committed; decisions would not be changed substantively at that point in time.

Not Applicable (NA): You have not been involved in a decision regarding this item.

| •     |  | Decided    | REA       | AorC | NA | •                    |
|-------|--|------------|-----------|------|----|----------------------|
| 16.   | Administrative appointments<br>(i.e, principal v. principal,<br>superintendent, etc.)            | 1          | 2         | 3    | 4  | •                    |
| 17.   | Faculty appointments<br>(i.e. teaching staff)  | 1          | 2         | 3    | 4  | 9<br>4. <b>1</b> . 1 |
| 18.   | Teacher conduct disputes   | 1          | 2         | 3    | 4  |                      |
| .19.  | Teacher salary agreement   | 1          | <b>`2</b> | 3    | 4  |                      |
| 20:   | Non-teaching staff wage scales   | 1          | 2         | 3 .  | 4  |                      |
| 21.   | Sabbatical policies (professiono<br>improvement leave)   | il .<br>1  | 2         | 3    | 4  |                      |
| 22.   | Decision making structures<br>(i.e. the administrative organ-<br>ization of the school district) | 1          | 2         | 3    | 4  |                      |
| 23.   | Donmitony regulations  | 1          | 2         | 3    | 4  |                      |
| 24.   | Student conduct regulations  | <b>i</b> , | 2         | 3    | 4  |                      |
| . 25. | Student disciplinary action  | 1          | 2         | - 3  | 4  |                      |
| 26.   | Student-invited speakers   | 1.         | 2.        | . 3  | 4  |                      |
| 27.   | Budget development   | 1          | 2         | 3    | 4  |                      |
| 28.   | Budget allocation  | 1          | 2.        | 3    | 4  |                      |
| 29.   | Tuition and Fees   | <b>.</b>   | 2         | 3    | 4  |                      |
| 30.   | Selection of an architect  | 1          | 2         | 3    | 4. |                      |
| 31.   | Architectural drawings   | 1          | 2         | 3.   | 4  |                      |
| 32.   | Building site selection  | .1         | 2         | 3.   | 4  |                      |

176 CC

53

54

55\_ 56\_ 57

58

177

| سر                         |   | Decided  | REA                                       | < <u>^ 0</u>                                 |               | NA                    | •     | <u> </u>  |
|----------------------------|---|--|---|--|---------------|-----------------------|-------|---|
| <b>)</b> .                 | lestablishing objectives and  | 1  | 2   | 3  |               | 4                     |       | 70_   |
| 4.                         | priorities for schools)<br>Program review and development   | 1  | 2 -                                       | . 3  | •             | 4                     | •     | 71.   |
| Ŧ.<br>5.                   |   | 1  | 2   | 3  |               | 4                     |       | 72  |
| 36.                        |   | 1  | 2   | ್ರ   |               | 4.                    | -     | 73  |
| 37.                        |   | ** 1   | 2   | . 3  | $F_{\rm ext}$ | 4                     |       | 74  |
| 8.                         |   | 1  | 2   | 3  |               | 4                     |       | 7.  |
| 39.                        |   | 1.   | 2   | 3  |               | 4                     |       | 7.6   |
| 40.                        |   | in the   | 2   | 3  | •             | .4                    |       | 77_   |
| 41.                        |   | 1  | 2   | 3  | 94 - 94<br>1  | 4                     |       | 78_   |
| د<br>چ                     |   |  | $\sum_{i=1}^{n}$                          |  |               |                       |       |   |
| 04-0-                      | T ÎII   |  |   | et<br>Guint es                               |               |                       | ,     | 1   |
| .0                         | <del>na na tanàna aona d</del> ia kaominina dia kaominina<br>Ny INSEE dia kaominina dia k |  |   | арарана.<br>1919 - Аларана<br>1919 - Аларана |               |                       | · · · |   |
| 6<br>legi                  | ase circle the appropriate number.<br>your agreement with each of the fi<br>arding the selection and composit<br>the key below in responding:   | ion of sch   | tatei<br>ool                              | nents<br>board                               |               |                       | ÷     |   |
| regi                       | your agreement with each of the fi<br>arding the selection and composit   | sllowing s   | tate<br>ool                               | nents<br>board<br>D)                         |               | SD)                   | 242 % | • jai<br>6<br>• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • |
| reg                        | your agreement with each of the fl<br>arding the selection and composit<br>the key below in responding:<br>1. Strongly Agree (SA)<br>2. Agree (A)   | flowing s<br>ion of sch  | tate<br>ool                               | nents<br>board<br>D)                         |               | SD)                   |       |   |
| reg<br>Ise                 | your agreement with each of the fl<br>arding the selection and composit<br>the key below in responding:<br>1. Strongly Agree (SA)<br>2. Agree (A)   | flowing s<br>ion of sch  | tate<br>ool                               | nents<br>board<br>D)                         |               | •                     |       | 79  |
| of<br>reg<br>Use           | your agreement with each of the fl<br>arding the selection and composit<br>the key below in responding:<br>1. Strongly Agree (SA)<br>2. Agree (A)<br>3. Undecided (U)<br>Board members should be elected  | Selowing s<br>ion of sch<br>4. Disagr<br>5. Strong<br><u>SK</u><br>1 | tate<br>ool                               | nents<br>board<br>Bl<br>is agn               |               | <u>.</u><br><u>SD</u> |       |   |
| 2 6<br>reg<br>1 5 e<br>1 . | your agreement with each of the fi<br>arding the selection and composit<br>the key below in responding:<br>1. Strongly Agree (SA)<br>2. Agree (A)<br>3. Undecided (U)<br>Board members should be elected<br>by local constituencies<br>Board members should be appointed  | Selowing s<br>ion of sch<br>4. Disagr<br>5. Strong<br><u>SK</u><br>1 | tate<br>ool                               | nents<br>board<br>Bl<br>is agn               |               | <u>SD</u><br>5        |       |   |
| 26<br>12<br>15<br>2.       | your agreement with each of the fi<br>arding the selection and composit<br>the key below in responding:<br>1. Strongly Agree (SA)<br>2. Agree (A)<br>3. Undecided (U)<br>Board members should be elected<br>by local constituencies<br>Board members should be appointed  | 4. Disagr<br>5. Strong<br>5. Strong                                  | tate<br>ool                               | nents<br>board<br>Bl<br>is agn               |               | <u>SD</u><br>5        |       | 80_   |
|                            | your agreement with each of the fl<br>anding the selection and composit<br>the key below in responding:<br>1. Strongly Agree (SA)<br>2. Agree (A)<br>3. Undecided (U)<br>Board members should be elected<br>by local constituencies<br>Board members should be appointed<br>by government<br>Some members should be elected an  | 4. Disagr<br>5. Strong<br>5. Strong                                  | tate<br>ool                               | nents<br>board<br>Bl<br>is agn               |               | <u>SD</u><br>5        |       | 80<br>Card#<br>14                                   |
| 2 6<br>reg<br>1 5 e<br>1 . | your agreement with each of the fl<br>anding the selection and composite<br>the key below in responding:<br>1. Strongly Agree (SA)<br>2. Agree (A)<br>3. Undecided (U)<br>Board members should be elected<br>by local constituencies<br>Board members should be appointed<br>by government<br>Some members should be elected and<br>others appointed.<br>The superintendent should be a   | 4. Disagn<br>5. Strong<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1            | tate<br>ool<br>ly D<br><u>A</u><br>2<br>2 | nents<br>board<br>lis agn<br>3<br>3          |               | <u>SD</u><br>5        |       | 80<br>Card#<br>14                                   |

ŧ۴°

Continued...8

|  |  |   |  |   | .9  |  | · · · |                         |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|--|-------|-------------------------|
| o  |  | 4   |  |   |   | (  | 178   |                         |
| · . · ·  |  | SA  | A  | <u>u</u> :  | D   | SD   |       | cc                      |
| 7.   | High school students should have   | • <b></b>   |  | · · ·   | _   |  |       |                         |
| ·  | a non-voting representative at all board meetings  | 1   | <b>2</b> .,  | <b>3</b>  | 4.  | 5  | ¢     | . 9                     |
| 8.   | A local nomination committee should  |   |  | • ••  |   |  | •     |                         |
| e  | submit nominations for board a appointees to the Minister  | 1   | 2,   | 3   | 4   | 5  |       | - 10                    |
| 9.   | A provinicial nomination committee   | •   |  | 1   |   |  |       |                         |
|  | should submit nominations for<br>board appointees to the Minister  | 1   | 2  | 3   | 4   | 5  |       | 11_                     |
| 10.  | Parent advisory committees should  | 1   | .s`  | •   |   |  | Ň     |                         |
|  | have voting representatives on boards  | 1   | 2  | 3 '   | 4   | 5  |       | 12                      |
| p  |  | •   |  |   |   |  |       | -                       |
| Plea   | se add any comment you may wish to mo  | ike   |  | <del></del>   | •   |  | 1     |                         |
|  |  |   |  |   |   |  |       |                         |
|  |  |   | . *  |   |   |  |       | · · ·                   |
| •  |  |   |  |   |   |  |       |                         |
| low  | important would you regard the follow  | ving c  | hara   | cteri   | stle  | 2.6  | ·.    |                         |
|  | electing board members in your distri<br>w in responding.  | LCI.  | use  | rne r   | ey  | · .  | •     |                         |
| ero  | with responding.   | . "   | •  |   |   |  |       |                         |
|  |  |   |  |   | 1   |  |       | •                       |
|  | 2. Important (I)   | 1. Und<br>5. Hig  | 1  |   | · •   | ble  |       |                         |
|  |  |   | 1  |   | · •   | ble  |       |                         |
|  | 2. Important (I)   |   | 1  |   | · •   | bLe<br><u>HU</u>   | :     |                         |
| •••<br>••<br>••  | 2. Important (I)   |   | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  | 4     | 13                      |
|  | 2. Important (1)<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)  |   | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  | •     | 13                      |
| 12.  | 2. Important [1]<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant [UI]<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or   |   | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  |       | 13 <u>-</u><br>14<br>15 |
| 12.  | 2. Important [1]<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or<br>occupation<br>Interest in education<br>Generally known to other board  |   | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  |       | 14                      |
| 12.<br>13.<br>14.  | 2. Important [1]<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant [UI]<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or<br>occupation<br>Interest in education<br>Generally known to other board<br>members   |   | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  |       | 14                      |
| 12.<br>13.<br>14.  | 2. Important [1]<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or<br>occupation<br>Interest in education<br>Generally known to other board<br>members<br>Time to devote to board activities   |   | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  |       | 14<br>15                |
| 12.<br>13.<br>14.<br>15.   | 2. Important [1]<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or<br>occupation<br>Interest in education<br>Generally known to other board<br>members<br>Time to devote to board activities<br>Business knowledge   |   | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  |       | 14<br>15                |
| 12.<br>13.<br>14.<br>15.<br>16.<br>17.   | 2. Important [1]<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or<br>occupation<br>Interest in education<br>Generally known to other board<br>members<br>Time to devote to board activities<br>Business knowledge<br>Strong views on most issues  |   | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  |       | 14<br>15                |
| 12.<br>13.<br>14.<br>15.<br>16.<br>17.   | 2. Important [1]<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or<br>occupation<br>Interest in education<br>Generally known to other board<br>members<br>Time to devote to board activities<br>Business knowledge   |   | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  |       | 14<br>15                |
| 12.<br>13.<br>14.<br>15.<br>16.<br>17.<br>18.                                    | <ol> <li>Important [1]</li> <li>Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)</li> <li>Stature within the community<br/>Stature in chosen vocation or<br/>occupation</li> <li>Interest in education</li> <li>Generally known to other board<br/>members</li> <li>Time to devote to board activities</li> <li>Business knowledge</li> <li>Strong views on most issues</li> <li>Length of time spent in the</li> </ol>  | 5. Hig<br>(Hu<br><u>VT</u><br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1                | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  |       | 14<br>15                |
| 12.<br>13.<br>14.<br>15.<br>16.<br>17.<br>18.<br>19.                             | 2. Important [1]<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or<br>occupation<br>Interest in education<br>Generally known to other board<br>members<br>Time to devote to board activities<br>Business knowledge<br>Strong views on most issues<br>Length of time spent in the<br>community  | 5. Hig<br>(Hu<br><u>VI</u><br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1           | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  |       | 14<br>15                |
| 12.<br>13.<br>14.<br>15.<br>16.<br>17.<br>18.<br>19.<br>20.                      | 2. Important [1]<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or<br>occupation<br>Interest in education<br>Generally known to other board<br>members<br>Time to devote to board activities<br>Business knowledge<br>Strong views on most issues<br>Length of time spent in the<br>community<br>A middle-of-the-road point of view  | 5. Hig<br>(Hu<br><u>VI</u><br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1 | 1  | Undes   | · •   |  |       | 14<br>15                |
| 12.<br>13.<br>14.<br>15.<br>16.<br>17.<br>18.<br>19.<br>20.<br>21.               | 2. Important (I)<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or<br>occupation<br>Interest in education<br>Generally known to other board<br>members<br>Time to devote to board activities<br>Business knowledge<br>Strong views on most issues<br>Length of time spent in the<br>community<br>A middle-0f-the-road point of view<br>Vision to move ahead with new ideas<br>Understanding educational issues | 5. Hig<br>(Hu<br><u>VI</u><br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1 | hly<br><u>1</u><br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2 | Undes   | · •   |  |       | 14                      |
| 11.<br>12.<br>13.<br>14.<br>15.<br>16.<br>17.<br>18.<br>19.<br>20.<br>21.<br>22. | 2. Important (I)<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or<br>occupation<br>Interest in education<br>Generally known to other board<br>members<br>Time to devote to board activities<br>Business knowledge<br>Strong views on most issues<br>Length of time spent in the<br>community<br>A middle-0f-the-road point of view<br>Vision to move ahead with new ideas<br>Understanding educational issues | 5. Hig<br>(Hu<br><u>VI</u><br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1 | hly<br><u>1</u><br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2 | Undes<br><u>UI</u><br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3 | iral<br><u>U</u><br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4 | <u>Н</u><br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5 |       | 14                      |
| 12.<br>13.<br>14.<br>15.<br>16.<br>17.<br>18.<br>19.<br>20.<br>21.               | 2. Important (I)<br>3. Irrelevant; Unimportant (UI)<br>Stature within the community<br>Stature in chosen vocation or<br>occupation<br>Interest in education<br>Generally known to other board<br>members<br>Time to devote to board activities<br>Business knowledge<br>Strong views on most issues<br>Length of time spent in the<br>community<br>A middle-0f-the-road point of view<br>Vision to move ahead with new ideas<br>Understanding educational issues | 5. Hig<br>(Hu<br><u>VI</u><br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1 | hly<br><u>1</u><br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2<br>2 | Undes<br><u>UI</u><br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3<br>3 | iral<br><u>U</u><br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4<br>4 | <u>Н</u><br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5<br>5 |       | 14                      |

|             |                                    | r.  | е                        |                          | •               |                   |              |                                       |    |
|-------------|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|----|
|             |                                    |   |                          |                          |                 |                   | ]            | 179                                   |    |
|             |                                    | •   |                          | <b>TVT</b>               | ัวัน            | I U               | e HU e       | CC                                    |    |
| 23.         | Involvement                        | in communit                                   | y affairs                | 1                        | 2               | 3 4               | 5            | 25                                    | L  |
|             | •                                  | rmal education                                |                          | d 1                      | 2               | 3 4               | 5            | 26.                                   |    |
|             | Having own                         | children att<br>he district                   |                          | × 1                      | 2               | 3 4               | 5            |                                       |    |
| 26.         | Religious a                        |   | •                        | 1 - I                    | 2               | 3 .4              | 5            | 2                                     | 7  |
| Plea        | se add any c                       | .omments you i                                | may wish t               | o make                   | · /             |                   |              |                                       |    |
|             |                                    |   |                          | -                        | /               |                   | . ·          |                                       |    |
|             |                                    |   |                          |                          |                 |                   | <u></u>      |                                       |    |
| ••••••      |                                    |   |                          |                          |                 | <u> </u>          |              |                                       |    |
|             | · · · ·                            | ۰۵ پار  |                          | · · · ·                  |                 | ·                 | •            |                                       |    |
| Plea        | se indicate                        | the extent o                                  | f your agri              | eement o                 | r disa          | greeme            | nt           | *   ·                                 | İ. |
| dist        | eacn of the<br>rict. Use t<br>er.) | following s<br>he key below                   | tatements i<br>in respon | as they<br>ding;(Ci      | apply<br>rcle t | to you<br>he app  | r<br>ropriat | e                                     |    |
|             |                                    | y'Agree (SA)                                  |                          | . Disagr                 | 00 111          |                   | . *<br>      |                                       | 1  |
| a           | 2. Agree (<br>3. Undecid           | A) Way to                                     |                          | . Strong                 |                 |                   | (SD)         |                                       |    |
| •           | J. anaceta                         |   |                          |                          | <b>.</b>        |                   | °`. cn       |                                       | ╀  |
| ->.∛<br>∧ = | <b>1 4 4 5 5</b>                   | - 4 - 1 0 -                                   | ).<br>1 0 - °            | <u>34</u>                | <u>`</u> .      | <u>u</u> <u>v</u> | 21           | 4.5                                   |    |
| 27.         | should be r                        | at public sci<br>egarded as a<br>not a right. |                          | 19                       | 2               | 3 4               | 5            | ° 29_                                 |    |
| 28.         | •                                  | aff should he                                 | ave the                  |                          | 2<br>           | - u               | · · ·        |                                       |    |
|             |                                    | press their d                                 |                          | -                        | •               | ·                 |              |                                       |    |
|             |                                    | ssue in vari                                  |                          | ·                        |                 | • *               | ***          |                                       |    |
|             |                                    | communication tudent newspo                   |                          | · • •                    |                 |                   | · · ·        | 6<br>                                 |    |
|             |                                    | etc: without                                  |                          |                          |                 |                   |              | . 9                                   |    |
|             | reprisal.                          |   | u. u                     | 1.                       | 2               | 3 4               | 5            | 30                                    |    |
| 29.         | The adminis                        | tration show                                  | ld exercis               | e.                       |                 |                   |              |                                       |    |
|             | control ove                        | r the conten                                  | ts of the                | •                        | ~               | 1.2               | F            | 31                                    |    |
|             | student new                        |   |                          |                          | Z .             | - 5 4             | 2-           | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |    |
| 30.         | All school                         | speakers show                                 | uld be                   | •                        |                 |                   |              |                                       |    |
| ۰ <b>۰</b>  | process.                           | some officia                                  | c ocreening              | y .<br>1                 | 2               | 34                | 5            | 32                                    | t  |
| 31.         |                                    | o actively d                                  | iknunt tha               |                          | -               | -<br>-            |              | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |    |
|             |                                    | of a school                                   |                          |                          |                 | · · · · ·         |              |                                       |    |
| P 1-3       | 'strating,'s                       | itting in, o                                  | r otherwist              | 6                        |                 |                   |              |                                       |    |
|             | resulting to                       | obey the ru                                   | kes should               | een oo ara bo<br>y tigoo |                 | 2 4               | . E .        | 33                                    |    |
|             | *                                  | or suspende                                   |                          | , ,                      | <b>4</b>        |                   |              |                                       |    |
|             |                                    | facilities as vailable for                    |                          |                          | . ч             |                   |              |                                       |    |
| 32.         | use.                               |   | LUMMURALY                | 1 T                      | 2               | 3 4               | 5            | 34                                    | •  |
| 32.         | Cura c.                            |   |                          | 1                        |                 | •                 |              |                                       |    |
| 40          |                                    | LUStom now                                    | in use                   | · -                      | - ^·            |                   |              |                                       |    |
| 32.         |                                    | system now .<br>odified.                      | in use                   | 1                        | 2               | 3 4               | 5            | 35                                    | 1  |

|                         | ···· .   | ،<br>پر بې  | · · · · · ·                                |                                       |                    |                     |                      | · .         |                                       |               |   |
|-------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------|----------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|---|
|                         | . 1  |   | Υ  | A2                                    | ан са<br>А         | u -                 | n                    | SD.         | 180                                   |               | Ī   |
| 34.                     | The value of<br>in rec <b>ruit</b> ing<br>recei <b>ve less</b>                   | teachers shi  | fications<br>ould                          | 調査                                    | Z                  | 3                   | 4                    | 5           |                                       | 36            | 1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1<br>1 |
| 35.                     | The schools s<br>engaged in so<br>social proble                                  | should be act<br>plying contemp<br>ems:   | ive <b>ly</b><br>porary                    | 1                                     | 2.                 | 3                   | <b>.</b> 4           | 5           | **<br>*                               | 3 <b>J</b> ra |   |
| 36.                     | The curriculu<br>to accommodat<br>in student at<br>educational                   | te a wide divi<br>bility <b>levels</b>  | ersity 。<br>and                            | · · ·                                 | 2                  | 3                   | 4                    | 5           | •                                     | 38            |   |
| 37.                     |  | onal values of the second s | of its                                     | 1                                     | . 2                | 3                   | . ,t                 | 5           |                                       | 39            |   |
| 38.                     | should be sub  | the school p<br>ject to disc<br>as well as l  | oremises<br>ipline                         | 1                                     | 2 · .              | . 3                 | 4 <sup>°</sup>       | 5           | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |               |   |
| 39.                     | There should<br>educators on   | be more profe<br>school boards  | essional<br>s.                             | 1                                     | 2                  | . 3                 | 4                    | 5           | 1<br>5<br>4 7                         | 41            |   |
| 40.                     | The superinte  | indent should ther than a   | act as                                     | 1                                     | 2                  | 3                   | 4                    | 5           |                                       | 42            |   |
| 41.                     | Except for ma<br>ential nature<br>should be dis<br>sessions.                     | tters of a co<br>, all board b<br>cussed fully  | business                                   | . 1                                   | 2                  | • 3                 | 4                    | 5           |                                       | 43            | 1.  |
| - 42 .                  |  | ery groups to<br>ational matte<br>d for each so   | ers should                                 | 1                                     | 2                  | °°<br>•• <b>3</b>   | 4                    | 5           |                                       | 44            |   |
| · · ·                   | Collective ba<br>teachers and<br>at the local<br>level.                          | boards should   | t be done .                                | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 2                  | 3                   | 4                    | 5           | •                                     | 45            |   |
| in ge<br>'your<br>preyi | ollowing seri<br>neral. In re<br>frame of refe<br>ous series b<br>ment in terms  | sponding to t<br>rence to this<br>ut instead in   | these states<br>s school di<br>rdicate you | ments<br>stric<br>r agr               | do<br>t (a<br>eeme | not<br>s in<br>nt o | limix<br>the<br>r di | <b>t</b> ,: |                                       |               |   |
|                         | Sahaal dirtri  | ,   |  | <u>SA</u>                             | <u>A</u>           | <u>u</u>            | <u>D</u>             | <u>SD</u>   | •                                     |               | •   |
|                         | School distri<br>entirely from<br>rather than h<br>upon a local<br>tax assessmen | provincial s<br>aving to rely<br>educational p  | ources<br>partially                        | 1                                     | 2                  | 3                   | 4                    | 5           |                                       | 46            |   |
| f(y) = f(y)             |  | and a second  |  |                                       | · · · ·            |                     | CONI                 | tinuec      | 1                                     | 11            | ۰.  |

|                                | e  |  |   | í<br>N                | 101             | -           |
|--------------------------------|--|--|---|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------|
| · · ·                          | û  | SA - A   | UN 10                                     | SD.                   | ce              | •           |
| 45.                            | Increased provin <del>cial</del> support of public education should mean   |  |   |                       |                 | •           |
|                                | increased provincial control.  | 1 2  | •3 4                                      | 5                     | 47              |             |
| <b>46.</b>                     | The typical high school curric-<br>ulum suffers from the special-<br>ization of teaching staff.  | •1 •2  | 3.4                                       | 5                     | 48              |             |
| 47.                            | Socially disadvantaged students<br>who appear to have potential<br>should be admitted to high<br>school programs even when they<br>do not meet normal entrance<br>requirements.  | 1 2  | 3 <b>4</b>                                | 5                     | 49              | •           |
| 48.                            | The district superintendent should be provincially appointed.  | 1 2  | - 3. 4                                    | <b>5</b>              | 50              |             |
| 49.                            | Running a school division is<br>basically like running a big<br>business.  | 1 2  | * .<br>3 . 4                              | <b>. 5</b>            | 51              | ,<br>,<br>, |
| 50.                            | School boards increase the effec-<br>tiveness of school management.  | 1 2  | 3 4                                       | 5                     | 52              |             |
| 51.                            | All decisions regarding curric-<br>ulum should be made at the local<br>district level.   | 1 2  | , ~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~    | ویس <sup>م</sup><br>ج | 53              | •' •<br>«   |
| 52.                            | There is a need for greater discipline in schools.   | 1 2  | 34  | 5                     | 54              |             |
| 53.                            | Departmental exams should be reinstated.   | 1 2  | 3 4                                       | 5                     | 55              |             |
| 54.                            | Schools should place more<br>emphasis on basic skills rather<br>than vocational programs.  | 1 3.   | 34  | 5                     | 56              |             |
| gove<br>schoo<br>tanco<br>eged | feel that the single most important<br>ining board is the choice of a new p<br>ols. Please indicate your feelings<br>to of the following characteristics u<br>in the selection of a superintender<br>the key below circle the approprie<br>tion: | superintend<br>regarding<br>which might<br>nt for your | lent of<br>the impo<br>be cont<br>institu | or-<br>sid-<br>ition. | <i><i>ž</i></i> | ·           |
| · · · ·                        | 1. Absocutely Essential (AE)<br>2. Important (I)<br>3. Not Important (NI)  | 4. Undesir<br>5. High&y<br>(HU)                        |   |                       |                 | •           |
| ~~ <sup>*</sup> I              |  | <u>AE ··· </u>   | <u>N.T., U</u>                            | HU                    |                 | •           |
| 55.                            | Experience in public school<br>administration  | 1 2  | 34  | 5                     | 57              |             |
|                                |  | ~  | Cona                                      | tinued                | .12             |             |

**.**...

ŧ

|  |  |  | •  |  |  | •  | •                                      |           | s |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-----------|---|
|  |  |  | · 1  | • • •  | •  |  | 182                                    |           |   |
|  |  | *  | -  | AE   | $\underline{I}  \underline{NI}$  | <u>и</u> <u>н</u>  |  | <u> </u>  |   |
| 56.  | Successful a   | teaching expe  | rience   | 1  | 2 3  | 4  | 5                                      | _ 58      |   |
| 57.  | Holder of a  | n earned M. E  | d.   | 1  | 2 3  | 4  | 5 - ,                                  | .59       |   |
| 58.  | Academic scl   | holarship  |  | · 1  | 2 / 3-   | 4  | 5                                      | 60.       |   |
| 59.  | Religious A  | <i>biliation</i>   |  | - 1  | 2 3  | 4  | 5                                      | 61        |   |
| 60.  | Experience   | in business m  | anagement  | 1  | 2 3  | <b>,4</b> <sup>2</sup> ∃   | ; ·                                    | 62        |   |
| 61.  | Familiarity  | with the dis   | trict  | 1  | 2 3  | 4  | 5 :                                    | 63        |   |
| . 6 2 . `  | Personal li<br>"complication   | be free from<br>ons" (i.e. dl  | vorce)   | K.   | 2 3  | .4   | 74<br>5                                | 64        |   |
| 63.  | Polished pe  | rsonal style   |  | 1  | 2 3  | 4 !  | ;                                      | 65        |   |
| 64.  |  | leadership a   | bility   | 1  | 2 3  | 4  | 5                                      | 66        |   |
| 65.  | Evidence of  | past leaders<br>i.e. professi  | hip in   | 1  | 2 3  |  | ,<br>,                                 | 67        |   |
| 66.  |  | past leaders   | hip in   | 1  | 2 3  | 4  |  | 68        |   |
| 67.  | Sex  |  | · •  | 1  | 2 3  | . 4'   | ;                                      | 69        |   |
|  |  | •••  | $\mathcal{D}^{*}$  |  | -  |  | х                                      | · · · · · |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>ínvo<br>shou   | ority in make<br>cise major at<br>lved), mark (<br>ld be decided   | ing the decis<br>uthority leve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m   | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups   | everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis  | ne∑group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo  | o should<br>iy be<br>feel<br>or  |  | -         |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth   | ority in make<br>cise major at<br>lved), mark d<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark d<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen   | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that would<br>nt (S)   | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.   | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board  | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke  | o should<br>iy be<br>feel<br>or<br>iy below                                    | ,                                      | "         |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth   | ority in maka<br>cise major au<br>lved), mark d<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark d<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facula  | ing the decis<br>uthority leve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that would   | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups   | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board  | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>(B)<br>ment of  | o should<br>iy be<br>feel<br>or<br>iy below                                    | ,                                      | "         |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r   | ority in mak<br>cise major at<br>lved), mark o<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark o<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facula<br>3. Admina  | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that woul<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)  | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.   | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart  | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>(B)<br>ment of  | o should<br>iy be<br>feel<br>or<br>iy below                                    | ,                                      | ~         |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r<br><u>Exam</u><br>Yo                      | ority in mak<br>cise major au<br>lved), mark d<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark d<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facul<br>3. Admin<br>ple:<br>u may feel th   | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that woul<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)  | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.<br>5.   | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart  | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>(B)<br>ment of  | should<br>iy be<br>feel<br>ir<br>y below<br>Educati                            | ,                                      |           |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r<br><u>Exam</u><br>Yo<br>be                | ority in make<br>cise major at<br>lved), mark d<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark d<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facult<br>3. Admine<br>ple:<br>u may feel th<br>made by:  | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that woul<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)<br>istration (A)<br>fat a decisio  | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.<br>5.<br>n should   | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart<br>(D of   | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>(B)<br>ment of<br>E)  | should<br>iy be<br>feel<br>ir<br>y below<br>Educati                            | ,<br>.on                               | ~         |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r<br><u>Exam</u><br>Yo<br>be                | ority in mak<br>cise major at<br>lved), mark d<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark d<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facult<br>3. Admin<br>ple:<br>u may feel th<br>made by:<br>A. the board<br>major aut   | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one Spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that woul<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)<br>istration (A)<br>that a decisio<br>alone exerci<br>hority   | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.<br>5.<br>n should<br>sing   | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart<br>(D of   | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>(B)<br>ment of<br>E)  | should<br>y be<br>feel<br>y below<br>Education                                 | ,<br>.on                               |           |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r<br><u>Exam</u><br>Yo<br>be                | ority in make<br>cise major at<br>lved), mark of<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark of<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facula<br>3. Admina<br>ple:<br>u may feel th<br>made by:<br>A. the board<br>major auth<br>B. the board  | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that would<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)<br>istration (A)<br>fat a decisio<br>alone exerci<br>hority<br>and administ   | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.<br>5.<br>n should<br>sing<br>ration   | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart<br>(D of<br><u>S</u> <u>F</u><br>1 2                   | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>{B}<br>ment of<br>E)<br><u>A</u><br><u>4</u>  | should<br>iy be<br>feel<br>iy below<br>Education<br>B <u>D</u> co              | ,<br>.on                               |           |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r<br><u>Exam</u><br>Yo<br>be                | ority in make<br>cise major at<br>lved), mark of<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark of<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facult<br>3. Admine<br>ple:<br>u may feel th<br>made by:<br>A. the board<br>major auth<br>B. the board<br>each exem<br>C. the stude   | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that woul<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)<br>istration (A)<br>fat a decisio<br>alone exerci-<br>hority<br>and administ<br>cising major<br>hts, faculty   | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.<br>5.<br>n should<br>sing<br>ration<br>authority<br>and                               | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart<br>(D of   | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>(B)<br>ment of<br>E)  | should<br>iy be<br>feel<br>iy below<br>Education<br>B <u>D</u> co              | ,<br>.on                               |           |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r<br><u>Exam</u><br>Yo<br>be                | ority in make<br>cise major and<br>lved), mark of<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark of<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facula<br>3. Admina<br>ple:<br>u may feel th<br>made by:<br>A. the board<br>major auth<br>B. the board<br>each exerce<br>C. the studen   | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that woul<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)<br>istration (A)<br>fat a decisio<br>alone exerci-<br>hority<br>and administ<br>cising major<br>hts, faculty<br>h exercising                                   | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.<br>5.<br>5.<br>n should<br>sing<br>ration<br>authority<br>and                         | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart<br>(D of<br><u>S</u> <u>F</u><br>1 2                   | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>{B}<br>ment of<br>E)<br><u>A</u><br><u>4</u>  | should<br>y be<br>feel<br>y below<br>Education<br>B D co                       | ,<br>.on                               |           |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r<br><u>Exam</u><br>Yo<br>be                | ority in mak<br>cise major an<br>lved), mark of<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark of<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facult<br>3. Admin<br>ple:<br>u may feel th<br>made by:<br>A. the board<br>major auth<br>B. the board<br>each exern<br>C. the stude<br>board each<br>authority                                   | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that woul<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)<br>istration (A)<br>hority<br>and administ<br>cising major<br>hts, faculty<br>h exercising   | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.<br>5.<br>n should<br>sing<br>ration<br>authority<br>and<br>major                      | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart<br>(D of<br><u>S F</u><br>1 2<br>1 2<br>(1) (2)        | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>{B}<br>ment of<br>E}<br><u>A</u><br>(4<br>(3) (4<br>3 (4  | should<br>y be<br>feel<br>y below<br>Education<br>B D co                       | on<br><u>6</u> E                       |           |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r<br><u>Exam</u><br>Yo<br>be                | ority in mak<br>cise major an<br>lved), mark of<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark of<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facult<br>3. Admin<br>ple:<br>u may feel th<br>made by:<br>A. the board<br>major auth<br>B. the board<br>each exern<br>C. the stude<br>board each<br>authority                                   | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that would<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)<br>istration (A)<br>that a decision<br>alone exerci-<br>hority<br>and administ<br>cising major<br>hts, faculty<br>h exercising<br>roups should                | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.<br>5.<br>n should<br>sing<br>ration<br>authority<br>and<br>major                      | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart<br>(D of<br><u>S F</u><br>1 2<br>1 2<br>(1) (2)        | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>{B}<br>ment of<br>E}<br><u>A</u><br>(4<br>(3) (4<br>3 (4  | should<br>iy be<br>feel<br>iy below<br>Education<br>B <u>D</u> c<br>in each    | on<br><u>6 E</u>                       |           |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r<br><u>Exam</u><br>Yo<br>be<br>Whic<br>the | ority in mak<br>cise major an<br>lved), mark of<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark of<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facult<br>3. Admin<br>ple:<br>u may feel th<br>made by:<br>A. the board<br>major auth<br>B. the board<br>each exern<br>C. the stude<br>board each<br>authority<br>h group or gr<br>following are | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that would<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)<br>istration (A)<br>that a decision<br>alone exerci-<br>hority<br>and administ<br>cising major<br>hts, faculty<br>h exercising<br>roups <u>should</u><br>eas: | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.<br>5.<br>n should<br>sing<br>ration<br>authority<br>and<br>major<br>exercise <u>m</u> | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart<br>(D of<br><u>S F</u><br>1 2<br>1 2<br>(1) (2)        | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>{B}<br>ment of<br>E}<br><u>A</u><br>(4<br>(3) (4<br>3 (4  | should<br>iy be<br>feel<br>iy below<br>Education<br>B <u>D</u> c<br>in each    | on<br><u>6</u> E                       | 7.0       |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r<br><u>Exam</u><br>Yo<br>be<br>Whic<br>the | ority in mak<br>cise major an<br>lved), mark of<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark of<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facult<br>3. Admin<br>ple:<br>u may feel th<br>made by:<br>A. the board<br>major auth<br>B. the board<br>each exern<br>C. the stude<br>board each<br>authority<br>h group or gr<br>following are | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that would<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)<br>istration (A)<br>that a decision<br>alone exerci-<br>hority<br>and administ<br>cising major<br>hts, faculty<br>h exercising<br>roups should                | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.<br>5.<br>n should<br>sing<br>ration<br>authority<br>and<br>major<br>exercise <u>m</u> | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart<br>(D of<br><u>S F</u><br>1 2<br>1 2<br>(1) (2)        | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>{B}<br>ment of<br>E}<br><u>A</u><br>(4<br>(3) (4<br>3 (4  | should<br>iy be<br>feel<br>iy below<br>Education<br>B <u>D</u> c<br>in each    | on<br><u>6 E</u>                       | 70        |   |
| auth<br>exer<br>invo<br>shou<br>auth<br>in r<br><u>Exam</u><br>Yo<br>be<br>Whic<br>the | ority in mak<br>cise major an<br>lved), mark of<br>ld be decided<br>ority, mark of<br>esponding:<br>1. Studen<br>2. Facult<br>3. Admin<br>ple:<br>u may feel th<br>made by:<br>A. the board<br>major auth<br>B. the board<br>each exern<br>C. the stude<br>board each<br>authority<br>h group or gr<br>following are | ing the decis<br>uthority (eve<br>only one spac<br>d by two or m<br>all that would<br>nt (S)<br>ty (F)<br>istration (A)<br>that a decision<br>alone exerci-<br>hority<br>and administ<br>cising major<br>hts, faculty<br>h exercising<br>roups <u>should</u><br>eas: | ion. Wher<br>n though s<br>e. For ma<br>ore groups<br>d be inclu<br>4.<br>5.<br>n should<br>sing<br>ration<br>authority<br>and<br>major<br>exercise <u>m</u> | e only o<br>everal g<br>tters wh<br>exercis<br>ded. Us<br>Board<br>Depart<br>(D of<br><u>S</u> <u>F</u><br>1 2<br>1 2<br>(1) (2) | ne group<br>roups ma<br>ich you<br>ing majo<br>e the ke<br>(B)<br>ment of<br>E)<br>A<br>(4)<br>(3)<br>(4)<br>(3)<br>(4)<br>(3)<br>(4)<br>(3)<br>(4)<br>(3)<br>(4)<br>(4)<br>(3)<br>(4)<br>(4)<br>(4)<br>(3)<br>(4)<br>(4)<br>(4)<br>(4)<br>(4)<br>(4)<br>(4)<br>(4)<br>(4)<br>(4 | should<br>y be<br>feel<br>y below<br>Education<br><u>B</u><br>D<br>c<br>n each | of<br><u>6</u><br><u>6</u><br><u>6</u> |           |   |

**183**,

| . 51 |   | <u>s</u> | <u>F</u> | <u>.</u> | B          | DOGE                  | . [        | cc              |
|------|---|----------|----------|----------|------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------|
| 169. | Adding or deleting specific courses   | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4<br>4     | 5                     |            | 71_             |
| 7.0. | Adding or deleting a program(s)   | 1        | .2       | 3        | 4          | <ul><li>✓ 5</li></ul> |            | 72              |
| 71.  | Allocating finances within the district   | 1        | 2        | 3        | .4         | <b>5</b>              |            | 73              |
| 72.  | Establishing rules regarding student conduct                                      | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4          | 5                     | •          | 74              |
| 73.  | Selecting speakers for student-<br>sponsored activities                           | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4.         | 5                     |            | 75              |
| 74.  | Appointing district super<br>intendents   | 1        | 2        | 3        | .4         | 5                     |            | 76              |
| 75.  | Determining tuition and fees  | 1        | .2       | 3        | . 4        | 5                     | 7          | 17              |
| 76.  | Deciding the future of a teacher accused of immoral conduct                       | 1        | 2        | . 3      | 4          | •<br>• 5 . '          | 4          | T8              |
| 77.  | Determing wage scales for<br>non-teaching staff members                           | 1        | 2        | 3,       | 4          | 5                     | -          | 79              |
| 28.  | Jaking disciplinary action<br>against a student for cheating<br>on an examination | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4          | 5                     |            | 80              |
|      |   |          |          |          |            |                       |            | Card#3<br>1 - 4 |
|      |   |          | •        | •        |            |                       |            | 5               |
| 79.  | Acquiring new sites and property  | I,       | 2        | 3        | <b>4</b> / | <b>5</b>              |            | ·               |
| 80.  | Approving architectural drawings<br>Gor a new building                            | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4          | 5,                    |            | 6               |
| 81.  | Establishing the school district budget   | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4.         | 5                     |            | 7               |
| 82.  | Establishing individual school<br>budgets   | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4          | 5                     |            | 8               |
| 83.  | Developing contacts with<br>governmental offices                                  | 1        | 2        | . 3      | 4          | 5 .                   |            | 9               |
| 84.  | Developing contacts with post secondary institutions                              | . 1 .    | 2        | 3        | 4          | 5                     | <b>`</b> 9 | 10              |
| 85.  | Establishing school district<br>administrative structure                          | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4          | 5                     |            | 11              |
| 86,  | Selecting an architect  | 1        | 2.       | 3        | 4          | 5                     |            | 12              |
| 87.  | Making teacher appointments   | 1        | 2        | 3        | 4          | 5                     |            | 13              |
| 88.  | Making administrative<br>appointments   | 1        | ·• 2     | 3        | 4          | 5                     |            | 14              |

2

Continued....14

کنو

| •     | •                      |                              |                             |                  | •        |                   |             |     |
|-------|------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------|----------|-------------------|-------------|-----|
|       |                        | •<br>•                       | т.<br>С.                    |                  |          | 1.                | • [%        | • • |
|       | - 4<br>                | •                            |                             |                  |          |                   |             | ,   |
| 100   |                        |                              |                             | <u>s</u> <u></u> | 4.       | <u>B</u> <u>D</u> | 06 E        |     |
| 89.   | forming p<br>Faculty L | olicies rega<br>eaves and so | irding<br>ibbaticals        | 1 2              | 3        | 4                 | <i>b</i>    | 15  |
| 90.   |                        |                              | admissions,                 | <b>#</b> 1 2     | 3        | 4                 | 5           | 16  |
| 91.   | Designing              | library ser                  | ivices                      | 1 2              | 3        | 4                 | 5           | 17_ |
| 92.   | Evaluatin<br>methods   | g`instructic                 | onal                        | 1 2              | 3        | 4                 | 5           | 18  |
|       |                        | •                            |                             | .)               |          | · · · ·           | • • • •     |     |
|       |                        |                              |                             |                  |          |                   |             |     |
| Plead | se add any             | comments yo                  | nu may wi <del>sh</del>     | to make          |          | ·                 | <del></del> |     |
| Plead | se add any             | comments yo                  | ou may wi <del>sh-</del>    | to make          | <u> </u> |                   |             |     |
| Plea. | se add any             | comments yc                  | ou, may wi <del>sh-</del> , | ŧo makę          |          |                   |             |     |
| Plea. | se add any             | comments yc                  | ou, may wi <del>sh-</del> , | to make          |          |                   |             |     |
| Plea. | se add any             | comments yc                  | ou, may wi <del>sh-</del> , | ŧo makę          |          |                   |             |     |
| Plea. | se add any             | comments yc                  | ou, may wi <del>sh-</del> . | ŧo make          |          |                   |             |     |
| Plea. | se add any             | comments yc                  | ou, may wi <del>sh-</del>   | ŧo makę          |          |                   | •           |     |
| Plea. | se add any             | comments yc                  | ou, may wi <del>sh-</del>   | ŧo make          |          |                   |             |     |
| Plea. | se add any             | comments yc                  | ou, may wi <del>sh-</del>   | ŧo make          |          |                   | 3           |     |
|       | se add any             | comments yc                  | u, may wi <del>sh-</del>    | ŧo make          |          |                   | 3           |     |

-

č





## ALBERTA SCHOOL TRUSTEES ASSOCIATION

12310 - 105 AVENUE Edmonton Alberta T5N 094 Telephone: 482-7311

186

October 21, 1977

To: All School Trustees

The Alberta School Trustees' Association has endorsed a research study being carried out by Lawrence Beaudry, a student of the Department of Educational Administration at the University of Alberta and who, at present, holds the position of principal of Central Elementary School in the Lac La Biche School Division No. 51.

Mr. Beaudry is conducting a study about school trustees as partial fulfillment of a Master of Education degree. The Alberta School Trustees' Association is interested in the results of this study and feels that the data generated would be both interesting and useful to school boards. We are assured that any and all information gathered will be treated with utmost confidence. No person or school system will be identified with respect to any particular event or decision.

Your Association office respectfully requests your cooperation by completing the questionnaire which Mr. Beaudry will be distributing to every school trustee in the Province.

Yours very truly,

Stanley G. Maertz Executive Director



## TO ALL SCHOOL TRUSTEES:

The research project represented by the enclosed questionnaire is directed toward providing information about who our trustees are, what they do, and what their views are on various educational issues.

The information accumulated through the questionnaire will be used to develop several research articles which will be made available to the A.S.T.A. for distribution to their membership. Information received is strictly confidential and will not be presented in any manner that allows for identification with individual trustees or boards.

A high response rate is essential if an accurate profile of Alberta School Trustees is to be obtained. The questionnaire will take approximately twenty minutes to complete.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would answer the questions to the best of your ability and return the completed questionnaire in the pre-addressed envelope as soon as possible.

Thank you for your co-operation.

Lawrence Beaudry