

INFORMATION TO USERS

While the most advanced technology has been used to photograph and reproduce this manuscript, the quality of the reproduction is heavily dependent upon the quality of the material submitted. For example:

- Manuscript pages may have indistinct print. In such cases, the best available copy has been filmed.
- Manuscripts may not always be complete. In such cases, a note will indicate that it is not possible to obtain missing pages.
- Copyrighted material may have been removed from the manuscript. In such cases, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, and charts) are photographed by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each oversize page is also filmed as one exposure and is available, for an additional charge, as a standard 35mm slide or as a 17"x 23" black and white photographic print.

Most photographs reproduce acceptably on positive microfilm or microfiche but lack the clarity on xerographic copies made from the microfilm. For an additional charge, 35mm slides of 6"x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations that cannot be reproduced satisfactorily by xerography.

8701335

Taylor, Michael Ray

**PRESIDENTS' AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN'S PERCEPTIONS OF TRUSTEE
SELECTION AND TENURE IN THE NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE SYSTEM**

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Ed.D. 1985

**University
Microfilms
International** 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark .

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____
2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____
3. Photographs with dark background _____
4. Illustrations are poor copy _____
5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____
6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____
7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages
8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____
9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____
10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print _____
11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.
12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.
13. Two pages numbered _____. Text follows.
14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____
15. Dissertation contains pages with print at a slant, filmed as received _____
16. Other _____

University
Microfilms
International

PRESIDENTS' AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN'S PERCEPTIONS OF
TRUSTEE SELECTION AND TENURE IN THE NORTH
CAROLINA COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM

by

Michael Ray Taylor

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

Greensboro
1985

Approved by


Dissertation Adviser

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser

E. L. Brunick
Joseph E. Brunick

Committee Members

Joseph E. Brunick
Walter L. ...
Harold R. ...
E. L. Brunick

June 17, 1985
Date of Acceptance by Committee

June 17, 1985
Date of Final Oral Examination

TAYLOR, MICHAEL RAY, Ed.D. Presidents' and Trustee Chairmen's Perceptions of Trustee Selection and Tenure in the North Carolina Community College System. (1985) Directed by Dr. Joseph Bryson and Dr. Lee Bernick. 163 pp.

This dissertation studies the critical aspect of local governance in the North Carolina Community College System. The researcher concentrated on the question of local trustee service on the 58 community college/technical college/technical institute boards in the North Carolina system and sought to expand the knowledge base concerning the areas of (1) trustee selection, (2) criteria for service, and (3) length of trustee service.

The study sought to answer the following questions: (1) What are the criteria upon which the selection of local boards of trustees is based? (2) By what methods or by what governing agencies are local trustees selected (elected or appointed)? (3) What is the length of service for board of trustee members? In addition, the study surveyed state community college leaders to find out their perceptions of the current trustee governance policy and several key issues surrounding this policy.

Data were collected from a review of the available literature on the subject, a study of the legal policies of community colleges in other states, interviews with key leaders in the North Carolina Community College System, and a survey of community college presidents and trustee chairmen.

The results of the survey in North Carolina revealed that presidents and their trustee chairmen rate the county commissioners as the most effective in making appointments to the local trustee board; they also perceive that the Governor makes appointment decisions based on political considerations more often than the commissioners or the board of education do. The respondents were overwhelmingly opposed to the election of trustees

but were about evenly split on the issue of limiting trustee service on the local board. Those responding favorably to this question generally supported a plan for shorter terms and some limit on the number of terms a trustee may serve. The presidents and trustees also believe that trustees should ideally possess a set of traits which include an understanding of the mission and role of the college, leadership abilities, stature in the community, and sufficient time needed for trustee duties.

From the survey responses and findings, it is apparent that while the presidents and trustee chairman have some concerns about the current appointment policy, they are strongly supportive of that policy and there is no consensus for change.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the many people who have contributed to the completion of this study. Included are many community college presidents and trustee chairmen, State Community College President Robert W. Scott, Lenoir Community College President Jesse L. McDaniel and A. Forrest Waller, Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Lenoir Community College. Also, special thanks to Dr. James Batten and Dr. Walter McLendon, East Carolina University who were instrumental in helping to develop the survey. In addition, grateful acknowledgement is given to Dr. Mary Cauley of Lenoir Community College for her support and encouragement. Others who deserve special thanks are Ms. Ellen Schrader who provided technical assistance in the analysis of data and Ms. Jessie Wooten who was instrumental in completion of this project.

The writer expresses sincere appreciation for the support and guidance provided by the members of his dissertation committee: Dr. Lee Bernick, Dr. Dale Brubaker, Dr. Joseph Bryson, and Dr. Harold Snyder.

This acknowledgement would not be complete without an expression of gratitude for the counsel provided by the late Dr. Dwight Clark, who was the writer's advisor and committee chairman until his death in September, 1984. It is in the memory of Dr. Clark, who always encouraged and expected the very best of this writer that this study is dedicated.

And finally, the writer expresses sincere gratitude to his wife, Alice, for her untiring support, encouragement, and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Community College Background	3
Local Control Focus in History	14
Statement of the Problem	18
Scope of the Problem	20
Significance of the Study	21
Definition of Terms	22
Methods, Procedures, and Sources of Information	23
Design of Study	26
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	27
Responsibilities of Governing Boards	28
Trustee Characteristics: Who Should Serve?	36
Selection of Board Members	45
Board Size and Trustee Tenure	54
III. LOCAL BOARD GOVERNANCE IN UNITED STATES COMMUNITY COMMEGE SYSTEMS (A STATE-BY-STATE ANALYSIS)	59
States with 100% Governor Appointments	60
States Where Governor Shares Appointment Authority	60
States With Varying Size Boards	62
The North Carolina Appointment Law	68
Key System Leaders Interviewed on Governance Issue	77
IV. RESULTS	81
Trustee Appointment Method	81
Commissioners Rated Most Effective	86
Political Considerations	94
Models for Appointment Authority	100
Alternative Models	105

Elected Boards	106
Length of Terms and Service for Trustees	108
Trustee Characteristics	113
Additional Desirable Trustee Characteristics	118
Summary	118
Findings	121
V. SUMMARY	125
Conclusions	129
Recommendations	141
Suggestions for Further Study	143
BIBLIOGRAPHY	144
APPENDIX	152

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	Page
1. COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD COMPOSITION (ELECTED BOARDS)	64
2. COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD COMPOSITION (APPOINTED BOARDS)	65
3. PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND BOARD CHAIRMEN REGARDING PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF CURRENT APPOINTMENT METHOD FOR OBTAINING LOCAL TRUSTEES	82
4. CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND BY BOARD CHAIRMEN REGARDING PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF CURRENT APPOINTMENT METHOD FOR OBTAINING TRUSTEES	83
5. PERCEPTIONS OF PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN REGARDING EFFECTIVENESS OF DIFFERENT APPOINTING GROUPS, BY NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES	88
6. CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN REGARDING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COUNTY COMMISSIONERS IN APPOINTING QUALIFIED MEMBERS TO THE LOCAL BOARDS OF TRUSTEES	89
7. CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEES REGARDING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE BOARDS OF EDUCATION IN APPOINTING QUALIFIED MEMBERS TO THE LOCAL BOARD OF TRUSTEES	90
8. CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN REGARDING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE GOVERNOR IN APPOINTING QUALIFIED MEMBERS TO THE LOCAL BOARD OF TRUSTEES	91
9. RESPONSE MEAN COMPARISONS OF THE SIX LARGEST SCHOOLS IN THE NCCCS WITH ALL SCHOOLS IN THE SYSTEM ON PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF APPOINTING GROUPS	92
10. DISTRIBUTION OF AGREEMENT BY PAIRED RESPONSES OF PRESIDENTS AND THEIR BOARD CHAIRMEN ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF APPOINTING AGENCIES	93
11. RESPONSE COMPARISONS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND TECHNICAL SCHOOLS ON EFFECTIVENESS OF APPOINTING GROUPS	94

12.	CROSS-TABULATIONS OF COMBINED RESPONSES OF PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN RATING THE INFLUENCE OF POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON TRUSTEE APPOINTMENTS BY THE GOVERNOR COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION	95
13.	CROSS-TABULATIONS OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND BY TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN RATING THE INFLUENCE OF POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON TRUSTEE APPOINTMENTS BY COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, BOARDS OF EDUCATION, AND THE GOVERNOR POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS	98
14.	RESPONSE MEAN COMPARISONS OF THE SIX LARGEST SCHOOLS IN THE NCCCS WITH ALL SCHOOLS IN THE SYSTEM ON INFLUENCE OF POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS BY APPOINTING GROUPS	99
15.	MEAN COMPARISONS OF OVERALL RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN RATING PREFERENCES FOR VARIOUS MODELS FOR APPOINTING TRUSTEE BOARD MEMBERS.	102
16.	CROSS-TABULATIONS OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND BY TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN RATING PREFERENCES FOR VARIOUS MODELS FOR APPOINTING TRUSTEE BOARD MEMBERS	103
17.	COMPARISON OF MEANS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND TECHNICAL COLLEGES/TECHNICAL INSTITUTES RANKING SUGGESTED APPOINTMENT MODELS FOR TRUSTEES	104
18.	CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES FROM PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEES CONSIDERING THE ELECTION OF TRUSTEES IN NORTH CAROLINA. RESPONSES WHICH WERE NOT CLASSIFIED IN EITHER GROUP WERE ALSO INCLUDED	107
19.	PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY PRESIDENTS AND BY TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN REGARDING LIMITING THE LENGTH OF TRUSTEE BOARD SERVICE	108
20.	CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND BY TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN CONSIDERING LIMITING THE LENGTH OF SERVICE FOR TRUSTEES ON LOCAL BOARDS. (RESPONSES WHICH WERE NOT CLASSIFIED IN EITHER GROUP WERE INCLUDED.)	109
21.	PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN FOR LIMITING TRUSTEE SERVICE	111
22.	CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN ON PREFERENCES FOR THE NUMBER OF TERMS A TRUSTEE SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO SERVE ON THE BOARD	112

23.	CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES FROM PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN TO PREFERENCE FOR LENGTH OF TERMS FOR TRUSTEE SERVICE	114
24.	RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF TRUSTEE CHARACTERISTICS AS SELECTED BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN	115
25.	RANK ORDER OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS ON SELECTED ITEMS . . .	116
26.	RANK ORDER OF RESPONSES BY TRUSTEES ON SELECTED ITEMS	117

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) is a major and vital force for education in the state. Over the last 20 years, the NCCCS has experienced unprecedented growth. Beginning with just 24 institutions in 1963 serving some 24,000 adult citizens, the system today has 58 member institutions which annually serve over 600,000.¹

In addition, the NCCCS now awards one in five high school diplomas or equivalents which are granted annually in the state. In fact, the system enrolls some 45 percent of all post-high-school students attending public and private institutions of higher education in North Carolina.²

From a financial standpoint, the system has grown just as dramatically. The 1963 General Assembly appropriated \$4,074,962 to operate the original 24 schools in the community college system.³ In 1984 the state budget for the system totaled over \$260,000,000⁴.

As evidenced by its unprecedented growth in a number of areas and the rapidly changing employment market, great emphasis will be placed on the role of the two-year college system in the state in the future.

¹North Carolina, Department of Community Colleges, North Carolina Community College Annual Report (Raleigh, 1984), p. 6.

²North Carolina, Department of Community Colleges, Educational Leadership for the Future (Raleigh, 1984), p. 1.

³North Carolina, State Board of Education, N. C. Community College Report, 1963-1970 (Raleigh, 1970), p. 4.

⁴N. C., State Board of Community Colleges, Summary of Institutional Budget Request: Fiscal Year 1984 (Raleigh, 1984).

The State Commission on the Future of North Carolina, established by Governor James B. Hunt, Jr. to develop goals and objectives for the state over the rest of this century, noted the importance of the community college in its report published in 1983. The Commission has identified the NCCCS as a key resource for the state in addressing the challenges of the future to ensure the welfare of its citizens.⁵ In responding to this challenge, the NCCCS faces a period when its achievement and capabilities must be re-examined. To focus on quality for the future, the leadership of the community college system must be alert to new challenges which demand change responses.

Governor Hunt pointed out the need to be ever vigilant in considering the future of the system when he addressed the Community College Congress in 1981 and charged the system to "be receptive to change when changes are needed . . . (and) be prepared to take brave steps to build our future."⁶

NCCCS President Robert W. Scott addressed the need for change when he explained, "I hope that during the coming years we will be able to retain that spirit of excitement, vitality, flexibility and adaptability that has made our system so great. We must adapt to changes in society and the economy or we will lose sight of the great opportunity we have."⁷

⁵NC,DCC, Educational Leadership, Foreword.

⁶Ibid.

⁷NC,DCC, N. Car. Comm. College Annual Report, Preface.

According to a 1984 report of the North Carolina Community College Advisory Committee, which was charged with responding to the report of the Commission on the Future of North Carolina,

Leadership at the state and institutional levels is the key to ensuring quality and progress for the community college system. People who are dedicated and who will apply their energies to meeting the system's goals must be selected for the State Board of Community Colleges and local boards of trustees as presidents, faculty and staff.⁸

To understand this concern more fully, it is important to consider the organizational structure of the community college system in North Carolina and its history.

Community College Background

The roots of the community college system in North Carolina run deep; in fact, the historical foundation can be traced back over half a century. While the system has undergone a multitude of changes, it has remained for the most part true to its original philosophy of providing low cost, comprehensive, post-secondary educational opportunities for as many citizens as can benefit from it.

However, the system, as it operates today, did not spring full bloom with 58 institutions. The origin of the system in this state can be traced to 1927 when the first public junior college opened in North Carolina.⁹ From then it is a story of slow but steady development to the system as it exists today.

⁸NC,DCC, Educational Leadership, p. 4.

⁹Kenyon B. Segner, III, A History of the North Carolina Community College Movement in N. C., 1927-1963 (Kenansville, N.C.: James Sprunt Press, 1966), p. 1.

Buncombe County Junior College opened its doors in the mountains of North Carolina in 1927. The Asheville college was unique among the post-secondary schools in the state in that tuition was free and the school offered terminal programs in the technical and vocational education areas along with the traditional liberal arts curriculum.¹⁰ These offerings by Buncombe County represented the first efforts of a post-secondary school in North Carolina to offer a "comprehensive" educational program and mirrors the programs of many schools in the system today.

Initially, Buncombe County Junior College was operated under the jurisdiction of the Buncombe County Board of Education and was supported by county tax money.¹¹ The school struggled during the Depression, adding a \$100 per semester tuition in the Fall of 1930 to help provide financial support. Then in 1936, it was taken over by the Asheville Board of Education, as the county could no longer afford the operation. The name was then changed to Asheville-Biltmore College. In 1939 the General Assembly approved legislation allowing the two school systems, Asheville City and Buncombe County, to operate the two-year college jointly.¹² The college continued to struggle, moving from basement rooms in an Asheville high school building to other locations around the city and did not gain permanent facilities until 1949.¹³

While Asheville-Biltmore was never a large college in terms of enrollment, it did play a significant role in the development of the

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹Ibid., p. 2.

¹²Ibid., p. 4.

¹³Ibid., p. 6.

comprehensive community college system in the state. Until 1947, Asheville-Biltmore was the only public junior college in the state, when it was joined by schools with similar purposes in Charlotte and Wilmington. Along with the two newcomers, Asheville-Biltmore was later taken over completely by the state and is known today as the University of North Carolina at Asheville.

While Asheville-Biltmore College began operations in 1927, it was not until after World War II that the idea of additional public colleges began to develop in this state. The influx of GIs with their educational benefits caused unprecedented growth in the enrollment of the state's public colleges. State officials developed a plan to help handle this increase in enrollment by starting college extension centers at Charlotte, Wilmington, and Greensboro, which offered freshman and sophomore-level courses that were transferable to state senior colleges.¹⁴

While some of these centers operated only for a couple of years as state-supported schools, the schools at Wilmington and Charlotte were continued with local support.¹⁵ The New Hanover Board of Education took over the support for the Wilmington center while the Charlotte Board of Education took over jurisdiction for the college in the Queen City.¹⁶ These schools remained locally controlled and financed until the state assumed responsibility for their operation.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 7.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 9.

¹⁶Ibid.

Again, these college centers continued to plant the seeds which helped to convince state educators of the need for additional educational opportunities for state citizens.

Any study of the community college system in this state is also a study of educational leaders who saw great potential for a system of public junior or community colleges. One of those early leaders was Dr. Clyde Erwin, Superintendent of Public Instruction in the state from 1934 to 1952.¹⁷ Dr. Erwin, whose son is today president of Wayne Community College in Goldsboro, was a strong advocate of a system offering the 13th and 14th grades of vocational training to the state's citizens.

As early as 1946, Erwin asked the State Board of Education to consider the establishment of a community college system as part of the expanding public school system in the state. Erwin's idea for a junior college was for a program

that would contribute balance to the senior college enrollment and would make it possible for parents to save economically and would enable students who would not ordinarily get a college education to do so. It is the business of public education to meet the needs for education whatever those needs may be. We have come to the time when we have to consider the need for greater education.¹⁸

Erwin's advocacy of at least a study of a community college system was met by critical review on many levels, and the 1948 General Assembly killed two bills in committee that would have helped provide some financing for such a study. However, the General Assembly did approve a resolution calling for the State Superintendent to appoint a study

¹⁷Ibid., p. 28.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 29.

commission and use certain private funds to help pay for a review of the possibilities for establishment of some type of junior college program in the state. Erwin continued to persist in his efforts to study the potential for a true community college system and in 1950 he appointed a commission to study the state's need in this area. Dr. Allan S. Hurlburt, Head of the Department of Education at East Carolina Teachers' College, was named by Erwin to direct the study.¹⁹

The Hurlburt Commission, as it came to be known, published its report in October of 1952, entitled Community College Study.²⁰ The study called for a state-wide network of tuition-free, comprehensive community colleges. Perhaps as important as anything in the study was the description of what a comprehensive community college should be. Prior to this, the terms community college and junior college had been used interchangeably. But, the Hurlburt Commission established some new guidelines for community colleges.²¹

The Hurlburt Commission listed four characteristics for the schools: (1) low cost tuition for the students, (2) location within commuting distance of students, (3) local control of the schools, and (4) a curriculum offering a wide variety of educational opportunities to as many students as possible, including traditional two-year liberal arts, general education, terminal courses in vocational and technical areas, inservice

¹⁹Ibid., p. 41.

²⁰Ibid., p. 44.

²¹Ibid., p. 45.

training for workers, leisure-time education, and educational opportunities for dropouts. The commission also advocated that the state assume a great measure of fiscal responsibility for the schools.²²

The Community College Study was developed into legislation by State Representative Roy Taylor from Asheville, who was familiar with the junior college in his hometown.²³ While the bill was backed initially by a broad base of support and passed two readings in the House, it was ultimately defeated, and it was ten years before a true "community college" bill was approved by the General Assembly.²⁴

Another landmark in the development of the system came in 1953 when the General Assembly adopted a resolution authorizing the Governor to appoint a commission to study higher education in the state. The commission was to study the state's overall system of higher education and make recommendations to the 1955 General Assembly for needed changes.²⁵

Two years later the commission reported back to the General Assembly, noting a number of problems in the operation of higher education in the state: (1) the low percentage of college age youth who were actually enrolling in college, (2) the lack of efficiency in money spent on higher education and outcomes, (3) the lack of planning for higher education needs in the state, and (4) duplication of courses and programs at various schools. The Commission recommended that the General Assembly

²²Ibid.

²³Ibid., p. 51.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid., p. 16.

establish a Board of Higher Education to coordinate post-secondary education in North Carolina.²⁶

The General Assembly adopted the commission's recommendations and in May, 1955, created the State Board of Higher Education. The board had nine members who were appointed by the Governor with the consent of the General Assembly. D. Hiden Ramsey was elected by the members of the board as its first chairman.²⁷

Ramsey was to become a quick advocate of more junior colleges in the state. However, his idea of a junior college and that of Clyde Erwin were quite different. In fact, Ramsey and others held the view that vocational and technical education were not functions that should be termed "higher education" and were not programs that should receive state support.²⁸ Clearly, the concept of Ramsey and others was the establishment of liberal arts junior colleges aimed at preparing students for transfer into senior colleges. There was no place for adult education and terminal degree programs in their junior colleges.

Through the efforts of Ramsey and the State Board of Higher Education, the General Assembly approved the first "community college" bill in 1957.²⁹ The purpose of these new community colleges is spelled out clearly in House Bill 761 which served as the law that brought the

²⁶Ibid., p. 17.

²⁷Ibid., p. 19.

²⁸N. C. State Board of Education, First Five Years, 1963-1968: A Progress Report (Raleigh, N.C., 1969), p. 1.

²⁹N. C. State Board of Education, Community College Special Bulletin (Raleigh, N.C., 1960), p. 15.

new educational system to reality. The term community college is defined as an educational institution dedicated primarily to the particular needs of a community or area, offering the freshman and sophomore courses of a college of arts and science and the courses of a two-year technical institute of college grade.³⁰

The community college of 1957 was a far cry from that of today. The act provided additional state support for the junior colleges at Asheville, Wilmington, and Charlotte, as long as those schools gave up local control and allowed the State Board of Higher Education to have complete jurisdiction. The 1957 bill also provided funds only for academic programs at the two-year schools, while terminal programs were downgraded or discontinued completely.³¹ Indeed, the state now had a system of liberal arts two-year junior colleges, which were quite apart from the comprehensive educational institutions envisioned by members of the Hurlburt Commission.

Not a great deal of activity in school development took place under the new law. Only two schools were actually chartered under the 1957 act, one at Elizabeth City and another at Gaston. Both of these schools now operate under the community college system.³² The other three schools in the act--Asheville, Wilmington, and Charlotte--now operate as parts of the university system.³³

³⁰Ibid., p. 22.

³¹Ibid., p. 26.

³²NCSBE, First Five Years, p. 3.

³³Ibid., p. 67.

While the 1957 General Assembly did approve a community college act, it was in fact a "community college" in name only. More related to the guiding principle of the community college concept, perhaps, was the General Assembly's approval of a request for funds from the State Board of Education to develop area post-high-school vocational schools.³⁴ With the strong backing of Governor Luther Hodges, who felt job training was of paramount importance for the industrial development of the state, the General Assembly in 1957 approved the bill with an initial appropriation of \$500,000.³⁵ The State Board of Education, under the strong leadership of Dr. Dallas Herring, was charged with establishing the program. Under this plan, the State Board of Education would develop industrial training centers around the state. The first centers were located in Burlington, Durham, Goldsboro, Greensboro-High Point, Leaksville, Wilmington, and Wilson.³⁶

After an initial period of difficulty and opposition from a variety of sources, the industrial education centers (IECs as they were called) gained popularity in the state, and the programs prospered. Additional IECs were opened at various locations around the state.³⁷

Tuition was free at these centers and for the most part the schools followed the "open door" admissions policy, admitting almost anyone who applied. Program emphasis at the centers was primarily job oriented in

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid., p. 68.

³⁶Ibid., p. 69.

³⁷Ibid., p. 73.

one-year and two-year programs. Job training was the primary function of the centers.³⁸

So, with the creation of the IEC and the Community College act, both in 1957, the state had two parallel post-high-school education programs located under two different state agencies. It was obvious to many that such a system was not very effective in the development and delivery of educational opportunities to the adult citizenry of the state.

A strong proponent and perhaps the leading advocate for a different concept was Herring, who was chairman of the State Board of Education and a member of the State Board of Higher Education. With the election of Terry Sanford, Herring found a strong ally who was also interested in changes in the educational system in the state. In September of 1961 Sanford, who is remembered as an "education Governor," appointed a 25-member commission to study and make recommendations concerning higher education in the state. The commission was headed by Winston-Salem attorney, Irving Carlyle. Herring was also a member of the commission along with other leading educational, civic, and business leaders around the state.³⁹ It was this Governor's Commission on Education Beyond High School which developed the blueprint for the current system.⁴⁰

From the very first, it became obvious that the commission would recommend some major overhauls in the community college system, making it more comprehensive in nature. After studying the current operation

³⁸Ibid., p. 87.

³⁹Ibid., p. 3.

⁴⁰Ibid., p. 121.

of both systems, looking at other state systems, and studying a wealth of data about future enrollment predictions and educational needs the commission published its report in December, 1962.⁴¹

The major findings of the commission were (1) that the university system should be redefined, (2) that the junior colleges at Wilmington, Asheville, and Charlotte should be converted to senior colleges, and (3) that a state system of comprehensive community colleges should be developed.⁴² Regarding the third recommendation, the commission more specifically said

the state should develop one system of public two-year post-high-school institutions offering college-parallel, technical-vocational-terminal, and adult education instruction tailored to area needs; and that the comprehensive community college so created be subject to state-level supervision under one agency.⁴³

It was a difficult fight, primarily because of opposition from private colleges, but in 1963 the General Assembly approved the Omnibus Higher Education Act, which included the establishment of a community college system in the state.⁴⁴

The new schools created under the law were designed to fill the gap in educational opportunity that existed between high school and the senior college and university. In carrying out this role, the technical institutes and community colleges offered academic, cultural, and occupational

⁴¹Ibid., p. 122.

⁴²Ibid., p. 124.

⁴³Ibid., p. 125.

⁴⁴Ibid., p. 134.

education and training opportunities from basic education through the two-year college level, at a convenient time and place and at a nominal cost, to anyone of suitable age who could learn and whose needs could be met by these institutions.⁴⁵

The 1963 community college bill also provided for governance for the two-year college system. The focus of the new system was more on the local level than the then operating four-year college system.

Local Control Focus In History

Community college governance represents a unique situation in education. Richards and Berder, in Governance for the Two-Year College, noted that the system "developed with elements of both secondary schools and university structures incorporated in it."⁴⁶

The authors indicated that from secondary schools the community college inherited the focus on the teaching-learning process with primary interest in the student and an organizational structure that viewed the president as a principal at the top of the chain of command. From the university, the two-year college took the emphasis on subject specialization, curriculum emphasis, and faculty ranking.⁴⁷ It is apparent that the two-year colleges in North Carolina tried to incorporate elements from both systems in their governance structure.

The governance of the two-year post-secondary education system in the state is thus similar and yet quite different from the university system.

⁴⁵NCSBE, North Car. Comm. College Report, 1963-1970, p. 1.

⁴⁶Louis W. Berder & Richard C. Richards, Jr., Governance for the Two-Year College (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1972), p. 5.

⁴⁷Ibid.

The two-year system receives most of its funding from the state, as does the university system, and also has a similar institutional hierarchical structure. Transfer arrangements are consistent throughout most schools in both systems. Each school in both systems has a Board of Trustees. However, that is the extent of the similarities.

The university system is governed by a powerful centralized state board, the University of North Carolina Board of Governors. The two-year college system meanwhile has a central state board but much of the control of the institutions lies in the local Boards of Trustees that serve each school.

From the start, two-year colleges have been locally governed in North Carolina. The very first junior college in the state, supported by local tax funds, was administered by a local Board of Education. Both the Asheville and Buncombe County Boards of Education controlled Asheville-Biltmore Junior College either separately or jointly during its days of operation.

Following this lead, both of the community college studies undertaken at the state level advocated local control of the schools. The first community college study, conducted by the Hurlburt Commission, advocated a community college system where

community colleges have developed only in localities where there has been local interest that has caused the people to take the initiative in establishing and in supporting them. Local control is essential to the maintenance of local interest and the shaping of the curriculum to local needs.⁴⁸

⁴⁸Segner, p. 45.

More specifically, the Hurlburt Commission recommended that the community college should be administered by local Boards of Trustees which would report to the State Board of Education.⁴⁹

That original community college bill died in the General Assembly, but that same theme of local control can clearly be seen in the two succeeding acts. First, the Industrial Education Centers were operated as part of the local school system and administered by the local school superintendent and the school board. Each center was required to have an advisory board but the primary administering body was the local Board of Education.⁵⁰

The next step in the series of developments was the Carlyle report, the foundation for the system as it is today. The Carlyle report established two levels of governance for the proposed system. First, the schools were to be developed under one state-wide agency, the State Board of Education. Both governance and fiscal control for the new schools were to be under the State Board of Education.⁵¹

While the new schools were to be supervised on the state level by one agency, the commission also recommended that the schools be locally administered by boards of trustees. The trustees were to have responsibility for

initiative in the selection of community college personnel; in the establishment of college policies, procedures, and curriculum, and in the location, design and construction of college physical facilities . . . subject to the rules and regulations of the State Board.⁵²

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰Ibid., p. 48.

⁵¹NCSBE, First Five Years, p. 3.

⁵²Segner, p. 124.

The local board was to hire the President, subject to approval by the State Board of Education, who would report to the local board of trustees through regular meetings. The Carlyle report also recommended the method of local board membership. The 12 members of the board were to be appointed by the Governor, county commissioners, and local board(s) of education with each appointing four members.⁵³

The Carlyle report, introduced as a bill in 1963, passed almost entirely intact. This became the basis for GS 115A, the original law concerning community colleges and technical institutes in the state.⁵⁴

The importance of the local level of control in the community college system is then evident by its significant role in the history and development of the system.

At the local level, each of the Boards of Trustees is responsible for quality assurance. By state statute, the local board in the community college governance structure has considerable power, including employing the president and approving all budgets and curriculum matters, subject to final approval by the State Board of Community Colleges.

With such a focus of control at the local level, the role of the Board of Trustees at each institution is magnified.

It is imperative, then, that local trustees set high standards in selecting institutional presidents and qualified staff and instructors. All trustees must understand the overall mission and operation of their individual institutions, the criteria required for awarding certificates,

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 125.

diplomas and degrees, and the problems of the disadvantaged and handicapped students; moreover, they must be committed to providing quality programs for the citizens of their service areas. To ensure these requirements are met, criteria should be established and applied for appointment to local boards of trustees. In addition, membership should reflect the population of the service area in race, sex, and geographic distribution.⁵⁵ "Further, a study should be made of the methods of appointment and length of tenure on local boards to determine whether changes should be made."⁵⁶

Statement of the Problem

As the NCCCS moves into its third decade of service to the citizens of North Carolina, it is evident that the focus of the system and the state itself have changed. Just as the state has moved to a new highly technological, information-based economy, the community college system has moved from being viewed as grades 13 and 14 of the secondary school system to taking its place as one of the major forces which will shape the future of the state.

The maturity of the system and the demands placed upon it for the future of North Carolina require that its achievements and capabilities be re-examined. One aspect of the system which requires re-examination focuses on the governance structure at the local level, the local boards of trustees which control the institutions in the state-wide system.

⁵⁵NCDCC, Education Leadership, p. 4.

⁵⁶Ibid.

At its inception, the present system came under the governance of local Boards of Education. Many present community colleges and technical colleges began as extensions of the public school system, and final control of those early industrial education centers rested with the local Board of Education. The appropriateness of that early arrangement is not questioned. However, given the growth and expansion of the system in its present form and the implications of surfacing challenges proposed for the system, the governance structure of local boards of trustees should be carefully studied.

The orientation of this study is in the area of governance structure for community college institutions. The problems to be addressed in this study are the establishment of criteria for selection of trustees and whether changes should be made in the methods of appointment and length of service for local board trustees.

A goal of the study is to expand the knowledge base concerning trustee selection, methods of appointment, and length of service upon which appropriate decisions might be made. Therefore, the study sought answers to the following questions:

(1) What are the criteria upon which the selection of local boards of trustees are based? [What criteria should be used in the selection process?]

(2) By what methods or by what governing agencies are local trustees selected (elected or appointed)? [What method should be used in the selection process?]

(3) What is the length of service for board of trustee members? [What should be the length of service for board of trustee members?]

The search for answers to these questions will focus on the NCCCS, because of geographic proximity and accessibility of information. The study is motivated by the observation that the NCCCS has grown and changed since it was placed under the auspices of the state's public secondary school system; however, the provisions in General Statute 115D for establishing local boards of trustees remain unchanged.

Further motivation for this study came from the direct challenge posed by the NCCCS Advisory Committee in its report addressing the importance of providing leadership for the NCCCS institutions equal to the challenges of the future, the committee said that "a study should be made of the methods of appointment and length of tenure on local boards to determine whether changes should be made."⁵⁷

In view of this recognition of the problem and the fact that little empirical evidence was found addressing the problem, it follows that a definite need for initiating and conducting intensive research concerning the problem exists. This research should culminate in the development of a framework indicating appropriate selection criteria and methods of appointment for local boards of trustees, along with recommendations for length of service for board members in the NCCCS. The design of such a framework was the intent of this researcher.

Scope of the Problem

This therefore is a study and analysis of Board of Trustee governance in the community college system in North Carolina as it relates to several issues concerning trustee appointment.

⁵⁷Ibid.

Focusing on one aspect of NCCCS governance, that of the local institution, this study assessed the governance structure for North Carolina community college local boards of trustees.

Research described the various methods of board appointment, criteria for membership, and tenure of local board of trustee members in the other 49 state community college/technical college systems in the nation. Information on the current status of the local board governance issue in North Carolina concerning these three areas in question was gained by surveying key leaders from each of the 58 institutions in the North Carolina Community College System. Included in the survey were presidents and board of trustee chairmen from each institution.

In addition, to strengthen the development of a framework for the local board governance issue, key educational and political leaders were identified and interviewed concerning their understanding of the current policy and suggestions for making changes in this policy.

Significance of the Study

As stated in the introduction, the community college system in North Carolina has grown rapidly over the past twenty years. While the rapid expansion currently has slowed, the pace of change needed to cope with the shifting demands on vocational and technical training has increased dramatically. With that change have come new demands from the public for quality assurance and answers to questions about existing governance structures which date back to the founding of the system.

This research was an attempt to organize data to expand the knowledge on institutional governance for the North Carolina Community College System. The findings of the study should prove useful to the

North Carolina Department of Community Colleges, especially in view of the fact that the organization has recommended that such a study be conducted.

However, the usefulness of any framework for the governance structure of NCCCS institutions is obviously the prerogative of that organization. The framework will be presented as one that might be considered in whole or in part, according to its utility to update the governance structure.

Furthermore, this research should have utility for local institutions in ensuring that their governance structures are such that they enable their institutions to be equal to the task of providing quality educational programs for the citizens of their regions, as they face the challenges of the future.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following selected terms are defined:

Board of Trustees: a group of citizens elected or appointed to serve in a legal supervisory capacity for a community college, technical college or technical institute.

Community College: a public educational institution offering one-year and two-year terminal degree programs in vocational and technical fields of study in addition to a maximum of two years of college parallel work.

Technical Institute/Technical College: a public educational institution offering one-year and two-year terminal degree programs in vocational and technical fields of study.

Advisory Board: A group of citizens elected or appointed to serve in a predominately advisory function for a community college, technical college or technical institute.

Methods, Procedures, and Sources of Information

The basic research technique of this historical research study was to examine and analyze the available information concerning board of trustee membership for community colleges/technical colleges and technical institutes in North Carolina. In order to insure that this research had not previously been done, a search was made of several authoritative resources to determine whether a need existed for such research. A search was also made of Dissertation Abstracts to find related studies which had already been completed.

In addition, journal articles and other resources were identified through use of Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, Education Index, and several computer services which produced lists of related topics. Also a number of articles and journals were identified through a computer search from Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC).

Information was further gathered through a review of general statute codes from other states. Information was also available through a review of handbooks from a number of state Boards of Community Colleges concerning administration and legal framework for their community college system.

Additional information was gained through the administering of a survey to selected groups in the system. Community college/technical college and technical institute presidents and board chairmen were selected to be surveyed. After this survey was developed, it was reviewed by several professors in the Department of Secondary Education at East

Carolina University. After revising it with their recommendations, the survey was tested for content validity on five administrative staff persons at Lenoir Community College and five members of the Lenoir Community College Board of Trustees. After incorporating their suggestions into the survey, the instrument was mailed to all 58 community college/technical college and technical institute presidents and also to all 58 chairmen of the boards of trustees for these institutions. The two groups represent the top policy-making and administrative personnel for each school. The president by law is selected by the board of trustees and serves at their pleasure while the trustee chairman is selected by the trustees for a term of one year.

One follow-up mailing was used to gain additional returns and improve the overall return rate. A final rate of 86 percent or 100 of 116 possible returns was realized. The returns were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) as the data program. Information gained from this data analysis is presented in Chapter IV.

In addition, selected key personnel in the system were interviewed concerning their understanding of the current governance structure and their evaluations of the system and any recommendations for change. Key persons selected for interviews were the President of the Department of Community Colleges, the Chairman of the State Board of Community Colleges, and the current Chairman of the Presidents Association, an organization composed of state presidents from all 58 schools in the system who meet quarterly to review the overall operation of the system, propose changes in state policy and other key issues. These three were selected to be interviewed based upon (1) their involvement in the

governance operation of the NCCCS, (2) their familiarity and involvement with the appointment process, and (3) their ability to influence possible policy changes for the system.

The method of work for this study was used to produce both a review of the current status of local governance structure of community college systems in the nation and a framework for local governance for the North Carolina Community College System. To accomplish these two main tasks, the methodology for this study included a variety of research techniques and will include both primary and secondary sources of data.

First, the study presents a review of the literature relevant to the role and function of the local board of trustees and trends from a national perspective in local governance and trustee issues.

In addition, the study includes a survey of other state community college systems for the purpose of developing a data base which will be used in preparation of the framework concerning local governance in this state.

This survey addresses specific questions to these particular state systems covering the areas of local governance including the appointment process for local boards of trustees, criteria for membership, and length of service for trustees.

Also, community college presidents and board chairmen were surveyed as to their opinions on the current board membership policies, and their recommendations and suggestions as to changes in the current system. In addition, selected community college leaders were interviewed to obtain their comments and recommendations appropriate to the question of local board governance.

Design of the Study

The remainder of the study is divided into four major parts.

Chapter II contains a review of related literature describing the purpose and function of community college Boards of Trustees.

Chapter III includes an analysis of national survey data on trustee appointment, criteria for membership, and service in other states as dictated by state statutes. Copies of the various statutes and other pertinent legal documents from selected states are included in the appendices. Also included is an analysis of the North Carolina Statutes. Chapter III also contains several interviews conducted with selected community college leaders concerning the current appointment policy and their suggestions on ways to improve the current system.

Chapter IV includes the results of a state survey conducted among institutional presidents and chairmen of the schools' boards of trustees to gather data concerning their opinions on selected questions dealing with board appointment, criteria for membership, and length of service.

The concluding Chapter V of the study contains a summary of the information gained in Chapters II-IV and conclusions revealed in the study; it also provides the author's own framework for developing a system for board appointment or election, criteria for membership, and member service. Recommendations for related research will conclude the study.

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter II presents a review of literature related to several broad topics concerning broad governance and trusteeship. The topics will be considered in the following order: [responsibilities of governing boards, trustee characteristics, board member selection process, and board size and trustee tenure.]

A few years ago John Kenneth Galbraith called the governing boards of American Universities "an anachronism . . . but not yet a harmless anachronism . . . it remains a barrier to rational progress."¹

Trustees, regents, boards of visitors, and others, by whatever name they are called--lay citizens are responsible for a portion of the governance of American colleges and universities. No less than 35,000 men and women serve on these variously named boards in America today and help guide the enterprise of higher education.²

Like many of our other traditions, the idea of governance of higher education by lay persons came from Europe. The prototype of today's American boards of trustees appeared during the Italian Renaissance when

¹Mary Lou Zoglin, Power & Politics in the Community College (Palm Springs, California: FTC Publishing Company, 1976), p. 51.

²John W. Nason, The Future of Trusteeship (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1974), p. 3.

municipalities took over management of some universities and selected four or more "good citizens" to oversee the conduct of the institutions.³

The first university in America, Harvard, established the first board of trustees in this country in 1636, and the role of the lay trustees in the governance of higher education has been growing ever since.⁴ Later, American colleges and universities continued to add to this tradition of lay leadership. The charter of the College of William and Mary, written in 1693, spells out the concept of trusteeship as the form of governance for the institution.⁵

Trustees for those first institutions of higher education were mainly clergymen and lay church leaders, since many early colleges and universities were closely related to the church. However, by the late 19th century business and professional men took over as trustees, as the public system of higher education was expanded.⁶

Responsibilities of Governing Boards

The role of the trustee board as a part of the governance structure of higher education has been growing since the days of Harvard and William and Mary. Over the past several decades, the rapid growth of higher education through exploding college populations, the growing number of

³Louise H. Heilbron, The College & University Trustee (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973), p. 1.

⁴Orley R. Herron, Jr., The Role of the Trustee (Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook Company, 1969), p. viii.

⁵Donald T. Williams, Jr., ed., President, Professors & Trustees (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), p. 39.

⁶Heilbron, The College & University Trustee, p. 3.

institutions of higher education, and the increasing amounts of fiscal outlays by states and the federal government have created pressures and changes which have helped to shape the various governance structures and the roles and responsibilities of trustees.

The governing boards of both two-year and four-year colleges have had to change to meet these rapid and significant changes of duties and responsibilities. Community colleges, as the newest higher education institutional system on the scene, have also changed as rapidly, even during their brief history, as have the more traditional and more visible senior colleges.

These changes have left the local board of trustees for the community college assigned a wide range of responsibilities in the area of governance. Henderson noted in the Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities some different legal provision for community colleges aided these changes. Colleges are created through several provisions, including (1) constitutional enactment, (2) legislative enactment (3) legal charter, or (4) creation by authority of a tax district.⁷ Under whatever provisions the college is founded, Rauh noted the primary responsibility is to hold the charter and implement the guidelines established in it.⁸

Rauh noted the evolution of the trustees' role over the years. Many of the current large public institutions, particularly the

⁷Algo D. Henderson, "The Role of the Governing Board," Association of Governing Boards Reports 10, No. 2, (Oct. 1967): 6-9.

⁸Morton A. Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), p. 7.

land-grant colleges, evolved from the limited purpose of teaching "such branches of learning as related to agriculture and the mechanical arts," as stated in the Morrill Act of 1862. A continuing assessment of the role of the college trustee must take place to match this shifting role of the college itself, according to Rauh.⁹

However, while the role is ever changing, general responsibilities and functions are assigned to the trustees. Fisher stated that "the trustee has the primary responsibility to safeguard the purpose for which the institution was founded."¹⁰ According to Fisher, the board is primarily a "policy-making group that has the responsibility of continually assisting, guiding, and evaluating the progress of the institution."¹¹

Nason in The Future of Trusteeship pointed out that "the legal mandate of governing boards, either expressly stated or implied, is virtually absolute. Trustees are by law held responsible for the entire operation and performance of their institutions."¹² While the laws governing the operation of the various colleges and universities vary as much as the institutions themselves, most writers agree that a number of major tasks are commonly assigned to trustees. Potter listed the following 11 major tasks for trustees:

- (1) selecting, evaluating and terminating the President
- (2) ensuring professional management of the institution

⁹Ibid.

¹⁰Ben C. Fisher, A Manual for College Trustees (Raleigh: Edwards & Broughton Company, 1965), p. 13.

¹¹Ibid., p. 14.

¹²Nason, The Future of Trusteeship, p. 14.

- (3) purchasing, constructing and maintaining facilities
- (4) defining the role and mission of the institution
- (5) engaging in public relations operations
- (6) preserving institutional independence
- (7) evaluating institutional performance
- (8) creating a climate for change
- (9) insisting on being informed
- (10) engaging in planning for the institution
- (11) assessing board performance¹³

Nason added several additional tasks:

- (1) serving as a court of appeals
- (2) supporting the president
- (3) overseeing educational programs
- (4) interpreting the community college to the community¹⁴

Corson in The Governance of Colleges and Universities added an additional responsibility for trustees, that of fund raising. This role is critical for trustees of private colleges but less so for those sitting on boards of state public institutions.¹⁵

Numerous authors have written on the subject of tasks and responsibilities of the trustees. Rauh helped to condense the list into six key duties:

¹³George E. Potter, "Trustee Responsibilities," New Directions for Community Colleges Vol. IV (Autumn 1976): 10-16.

¹⁴John Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," Handbook of College & University Trusteeship, ed. Richard T. Ingram (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), p. 29-45.

¹⁵John J. Corson, The Governance of Colleges & Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1975), p. 265.

- (1) Trustees hold the basic legal document of origin
- (2) Trustees evolve the purpose of the institution consonant with the terms of the charter
- (3) Trustees seek a planned development for their institution
- (4) Trustees select and determine the tenure of the chief executive
- (5) Trustees hold the assets of the institution in trust
- (6) Trustees serve as a court of last resort.¹⁶

While these are general tasks assigned to most boards, several additional responsibilities deserve review as well. Fisher noted that since the board serves in a public capacity for accountability of the institution, "the trustees have the responsibility for management of all funds and the development of physical properties, and it is important that they are familiar with every phase of the college operation."¹⁷

Another key responsibility, according to Fisher, is to be involved in the "continual improvement of the instructional program of the institution. He should be certain the institution is meeting academic standards in every phase."¹⁸

This is the area where more board action is needed, according to Freeman. Boards have ignored work in the academic areas and ought to be more involved in planning and implementation of the educational program of the school.¹⁹

¹⁶Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 9.

¹⁷Fisher, A Manual for College Trustees, p. 14.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Jack E. Freeman, "Comprehensive Planning in Higher Education," New Directions for Higher Education, ed. John D. Millet (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977), p. 42.

Included in these functions is a clear understanding of the legal standing of the board. Cohen and Drawer in The American Community College noted that because boards are public corporations, they are legally responsible for all college affairs. This status involved them in legal actions on everything from personnel matters to issues of purchasing and contracts. The importance of the board's understanding of the law as it affects the governance of the college, cannot be overstated.²⁰

Another key role of the board is that of public relations or community liason, as Thornton in Community Junior College pointed out.²¹ Monroe in Profile of the Community College also identified public relations as a key board function. The close ties between the college and the community help to add significances to this role, according to Monroe.²²

Nason described these functions of the board in several board categories. First, trustees hold and control assets and programs in trust for the benefit of others. Theirs is a fiduciary role. Second, trustees are policymakers, "not managers or administrators who offer direction and supervision." And third, beneficiaries of the college vary, modified by law or public demand.²³

²⁰Arthur M. Cohen and Florence B. Drawer, The American Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982), p. 110.

²¹James W. Thornton, Jr., The Community Junior College (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1972), pp. 116-117.

²²Charles R. Monroe, Profile of the Community College (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), p. 308.

²³Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," p. 27.

One of their other important roles is that of providing a buffer between the college and the community. E. D. Duryea explained it best:

Little attention is given, unfortunately, to the uniquely significant role of the governing board in this country as the agency that both has protected internal autonomy and intellectual freedom and has served as a force to keep institutions relevant to the general society. This history badly needs doing. Despite occasional intrusions in internal affairs and matters related to academic freedom, the governing board has served as a point of balance for that essential dualism between institutional and academic autonomy and public accountability which has characterized American higher education. Current forces pressing for greater internal participation on the one hand and increased public control on the other need tempering by the experience of the past in this connection.²⁴

Bowen presented an additional role for the trustees. "Their assigned role is not that of mere conduit for external pressures from the outside world but rather that of a buffer to protect the autonomy and integrity of the institution and ultimately to oversee the institution in ways that will best serve the public interest."²⁵ The idea of more external and less internal work is echoed by Keeshan in the Chronicle of Higher Education, December 10, 1977, when he noted that the trustee should be more involved in shaping policy towards higher education and less on strictly internal matters of the individual schools.²⁶

In continuation of this theme of the role the trustee should play in the total picture of higher education, trustees are seen as providing

²⁴Nason, The Future of Trusteeship, p. 10.

²⁵Howard R. Bowen, The State of the Nation and the Agenda for Higher Education (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982), p. 90.

²⁶"Trusteeship: More than a Seat on the 50-Yard Line," Chronicle of Higher Education, 10 December, 1979, p. 56.

a bridge to society from the institution. "They are not solely advocates of the institution but of society. The decisions they make as to admissions determines the reality of the states quarantees of educational opportunity."²⁷

While there are a great many responsibilities cited for trustees, Corson warned that "a board of trustees cannot and should not run the institution. The board's role is direction, not management, and the distinction is vital."²⁸

The board of trustees is then expected to aid the institution in repelling the mounting forces of bureaucratization that take power and control from the local institution and place it at a different level in the governance structure.²⁹

Therefore there is no neutral ground for the trustee, according to Fisher. "Either he will be a help, or he will be a hindrance. His helpfulness to a large degree will be determined by the understanding he has of his role and the role of the faculty and administration."³⁰

While all these tasks and responsibilities are assigned to boards through state laws and charters, the reality between what should be and what is, is at times very uneven.

The responsibilities assigned to boards cover a wide range of topic areas, requiring a considerable amount of time. However, in general,

²⁷Corson, The Governance of Colleges & Universities, p. 269.

²⁸Ibid., p. 271.

²⁹Ibid., p. 269.

³⁰Fisher, A Manual for College Trustees, p. 15.

boards spend about one-fourth of their time on pressing academic issues such as admissions, curriculum, and the quality of the faculty while they spend the vast majority of their time on (1) financial matters, (2) the physical plant, (3) personnel, and (4) external affairs.³¹

While many of these tasks are for both public and private institutions of higher education and both two-year and four-year schools, Rauh explained that trustees of two-year schools face problems that are unique to community college boards. He cited the following problems: (1) rapid growth over the past decade, (2) special significances of the institutional purpose, (3) dimly defined positions in the total educational programs of the state, (4) complexities of the legal status of community colleges, (5) specialized functions of the trustees as laymen, and (6) more frequent selection of the president.³²

Fisher summed up the trustees' duties best when he said:

a college or university trustee is more than a person entrusted with property and wealth. He also has the responsibility of building an institution which, with increasing effectiveness, can serve students today and tomorrow. In this function, the trustee is a prime factor in creating tomorrow's world.³³

Trustee Characteristics: Who Should Serve?

"In whatever it is our duty to act, those matters also it is our duty to study." Thomas Arnold, 1846

From the study of the responsibilities with which trustees are charged, it is apparent that the very best qualified people possible

³¹Corson, The Governance of Colleges & Universities, p. 265.

³²Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 128.

³³Fisher, A Manual for College Trustees, p. 1.

should be placed on the boards to help carry out the many tasks that are assigned to them.

Thornton pointed out that board members represent the people who own and support the schools and form a grass roots organization which is actually closer to the people in the community than any other present form of government. "They voice the wishes and aspirations of the parents and the children. They spend the local taxpayers' money and are responsible to their neighbors for their actions. They are the trustees of great public responsibility."³⁴

Therefore, who should hold this position of public trust and responsibility? Various writers in the field list a number of characteristics needed for the trustees of today. Hampton held that "a deep support for the community college movement is a necessary requisite for any community college trustee."³⁵

Rauh listed three specific and essential characteristics for the successful trustee: (1) an analytic mind so he can extract the essential components of a problem and react accordingly, (2) the ability to ask discerning questions which have the quality of leading discussion to central policy issues and not simply operational details, and (3) ability to serve as a sounding board.³⁶

Heilbron in College and University Trustee also listed three qualities he considered essential. The trustee should (1) demonstrate

³⁴Thornton, The Community Junior College, p. 117.

³⁵William Hampton, "Community College Trustees Represent the Total Community," College & University Business 54 (February 1973): 45.

³⁶Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 87.

an understanding and interest in higher education, (2) be a product of higher education, and, (3) have some field of expertise which would be helpful in the execution of the trustees' duties.³⁷

Nason in The Future of Trusteeship simplified the qualities desired in the trustee to include (1) knowing a great deal about his institution, both to help guide and to defend it and (2) knowing something about the trends in higher education and what is going on elsewhere in the field.³⁸

Potter, talking about the board as a whole, noted that there should be a "diverse background" among the members who share the common bond of a love for the college. He added that the individual members need to be (1) active, (2) dedicated, (3) involved, and (4) most of all, informed.³⁹

The changing scene on the community college frontier puts new challenges before trustees and, therefore, makes new demands on their abilities, according to Nason. "The contemporary scene requires of all trustees not merely a better performance along familiar lines but new kinds of wisdom, courage, patience, sensitivity and understanding, as they chart a new course for their institutions and develop new patterns for their governance."⁴⁰

While Nason addressed the need for great insight and effort on the part of trustees, Cosand noted that the board can do a lot towards building its own credibility and improving its own usefulness.

³⁷Heilbron, The College & University Trustee, p. 13.

³⁸Nason, The Future of Trusteeship, p. 3.

³⁹Potter, "Trustee Responsibilities," p. 10.

⁴⁰Nason, The Future of Trusteeship, p. 13.

Boards and individual board members with an established reputation for seriousness of purpose, for dedication to the growth of the college in terms of quality and service to the community, for complete integrity create the prestige and dignity essential to a public body. Boards and board members possessing such prestige and dignity will survive and strengthen their colleges' resistance to state board domination and control.⁴¹

Corson adds that interest in understanding educational issues is needed for trustees to be effective. "Trustees' decisions on nonacademic matters depend for their validity on the trustees' understanding of educational objectives and processes."⁴²

With these characteristics in mind, Fisher explained that a trustee is effective when he does the following:

- (1) He sees his job as a difficult and responsible task.
- (2) He budgets his time and plans ahead to attend the meetings of the board and special called meetings.
- (3) He will accept specific responsibilities in either committee or general work.
- (4) He makes an earnest effort to be objective in evaluating the work, personnel, program and policies of his institution.
- (5) He is willing to give serious study to all phases of fiscal, academic, administrative, and community programs of the college.
- (6) He understands the distinction between making policy and administering policy.
- (7) He respects the work and the authority of the board of trustees as a whole.
- (8) He commits himself to resisting all pressure groups and individuals, either within or without the institution, who exert force counter to the purpose of the school.
- (9) He is willing to act, think, and work as an individual rather than as the representative of any special group.

⁴¹Joseph P. Cosand, "The Community College in a New Period of Change," Association of Governing Boards Reports 17, No. 8, (Sept./Oct. 1974/1975): 42.

⁴²Corson, The Governance of Colleges & Universities, p. 265.

(10) He is thoroughly committed to the ideas and purposes for which the institution was founded.⁴³

Nason added that "only a strong board which commands public respect for the job they are doing can effectively champion institutional autonomy."⁴⁴

While these may be the traits needed for the ideal trustee, many critics believe that too often the composition of the board does not collectively live up to public expectations. Rauh contended that the "typical college board of trustees makes no more sense in composition than a bank board of directors composed entirely of college professors."⁴⁵ Clark was even more critical in his commentary on boards of trustees when he called them "an instrument of external control . . . by persons who are part-time and amateurs rather than full time and experts."⁴⁶ And to Rauh, the distinguishing trait of college trusteeship in this country is that "control is vested in individuals who are not professional educators."⁴⁷

Another writer noted that criticism of governing boards must be attributed to three forces: (1) capabilities, (2) tradition, and (3) misinterpretation of their logic and role. One of these forces, capabilities, speaks directly to the issue of who is appointed or elected

⁴³Fisher, A Manual for College Trustees, p. 15.

⁴⁴Nason, The Future of Trusteeship, p. 2.

⁴⁵Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 2.

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Ibid., p. 1.

to the board of trustees and their abilities to serve in that capacity. He noted that many individuals are chosen to the board because of extraneous reasons contrary to the needs of the institution.⁴⁸

In a far-reaching survey of college board members in 1968, Rauh reported the actual trustee qualifications that the trustees themselves thought were necessary for board members. The top criterion cited was a sufficient amount of time to carry out the duties, which was listed by 94 percent of the trustees polled.⁴⁹

The poll revealed the following:

Relative Importance of Trustee Characteristics

(Percentage)

Characteristics

Stature in the community	92
Stature in vocation	90
Generally known to other trustees	28
Has sufficient time for duties	94
A middle-of-the road viewpoint	33
Alumnus of the institution	13
Holds strong views about most matters	46
Potential for financial contribution	45
Impatient with status quo, likes new ideas	67 ⁵⁰

Second in importance to the trustees polled in the Rauh study was the importance of trustee stature in the community. This was obviously a key factor to the trustees in this study, but Corson sees this as a potential detriment. "Many trustees bring to the institution illustrious names but little capacity to contribute to the socioeducational decisions central to their functions."⁵¹

⁴⁸Corson, The Governance of Colleges & Universities, p. 267.

⁴⁹Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 185.

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Corson, The Governance of Colleges & Universities, p. 267.

Goddard and Polk went so far as to reduce the qualifications for the board to the fact that some appointing agencies set the minimum standard for the trustee as someone who "will not embarrass either the governor or his party."⁵²

While this may be an extreme example in lack of criteria, few members bring to the boards on which they serve familiarity with problems of higher education or the process of a college. "Most are selected by governors or legislatures for extraneous political reasons, by church bodies for religious reasons, by alumni because of popularity, or by self-perpetuating boards for financial reasons."⁵³

This lack of established criteria for appointment has led to a variety of problems with boards. Nason cited a study of college presidents and board chairman which note that a lack of experience and understanding of the college function is the biggest factor in determining whether a board is effective. Both groups also cited too much deadwood on the board as another detriment.⁵⁴

In another study addressing the characteristics that should be sought in appointees and reality, 73 percent of those board members polled said leadership should be a criterion for selection while only 35 percent said it was actually a criterion.⁵⁵

⁵²Jeanne M. Goddard and Charles H. Polk, "Community College Trustee: Elect or Appoint?", Association of Governing Boards Reports 18, No. 3, (May/June 1976): 38.

⁵³Corson, The Governance of Colleges & Universities, p. 266.

⁵⁴Nason, The Future of Trusteeship, p. 26.

⁵⁵Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," p. 49.

One of the factors cited by a number of writers in pointing out problems with the current trustee format is that boards typically resemble each other.

Harnett explained "while there is some difference in boards and how they got there, they have the same common social, economic, occupational and ideological complexion."⁵⁶

Henderson in the "Role of the Governing Board" noted that the composition of most boards is skewed in favor of the upper socioeconomic segments of society. Large segments of the population, notably women, labor and the lower socioeconomic classes are not represented."⁵⁷

The writer added that "membership is biased strongly in favor of businessmen, lawyers and persons of wealth, and older persons. Boards, whose dealings are with problems that affect the youth, have members who are too old and conservative, when, instead, genuinely progressive leadership is required."⁵⁸ Henderson summed up the critical issue when he said trusteeships go to persons who have "resources, time, and prestige."⁵⁹

Just who are these trustees that some writers contend are drawn from such a narrow band of society? Graffe in a recent study noted that the

⁵⁶Rodney T. Harnett, "Trustee Power in America," Power & Authority, editors, Harold L. Hodginson & Richard Meeth (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982), p. 199.

⁵⁷Algo D. Henderson, "The Role of the Governing Board," p. 14.

⁵⁸Ibid.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 16.

trustees surveyed were 92 percent white and 86 percent male. Most were white males in their fifties.⁶⁰

Drake in a 1977 study which covered over 5,000 trustees, reported that 85 percent of the trustees surveyed who were on boards of public colleges and universities were male. Another 91 percent of the board was white, and non-hispanic leaving minorities with only nine percent of the trusteeships studied.⁶¹

The Drake study, conducted for the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, also revealed that only 13 percent of the trustees studied in public institutions were under 40 with the largest numbers of trustees in the 40-49 and 50-59 age range, 31 percent and 35 percent respectively. Of those studied, another 72 percent listed their income as over \$26,000 a year.⁶²

Other studies have shown trustees to be generally selected from the occupational fields of medicine, law, education, and business. Business executives make up the largest single group in one survey. As a group, the trustees personify "success" in the usual sense of the word in this country."⁶³

⁶⁰Gale Grafe, The Trustee Profile of 1976 (Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees, [1977]), p. 5.

⁶¹Sandra L. Drake, A Study of Community & Junior College Boards of Trustees (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community & Junior Colleges, 1977), p. 8.

⁶²Ibid., p. 9.

⁶³N. Dean Evans & Ross L. Neagley, Planning & Developing Innovation in the Community College (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973), p. 40.

This snapshot of board composition led Harnett to explain that "it would be hard to find in American society a single group whose public service has surpassed that of the trustee."⁶⁴

Changes need to be made to dilute the composition of the boards to help make them be more representative of the communities their institutions serve. The composition of the board should be broadened to bring in representation of diverse social and economic groups.⁶⁵

Evans and Neagley listed several general items to change the board makeup: (1) insure a racial mix, including minority groups represented in the community; (2) provide a wide range in the ages of board members; (3) insure that both men and women are represented on the board; (4) include as many persons with different occupational backgrounds as possible, which should help to assure a range of income levels and differences in expertise and experiences brought to the boards; and (5) attempt to resist appointments based solely on extraneous reasons.⁶⁶

Selection of Board Members

Board selection, the process of actually establishing the membership of the board, is the single most important step in insuring effective leadership by the board of trustees for the community college. Qualifications aside, only those who actually become board members will make the real impact on the process of higher education in this country.

Rauh in Trusteeship of Colleges and Universities quoted Chancellor Tolly of Syracuse University as saying about the trustee selection process,

⁶⁴Harnett, "Trustee Power in America," p. 55.

⁶⁵W. Max Wise, "Configurations in Governing," The Troubled Campus, ed. G. Kery Smith (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970), p. 135.

⁶⁶Evans and Neagley, Planning & Developing Innovation in the Community College, p. 42.

"Election to the board is fully as important as appointment of a full professor. Let us at least give it the same care."⁶⁷

Nason added, "Too many choices have been made on the spur of the moment under pressure. The selection of a trustee deserves as much forethought and search as that of a professor or dean."⁶⁸

Given this responsibility to establish policies and provide leadership for a college, trustees must indeed be selected with great care. "A board of politically motivated or self-serving individuals invites trouble for the college and the community. So does a board which is unable to work as a group and splits into factions or different pockets of power among itself."⁶⁹

The authors recognize that a delicate balance must be struck in establishing a board of trustees. The politically motivated board or one which finds itself divided into individual power cliques can present problems. Unanimity on all issues is not required and some board dissension can be a healthy sign at times. But, it will require some degree of unity for a board to develop comprehensive policies which the two-year college will need to meet the future challenges in its community.

Membership on the board can be gained through three different methods: election, appointment, or by virtue of a position (ex-officio).⁷⁰ There are advantages and disadvantages for all three methods.

⁶⁷Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 105.

⁶⁸Nason, The Future of Trusteeship, p. 28.

⁶⁹Cosand, "The Community College in a New Period of Change," pp. 33-34.

⁷⁰Dennis Ladwig, "Comparison of Governance Effectiveness of Appointed & Elected Boards of Education/Trustees" (Ed.d. Dissertation, Nova University, 1981), p. 7.

Polk, Lacombe, and Goddard see the election of the board as a positive factor for the community since the public has more influence with and more control over an elected board of trustees.⁷¹ Moreover, the elected board itself gains through more formal and legal powers.⁷² The elected board is thus recognized by the community with more authority and draws more community support in most cases. Generally, the community feels it has more input into an elected board.

In a study by Mills, nearly 60 percent of the trustees surveyed gained their positions by election.⁷³ In Rauh's study of two-year colleges, 42 of 100 schools surveyed had elected boards.⁷⁴ In the large sample surveyed by Drake, 1712 of 3422 members, or one half, were elected to their positions.⁷⁵ Zoglin supported the election of trustees, contending that election at large by voters in the community college service area provides the most advantages for the college itself.⁷⁶

While election may be favored by many, several writers have expressed apprehensions about using this method to select trustees.

⁷¹Jeanne Goddard, Vaughan A. Lacombe & Charles H. Polk, "Trustee Selection: Who Gets What, Who Pays What?", New Directions for Community Colleges 4, No. 3 (August, 1976): 19.

⁷²Goddard & Polk, "Community College Trustees: Elect or Appoint?", p. 39.

⁷³Peter K. Mius, Trustees & The Process of Institutional Change (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University, 1972), p. 3.

⁷⁴Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 186.

⁷⁵Drake, A Study of Community & Junior College Boards of Trustees, p. 11.

⁷⁶Ladwig, "A Comparison of Governance Effectiveness of Appointed & Elected Boards of Education/Trustees," p. 7.

"Besides the democratic theory behind election, little else can be said for it. Educational issues do not fit into party politics."⁷⁷

More partisan membership is another problem with elected boards. Trustees usually are elected after campaigning to represent a particular interest group in the community.⁷⁸

Hampton continued this theme of partisanship. "Too many are elected to represent special interest groups but their most important job has got to be to represent the total community. A community college does not belong to the students, faculty, or administration but the people."⁷⁹

Board members who are elected usually are oriented towards one interest group--politics, business, labor, or faculty--and will probably not be the kind of member who is willing to serve the total community.⁸⁰

Cosand said that "Boards with members who reflect a strong bias develop factional splits and the board's energies are consumed in confrontations instead of building through cooperative actions."⁸¹

Using the election method in the political process, there is also a greater potential for abuse, according to Pray. In his 1975 study on the roles of boards of trustees and the college president, Pray noted that community colleges should provide for a system of generating trustees

⁷⁷Nason, The Future of Trusteeship, p. 29.

⁷⁸Heilbron, The College & University Trustee, p. 10.

⁷⁹Hampton, "Community College Trustees Represent the Total Community," p. 45.

⁸⁰Cosand, "The Community College in a New Period of Change," p. 34.

⁸¹Ibid.

who will minimize political considerations and provide more balance of talents and concerns on the board.⁸²

The present practice of public election of many community college boards results in the injection of politics into board operation; fails except by occasional happy accident, to give a proper variety of talents and background; and discourages service by many able people. It is not a violation of the principles of democracy to substitute a different method than public election for the trustee selection process.⁸³

Pray does not believe that by simply having board members elected, a good trustee group will emerge. He sees in the election of trustees a partisanship which would be better avoided.

If the board of trustees is not elected, as some have suggested, the only other major way to create a board is through appointment by a variety of public officials and agencies.

As for the appointment process, several local and state officials play key roles in naming trustees using this method. The governor is the official most cited for making appointments. In a study by Nelson and Turf, 35 percent of the trustees were appointed by either the governor or some other elected official.⁸⁴ In the Rauh study, 35 of 100 boards had members who were appointed by the governor.⁸⁵ Drake reported that 433 of the 3422 or one-eighth of the board members surveyed in her study were appointed by the governor.⁸⁶

⁸²Thomas C. Pray, A New Look at Community College Boards of Trustees, Presidents and Their Relationship (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Junior Colleges, 1975), p. 10.

⁸³Ladwig, "A Comparison of Governance Effectiveness of Appointed & Elected Boards of Education/Trustees," pp. 7-8.

⁸⁴Nason, The Future of Trusteeship, p. 30.

⁸⁵Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 186.

⁸⁶Drake, A Study of Community & Junior College Boards of Trustees, p. 11.

In North Carolina, trustees for community colleges gain membership through the appointment process. By state statute, the 12 voting members of the local board are appointed by the Governor, county commissioners, and board(s) of education. Each group has four appointments, all made on a staggered basis.⁸⁷

With the appointment process, persons who might not consider running for office would be available for appointment, so the prospects of adding some diversity to the board is improved. In addition, the lack of partisanship provides the potential to gain appointments with fewer political strings.

However, Goddard and Polk noted that "the selection of a trustee is a political act and each action (appointing authority, voter, trustee) in the process pays a certain price and hopefully reaps a certain benefit."⁸⁸

Goddard and Polk note that the appointment process is also a part of the overall political nature of government. In most cases, the appointment official or agency is an elected office holder or holders. In the state of North Carolina, of the three appointing groups, the Governor and county commissioners are elected through partisan elections. And, in many instances the board of education is also elected, but in a non-partisan election. Some boards of education are appointed, but always by another elected board.

⁸⁷ North Carolina, Department of Justice, 1981 Cumulative Supplement to North Carolina General Statutes (Charlottesville: The Michie Company, 1981), p. 371.

⁸⁸ Goddard & Polk, "Community College Trustees: Elect or Appoint?", p. 37.

Although it may lessen partisanship and some of the other disadvantages of election, the appointment process is also political and possibly fraught with danger.

The political nature of an appointment need not lower the quality of the public board but this is always a possibility, according to Rauh. "The best man may not be appointed if he has no political appeal."⁸⁹

Devore pointed out that on the board there is no "room for political hacks, social butterflies, or joiners."⁹⁰ But, as another writer said, "there is no way of stopping the governor from making a bad appointment."⁹¹ Indeed, the appointment process may be just as full of potential for abuse as the election process, according to Pray. From the governor on down to other elected officials, the potential for abuse is prevalent.⁹²

Therefore, it is crucial that appointing agencies or officials respond to this important role with careful consideration of appointee qualifications and credentials. "More effort must be made to secure the appointment of trustees of intelligence, experience and dedication," Devore said.⁹³

⁸⁹Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 120.

⁹⁰P. Cameron Devore, "The Role & Responsibility of the Community College Board of Trustees," Occasional Report No. 16, (Los Angeles: University of California, 1970), p. 7.

⁹¹Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 120.

⁹²Pray, A New Look at College Boards of Trustees, Presidents & Their Relationship, p. 11.

⁹³Devore, "The Role & Responsibility of the Com. College Bd. of Trustees," p. 8.

Yet, a 1973 study of some trustees revealed that two-thirds of those responding believed that appropriate authorities who make appointments to boards do not place the most qualified persons on the board. Appointments are made for a variety of wrong reasons by these agencies and persons.⁹⁴

To improve the appointment process, several writers have suggested that the quality of appointees can be improved by providing some type of screening process. To this, Devore suggested that the pool of potential trustees be expanded and the list offered to a governor or other agency for consideration be enlarged.⁹⁵ Also suggested was the development of a screening process much like that used for judges, where an advisory council would make recommendations to a governor or other appointment agency, providing them with lists of possible trustees.⁹⁶ Another possibility is having an advisory committee screen potential trustees and offer lists of approved candidates to the appropriate official. Such a process might help to improve the overall quality of the community college board of trustees.⁹⁷

A number of suggestions have been made to help improve the selection process. One of the most comprehensive proposals was made in 1980 by the National Commission on College and University Trustee Selection which recommended the following:

⁹⁴Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board.," p. 49.

⁹⁵Ibid.

⁹⁶Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 121.

⁹⁷Heilbron, The College & University Trustee, p. 8.

- (1) Trustees of public colleges should be appointed by the state's governor or other established legal authority from a list of nominees who have been screened by some type of screening committee.
- (2) A nominating committee for each college should be appointed by the governor. This committee should consist of five people taking into account the diversity of the state, region or local community served by the college.
- (3) This nominating committee should have clearly defined responsibilities.
- (4) The search for qualified trustees should be broad in scope and continuous.
- (5) Qualified candidates should be carefully screened. This screening process should include a review of the candidates biographical information, review of supporting documents provided by nominators, and interviews.
- (6) The committee should make at least three nominations for each vacancy. If none of these nominees are acceptable, the committee should consult with the appointing agencies to learn why the nominees were rejected and should then submit additional names for consideration.
- (7) The state senate should have the opportunity to confirm trustee appointments and should use this confirmation process for substantive nonpartisan review.
- (8) New trustees should be provided with an orientation program.
- (9) Elected public officials should hold only ex-officio status on trustee boards without voting privileges. No board should have more than two such elected officials as members.
- (10) Political party affiliation should not be a criterion for board of trustee appointment.
- (11) There should be no resident requirements which prevent qualified persons from serving on trustee boards.⁹⁸

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges also recently completed a study concerning methods of selection for

⁹⁸Ladwig, "A Comparison of Governance Effectiveness of Appointed & Elected Boards of Education/Trustees," pp. 15-17.

trustees. Their study concluded that there is an urgent need for guidelines to assist state authorities in selecting the most able people for boards of trustees. This lack of any systematic method of recommending qualified citizens to the governor or other appointing agencies has caused many able men and women to be overlooked as potential trustee members. Both election and selection are involved in the political process and in few cases does any formal screening of the persons qualifications for trusteeship precede appointment or election to the board.⁹⁹

Polk, Lacombe, and Goddard noted that when boards of trustees are reviewed for characteristics, there is little difference between the elected and appointed boards. This led them to conclude that neither one is "better for all participants."¹⁰⁰

Futhermore, the Association of Governing Board's study of 1980 recognized there is no single best way to go about selecting trustees. Governors, other appointing authorities and agencies, and trustees themselves are urged to study more carefully the recommendations made to them.¹⁰¹

Board Size and Trustee Tenure

The role and function of the trustees and how membership on a board is gained (whether through election or appointment) having been considered, several technical matters concerning board membership should be reviewed such as the size of the board and the length of service for trustees.

⁹⁹Ibid., pp. 8-9.

¹⁰⁰Goddard, Lacombe & Polk, "Trustee Selection: Who Gets What, Who Pays What?", p. 19.

¹⁰¹Ladwig, "A Comparison of . . . ," p. 9.

As with the review on election or appointment to the board, research on board size and trustee tenure is sparse. A majority of the writings found on boards dealt with trustee responsibilities and characteristics of trustees. Such great variation occurs in the number of members on various boards that a number of researchers have addressed the question of optimal board size. Ideally, a board reflects community interest without being too large to handle.¹⁰² However, board memberships as low as 3 and as high as 257 have been noted in research on board size in colleges and universities in America.¹⁰³ Several writers have said that smaller is better when it comes to trusteeship. Pray noted that 87 percent of the two-year college boards he studied had fewer than 10 members while four-year schools had larger membership.¹⁰⁴

Henderson noted that a smaller board, between 7 and 20 members, can be both representative of an area and also easier to assemble for meetings.¹⁰⁵ Moreover, members are more likely to take an active role in the workings of a smaller board.¹⁰⁶

The National Commission on College and University Trustee Selection also addressed the question of board size and recommended at least nine voting members who serve with staggered terms.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰²Cosand, "The Community College in a New Period of Change," p. 34.

¹⁰³Henderson, "The Role of the Governing Board," p. 11.

¹⁰⁴Pray, A New Look at Comm. College Bds. of Trustees, Presidents & Their Relationship, p. 7.

¹⁰⁵Henderson, "The Role of the Governing Board," p. 11.

¹⁰⁶Ibid.

¹⁰⁷Ladwig, "A Comparison of . . . ," p. 12.

Heilbron said 11 should be a minimum number for a board and 24 the maximum total.¹⁰⁸ Three sources point to seven as the number most frequently used for community college trusteeship and for an effective board. Graffe, in a study of 136 schools, noted 47 had seven members on the board. The second most frequent number identified in the study was nine members.¹⁰⁹ Nason (110) and Mills (111) both noted that seven was the median size of board membership.

As for terms and retirement ages for board members, again the literature is varied and brief. Heilbron suggested that for balance and continuity terms should be staggered for trustee members. Length of term on the board should not be "so long as to allow the trustee to become stale on the job or lose enthusiasm, but the term should not be so short that one cannot grow and develop in the job to the advantage of the institution." Such terms should also be long enough to be free of political influence.¹¹² Heilbron continued that if the purpose of the term length is to help reduce political influence, then 6-to-8 year terms should be considered.¹¹³ Rauh agreed that 6-to-8 year terms that are staggered also tend to dilute political appointments and also ineffective appointees.¹¹⁴ Of those boards studied in the Rauh survey, the average

¹⁰⁸Heilbron, The College & University Trustee, p. 11.

¹⁰⁹Graffe, "The Trustee Profile of 1976," p. 1.

¹¹⁰Nason, The Future of Trusteeship, p. 25.

¹¹¹Mills, Trustees, The Process of Institutional Change, p. 3.

¹¹²Heilbron, The College & University Trustee, p. 7.

¹¹³Ibid.

¹¹⁴Rauh, The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities, p. 121.

length of board service was between 4 and 8 years but 20 percent of those surveyed had served more than 12 years.¹¹⁵

While the length of term of the board member is important, the number of terms a member may serve also needs to be considered. However, most boards--83 percent of those surveyed in one study--placed no limit on the number of terms a trustee could serve.¹¹⁶

Another factor to consider in reviewing board tenure and member terms is retirement age for trustees. While Nason did not suggest a specific limit on the terms and age for retirement, he noted that "continuity of service is important but hazards of age and diminishing returns favor a mandatory limit on the number of consecutive years any member can serve. This is the only sure way of maintaining a fresh stream of board members and of eliminating gracefully those who no longer make a contribution."¹¹⁷

Heilbron did suggest an age level of 70 and noted that while most presidents and administrators retire by age 70, the same should be required and expected of trustees.¹¹⁸

Among several reforms suggested for the process of tenure, Beck sets forth two recommendations: (1) fix a definite retirement age and then perhaps name those trustees who reach this age honorary trustees, and

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 92.

¹¹⁶Mills, Trustees, The Process of Institutional Change, p. 3.

¹¹⁷Nason, The Future of Trusteeship, p. 2.

¹¹⁸Heilbron, The College & University Trustee, p. 11.

(2) make terms four years in length, if possible with eight years maximum.¹¹⁹

The literature on these topics varied. A wealth of information was available on trustee responsibilities and the role of the board. However, information on such areas as board size, board tenure, and retirement age was limited, as was the material on the actual selection process for boards. These last several topics will be addressed in the remaining chapters and provide additional support for the importance of this study.

¹¹⁹Henderson, "The Role of the Governing Bd.," p. 16.

CHAPTER III
LOCAL BOARD GOVERNANCE IN UNITED STATES
COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEMS
(A STATE-BY-STATE ANALYSIS)

Chapter III is devoted to reviewing the various community college systems in operation in the 50 states with a focus on their board governance structure. This chapter reviews legal statutes pertaining to local board governance--methods of trustee appointment selection, length of term, and criteria for membership. It should be noted that some states do not have community college systems. Several states have single two-year institutions that are governed as a part of the university system. In addition, several states control their two-year colleges through state-wide agencies and boards, rather than through local boards of trustees. These differences have been noted in the study but the governing boards are included in the tabulations to insure representation for all states. The chapter also includes a review of the current NC appointment law.

From the results of this study of state community college systems in the nation, it seems apparent that most community colleges are governed locally by a board of trustees, whose members are appointed to their positions. Most of the trustees gained their position by appointment from the governor of their state. Of the 50 states reviewed, 31 have community college/technical school systems which have trustees,

regents, and other similarly named boards at either the state or local level that are appointed by either the governor or some public agency such as the county commissioners, board of education, or other.

Of the 31 states which have appointed boards, 17 have boards that are appointed completely by the Governor.

States with 100% Governor Appointments

Colorado	Kentucky
Connecticut	Louisiana
Delaware	Maine
Florida	Maryland
Georgia	Minnesota
Hawaii	New Hampshire
Idaho	South Carolina
Indiana	Utah
	Washington

The Governor shares appointment authority in another eight states with various other public agencies.

States Where Governor Shares Appointment Authority

Massachusetts	Rhode Island
New York	Tennessee
North Carolina	Vermont
Ohio	West Virginia

Only six states: Alaska, Mississippi, New Jersey, North Dakota, Virginia, and Wisconsin have boards which lack gubernatorial appointments. Clearly, as Drake and other authors noted earlier in the literature review, the Governor is the single most powerful authority in the community college governance equation. As in the selection of other state agency governing boards, the Governor is vested with considerable power and authority for making appointments at all levels of state government. This is supported by the results of this study.

The other 19 states in the nation have college governing boards whose membership is gained through election, either at the local or state level.

The survey also indicated that the size of the board varies depending on the method of selection. An appointed board averages slightly more than 10 members while an elected board is considerably smaller with about seven members.

While there is some difference in the size of the board, depending on its method of selection, there is little difference when considering the number of years in each term a trustee can serve. The term of office for both an elected and an appointed board is slightly less than five years. Elected members in the study served terms of 4.95 years while appointed members served terms averaging 4.84 years.

While five years is the average for length of term, several states have terms of much longer duration. Two states, Tennessee and New York, have trustees who serve nine-year terms.

Both of these states fall into the appointed category for board membership. Oklahoma has the longest term for elected trustees at seven years, while six of the 19 states with elected trustees serve six-year terms. Three states have three-year elected terms: Montana, Iowa, and South Dakota.

Five states also have three years as the term for appointed membership. The states are: Delaware, Indiana, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, and Alaska.

The largest board of trustees noted in the study was in Mississippi where 36 members serve on one board. State statutes in Mississippi allow boards to vary in size from 5 to 36. The largest elected boards can be found in Pennsylvania where a trustee board may vary in size from as few

as seven members to as many as 15. Board size varies, according to statutes, in six states with elected boards and four states with appointed boards.

States With Varying Size Boards

[Appointed Board]	[Elected Board]
Alaska	California
Florida	Iowa
Mississippi	Michigan
Virginia	Pennsylvania
	South Dakota
	Texas

The survey of the laws of the 50 states also showed a patchwork of election and appointment procedures for two-year colleges. New Mexico, which has elected boards, also has appointed boards. According to Sigfredo Maestas, Associate Executive Secretary of Academics with the Commission on Postsecondary Education in New Mexico, the 14 two-year schools have the following governance structure:

- (1) Nine two-year colleges are branches of universities who are governed by boards of regents appointed by the Governor of the State. Five regents serve on each board.
- (2) Three community colleges operate under the Junior College Act. Board members (five) are elected.
- (3) One community college has its own board of regents (also five members). Regents are appointed by the Governor.
- (4) One two-year military institute has a five-member board of regents appointed by the Governor.¹

Illinois is another state with elected boards which also has a variation of that procedure. The Mayor of Chicago and the Governor of the state make appointments to two schools.

¹Letter from Sigfredo Maestas, Office of Commission of Post-Secondary Education, State of New Mexico, 23 October 1984.

As for appointments to the Board, outside of those made by the Governors, the rest of the trustee appointments are left by statute to local agencies. Local sponsoring agencies, primarily the Board of Education or County Commissioners are the other key appointing powers.

The following two tables, 1 & 2, note the states by category of appointed or elected boards, number of members on the board of trustees, length of term of appointment, and appointing agency or electing body.

The survey results and the review of the state statutes do reveal that, as a whole, there are few criteria set for trustees and few limitations on the number of terms they may serve. Only three states were found to have legal policies limiting the length of service by a trustee, while no states have any defined criteria for trusteeship beyond residency and some general occupational requirements. Virginia, Rhode Island and Massachusetts trustees can hold no more than two consecutive terms.

The only general types of criteria for membership require trustees to be residents of the community college district or service area, Congressional district or other set geographical area. In some states however, like Vermont, the geographical limit is so broad as to encompass the entire state.² In these states the statute only requires that board members be state residents.

As for membership characteristics, the statutes vary but generally use terms such as "discreet moral character, sufficient education and experience," as the Mississippi law reads.³ In Rhode Island, the statutes spell

²Information Provided by Office of Chancellor, Vermont State College, Waterbury, Vermont, 9 November 1985.

³Mississippi, General Statutes of Mississippi (1964) Chapter 402, p. 110.

TABLE 1

COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD COMPOSITION
(ELECTED BOARDS)

State	Members	Length Of Term In Years	Elected By
Alabama*	8	4	Congressional Districts
Arizona	5	6	By precinct within service area
Arkansas	9	6	Community College Districts
California	5 or 7	4	Community College Districts
Illinois**	7	6	Community College Districts
Iowa	5-9	3	Community College Districts
Kansas	6	4	Districts
Michigan	7-9	6	Districts
Missouri	6	6	Districts
Montana	7	3	Districts
Nebraska	11	4	Districts
Nevada*	9	6	Districts
New Mexico***	5	6	By boards of education
Oklahoma	7	7	Districts
Oregon	7	4	Districts
Pennsylvania	7-15	6	Local governing boards
South Dakota	5-9	3	Districts
Texas	7-9	6	Districts

*State-wide board

**The Mayor of Chicago and the Governor appoint boards of trustees for institutions.

***Several two-year schools in the state have appointed boards.

TABLE 2

COMMUNITY COLLEGE BOARD COMPOSITION

(APPOINTED BOARDS)

State	Members	Length Of Term In Years	Appointed By
Alaska+	9-15	3	University President
Colorado	5	4	Governor
Connecticut	16	6	Governor
Delaware*	7	3	Governor
Florida+	5-9	4	Governor
Georgia*	15	7	Governor
Hawaii*	11	4	Governor
Idaho*	7	5	Governor
Indiana*	11	3	Governor
Kentucky	9	4	Governor
Louisiana*	17	6	Governor (University Bds.)
Maine*	9	5	Governor
Maryland	7	6	Governor
Massachusetts	11	5	Governor (Appoints 10)
Minnesota	7	4	Governor
Mississippi+	5-36	5	County Supervisor
New Hampshire*	7	4	Governor
New Jersey+	9	4	Bd. of Chosen Freeholders
New York	9	9	Governor (4) Local Sponsoring Agency (5)
North Carolina	12	4a	Gov. (4) County Com. (4) Bd. of Ed. (4)
North Dakota	5	5	Board of Education
Ohio	9	5	Gov. (3) County Com. (6)
Rhode Island*	11	3	Gov. (Appoints 8)
South Carolina	9	4	Governor
Tennessee	18	9	Governor (Appoints 12)
Utah	8	4	Governor
Vermont*	15	6	Governor (Appoints 10)
Virginia	9-15	4	Local Sponsoring Agency
Washington	5	5	Governor
West Virginia*	12	6	Governor (Appoints 9)
Wisconsin	9	3	Local School Boards

*State-wide board

+Size may vary according to counties served by schools

a-Terms for North Carolina Community College Trustees were reduced from eight years to four years by the General Assembly on April 4, 1985. The new law is effective July 1, 1985.⁴

⁴"Trustee Terms Reduced to Four Years," Trustees Events & Issues, 25 April 1985, pp. 1-3.

out clearly who serves: "The governor shall seek persons who best serve the needs of the entire state."⁵

Other state statutes list specific occupational areas that should be represented on the various boards. In Washington the law notes that, "in making such appointments, the governor shall give consideration to geographical exigencies, and the interests of labor, industry, agriculture, the professions and ethnic groups."⁶

Virginia, New Hampshire, Alaska and Tennessee are four of several states which note the need for trustees to represent various occupational and industrial concerns in the college service area. In Alaska, which has a small but diverse population, the law says that council membership should be "broadly representative of the local community served and shall include, insofar as possible, representation from: the professions, commerce and industry, labor and local government, local school districts, regional and local native corporations, alumni, students and military installations."⁷

In New Hampshire and Tennessee the law requires members to include certain groups. The New Hampshire Board of Governors is composed of seven members, all appointed by the Governor for four-year terms. Members must be from the field of business and industry (3) and from the field of education (2), health services (1), and labor (1).⁸

⁵Information Provided by Office of President of Community College of Rhode Island, Warwick, Rhode Island.

⁶Washington, State of Washington Code (1982) Section 28B-50.130, p. 9.

⁷University of Alaska Board of Regents, Regents Policy (1983), Part II, Chapter IV, p. 02.04.01.

⁸New Hampshire, New Hampshire General Statutes (1983) Chapter 379, p. 1.

In Tennessee the law puts requirements on membership for women (at least one), persons under 30 (at least one), three members each from the two leading political parties, and no more than two alumni members from the same state institution.⁹

Colorado, another state with members appointed by the Governor, also has requirements on board membership going to one partisan group. Membership of the local college council in Colorado can be composed of no more than three members from the same political party.¹⁰

Wisconsin also deals with board composition in its laws. Of the nine appointed members to local boards in Wisconsin, two must be elected from some governing board in the college district.¹¹

Concerning appointment qualifications, the laws are just as general. The Idaho statute which says, "Appointment to the board shall be made solely upon the consideration of the ability of such appointees efficiently to serve the interest of the people and education, without reference to locality, occupation, party affiliation or religion," sets a high standard for all statutes to follow.¹²

Of course, where governing officials are elected, such criteria is not incorporated into the legal statutes. The main requirement listed by states which have elections for trustees is residency. Some states do require candidates seeking election as trustees to meet the same requirements as other office seekers.

⁹Tennessee, General Statutes of Tennessee (1983) Chapter 8, p. 105.

¹⁰Colorado, Colorado Revised Statutes (1973) Volume 9, p. 376.

¹¹Letter From John Kroll State Board of Vocational-Technical and Adult Education, Madison, Wisconsin, 5 November 1984.

¹²Idaho, General Statutes, State of Idaho (1977) Chapter 2, p. 2.

While some states spell out what types of occupations should be represented on the board, some states note in the laws what types of occupational backgrounds are not desirable. In Alabama, where the State Board of Education is charged with supervision of the two-year colleges, the State Board is elected from Congressional districts. Members must reside in the District they seek to represent and cannot be an employee of the board or be a person "who is or has been engaged as a professional educator within five years."¹³

Taken as a whole, statutes for most states represent only minimum requirements for board of trustee membership, both for elected and appointed boards.

Copies of several state statutes which are representative of most state statutes are included in the appendix.

The North Carolina Appointment Law

The law under which appointments are made to the boards of trustees for community colleges/technical colleges and technical institutes in North Carolina has remained virtually unchanged since it was originally written in 1963.

The basic premise of the first law was to divide the appointment power for trustees among the Governor, county commissioners, and boards of education. This is spelled out clearly in North Carolina General Statute 115D-12, which denotes that

each community college and technical institute established or operated pursuant to this Chapter shall be governed by a board of trustees consisting of 13 members, who shall be selected by the following agencies.

¹³Alabama, Code of Alabama (1975) Volume B, p. 13.

Group One--four trustees, elected by the board of education of the public administrative unit located in the administrative area of the institution. If there are two or more public school administrative units, whether city or county units, or both, located within the administrative area, the trustees shall be elected jointly by all of the boards of education of those units, each board having one vote in the election of each trustee . . .

Group Two--four trustees elected by the board of county commissioners of the county in which the institution is located. Provided, however, if the administrative area of the institution is composed of two or more counties, the trustees shall be elected jointly by the boards of commissioners of all those counties, each board having one vote in the election of each trustee . . .

Group Three--four trustees, appointed by the Governor.¹⁴

The 13th member of the board, provided by law, is the president of the student government who serves as an ex officio non-voting member.¹⁵

The law also requires members to only be "residents of the administrative area of the institution for which they are selected or of counties contiguous thereto."¹⁶

The new North Carolina law also establishes the term of office for trustees at four years and has no stipulations about trustees being reappointed.¹⁷ In addition the North Carolina law allows for a larger board than the average found in the study, 12 members as compared to 10. The term of eight years was almost twice as long as the average of five found for other appointed boards around the nation until it was changed.

The North Carolina trustee appointment law represents a unique policy, in comparison to the other states in the survey. The North

¹⁴North Carolina, Cumulative Supplement to North Carolina General Statutes (1981), p. 371.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid.

¹⁷Trustees Events & Issues.

Carolina law provides for the most appointing agencies, three, and there is the potential for even more involvement. Since the law allows the local board of education to appoint members, additional involvement is possible where more than one board of education is operating in a particular college service area. One college in the system has five different boards of education making appointments along with the county commissioners and the Governor.

In addition, several community colleges serve more than one county. These colleges have several counties named as part of their administrative service area and thus have more than one county board of commissioners appointing trustees.

This power-sharing arrangement for trustees in North Carolina does produce some interesting cross-county appointments which are not found in other public agencies. At Mayland Technical College in Spruce Pines, all three counties in the college service area have board appointment authority. Each of three counties has four appointments as follows: The Governor appoints two trustees from one county and two from each of the other two counties, the boards of education from each county appoint one member each and then jointly appoint one member as do the county commissioners from all three counties.¹⁸

There are other unique power-sharing arrangements necessitated by the law. At College of the Albemarle, three counties have direct board appointments. In Pasquotank County, College of the Albemarle's home county, the

¹⁸Letter From Bill Wilkins, Mayland Technical College Board of Trustees, 31 January 1985.

commissioners appoint four trustees while the county board of education selects three members from the county and selects one member from another county in the service area. The Governor than appoints three members from Pasquotank County and then one from another county in the service area giving the college trustees from three different counties.¹⁹

While the law clearly gives boards of education and county commissioners board appointment authority, there is a legal question concerning whether these two appointing agencies can appoint their own members to the college board. An opinion by the North Carolina Attorney General's Office in 1984 stated that commissioners should not be allowed to appoint their own members to trustee boards.²⁰

According to Senior Deputy Attorney General Andrew Vanore, this opinion also covers appointments of the board of education members to the trustee board as well. "Our position is that current law does not allow either commissioner or board of education members to serve on community college boards. However, this is only an opinion of the Attorney General's office and is not considered a law."²¹

While this may represent the position of the Attorney General's office on the issue, the one school in question decided not to remove the county commissioner from the local board of trustees and numerous community colleges, technical colleges and technical institutes in the system

¹⁹Interview with Dr. Parker Chesson, Elizabeth City, North Carolina, 15 February 1985.

²⁰"Plans for Career Development, Basic Education Advance," News & Observer, 22 February 1985, Section 1, p. A13.

²¹Interview with Andrew A. Vanore, Raleigh, North Carolina 21 February 1985.

have both board of education and county commissioners serving on their boards.²²

Currently, there is an effort to allow boards of county commissioners and boards of education to appoint legally their own members to the local community college board. Representative Ed Nye of Bladen County introduced such a bill on February 21, 1985 in the North Carolina General Assembly.²³

In most states covered in the survey, appointment power is held by the Governor and shared with few other public agencies. Several states do allow other groups such as commissioners or other sponsoring agencies to make appointments. However, none shares the power equally among three different governmental branches as North Carolina does.

The distribution of power for appointments to board of trustees for two-year public colleges in North Carolina is at two distinct levels of government and follows tradition as well as setting a new precedent. The state government is represented in the appointment equation through the governor's office, while the other two appointing agencies, county commissioners and board of education, represent the local government in the appointment formula.

The allotment of appointments to the governor follows the traditional role of the governor in helping to shape educational policy in the state. The scope of the Governor's office provides the state's chief executive with the power to appoint members to over 500 different boards, many of these in the area of education.²⁴ The Governor has appointment power to

²²News & Observer.

²³Ibid.

²⁴"Hunt Made Spate of Appointments Hear," News & Observer, 6 January 1985, Section 1, p. A8.

both the State Boards of Community Colleges and Education and generally the chairman of both of these groups is selected by the governor.

At the same time, the appointments allotted to county commissioners are tied to their direct financial support of the schools. In North Carolina local support of the two-year college system provided by county government accounts for about 12-15 percent of each school's total budget.²⁵ By law, commissioners are charged to provide certain services to the local school and must meet these minimum requirements for local state support to continue. By law commissioners have appointment power to most local agencies that they provide direct financial support to.²⁶

However, the direct link for school board appointment power did not originate through statute, financial support or executive tradition, which makes another unique feature of the power-sharing law in that while major regulations governing the operation of the community college have changed since the original 1963 law, the appointment procedure has remained unchanged. Under the original law, the Department of Community Colleges, which serves as the state-level administrative office for the system, was placed under the auspices of the State Board of Education.

The DCC and the system remained under the direct state-level supervision of the State Board of Education until January 1, 1981, when a new State Board of Community Colleges was created. This new state board is charged by law to

²⁵Interview with Dr. Jesse L. McDaniel, Kinston, North Carolina, 14 February 1985.

²⁶Interview with High Stroud, Kinston, North Carolina, 27 February 1985.

adopt and execute such policies, regulations and standards concerning the establishment, administration, and operation of institutions as the State Board may deem necessary to insure the quality of educational programs, to promote the systematic meeting of educational needs of the State, and to provide for the equitable distribution of State and federal funds. . .²⁷

With the creation of a new state-level board to supervise the community college system, the formal link between the system and the public school system was ended. The new State Board of Community Colleges, through its Department of Community Colleges, handles all matters related to the operation of the two-year colleges in the state, including all financial matters which had in the past been included in the State Board of Education budget. But, with the creation of a new State Board of Community Colleges these links were severed and the two-year colleges joined the public schools and the university system as separate educational systems seeking funds from the General Assembly.

So, while the major links that had tied the public schools and community colleges together for 18 years were broken at the state level, the local link of board appointment by the boards of education was left in place.

The original link between the two educational systems was a very necessary one, according to Dr. Jerald James, a former community college president, who also served as Director of Vocational Education for the State Board of Education at the time the original community college bill was written in 1963 and who also had a hand in preparing the legislation.

²⁷North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges, Community College Laws of North Carolina (Raleigh, North Carolina, 1981), p. 6.

Dr. James, who was also a professor of Adult Education at North Carolina State University, explained that "there was a need to get as many people involved at the local level as possible to sell the community college idea in this state. There were a lot of powerful enemies who opposed the community college movement in this state and a broad base of local support was needed to get it approved."²⁸

The idea of having local school boards, who had supervised the industrial education centers for several years, make appointments to the local community college board, was part of the original concept for local governance, James said. "It is important to remember that IECs were operated under the local school board in many cases and the Director of the IEC reported to the local school superintendent. The concept of having board members appointed by the local school board was included in every draft of the original bill. It was felt that there was a need to recognize existing educational leadership in the community, especially since we needed this leadership to plan a totally new educational system. The members of the local school board represented the educational leadership available in the community."²⁹

In addition to seeking as much local support as possible for the community college concept, the need to disperse the power for operation of the new schools was also a consideration in the development of the appointment formula, according to Dr. Dallas Herring, who was chairman of the State Board of Education at the time the community college law was

²⁸Interview with Dr. Jerald James, Eden, North Carolina, 18 July 1984.

²⁹Ibid.

being written and then adopted. Dr. Herring explained in an interview that the effort in 1963 was to develop a system of two-year colleges that were indeed locally controlled and had as much autonomy from the state-level as possible.³⁰

"With the development of the system, we were determined to have as much local autonomy as possible and not to leave the power in the hands of one group. By having two local appointment agencies, we were able to do that. Also, there was a natural link between the public schools and the community colleges," Dr. Herring explained.³¹

Herring noted that there were not a lot of options in 1963 when the law was being developed. "About the only options were to let the State Board of Education have appointment power, which I do not feel would have been wise, or perhaps have the local municipalities in the service area make appointments. But, we have such a difference among the local governments that would probably have been hard to manage. Also, there was the possibility of election of trustees, but there was no history of electing trustees in North Carolina and since this was an entirely new educational system, we did not know how it would go," Herring concluded.³²

Overall, the North Carolina law is similar to other state community college laws in that the Governor does have appointment authority to the local board. However, that state-level authority is lessened when local appointments account for 2/3's of the total appointments on the board.

³⁰Interview with Dallas Herring, Rose Hill, North Carolina, 5 February 1985.

³¹Ibid.

³²Ibid.

The North Carolina law also provides for more local participation than most other state laws studied and also has a larger board membership and allows trustees to serve longer terms than the norm of the national study.

Key System Leaders Interviewed on Governance Issue

As part of the evaluation process of the current selection system for trustees in North Carolina, several key leaders in the system were identified and interviewed to gain their perspective on the question of local governance: John A. Forelines, Chairman of the State Board of Community Colleges, Dr. David E. Daniels, Chairman of the Presidents' Association for 1984-1985 who is also president of Wilkes Community College, and Mr. Robert W. Scott, President of the Department of Community Colleges.

All three explained that they had a good understanding of the current governance formula. Mr. Forelines was a local board chairman for 19 years before assuming the position of State Board Chairman while Daniels has worked with a local board at Wilkes Community College in his capacity as president of that school and Scott has met with many local boards and regional trustee groups in the last three years since he has been DCC president.

All three expressed the opinion that the proper role for the local board was for policy-making and not policy implementation. Mr. Forelines stressed the need for boards to avoid "day-to-day operational decisions" at the schools.³³

³³ Interview with John A. Forelines, Granite Falls, North Carolina, 4 February 1985.

The three also agreed that the current method of trustee selection, that of appointment, was appropriate. President Scott noted that appointed boards, in his experiences as former Governor of the state, were much preferred to elected boards.³⁴

The current formula of trustee appointments, four by the three different agencies, was strongly supported by Forelines and Daniels. Dr. Daniels suggested leaving the current policy just as it was and felt that appointments by the local board of education provided the college with an "essential link" that should be maintained. Daniels added that "it would be foolish to tamper with the current appointment process at this time when there is demand to increase articulation between the colleges and public schools."³⁵

Daniels also cited the current funding policy which includes 85 percent state funding for a system that is locally administered. "That is the genius of our system. We use state funds for our operation but retain a great deal of local control."³⁶

While Forelines was also very supportive of the current policy, he did admit that there was a possibility of conflict of interest between the school board appointments and the local board of trustees.³⁷ This was also a question raised by President Scott. "I question whether the school board should have the power to appoint fully one-third of the trustees to our local boards. I see a real conflict of interest in this

³⁴Interview with Robert W. Scott, Kinston, North Carolina, 29 January 1985.

³⁵Interview with Dr. David E. Daniels, North Wilkesboro, North Carolina, 30 January 1985.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Forelines.

case, especially when the school boards appoint their own members to our trustee boards, which has happened in many cases."³⁸

However, Scott also raised the question of who would replace the board of education or how a different board would be appointed. "I may not like the current situation completely, but I am not sure what a new board might be like and if it would be an improvement over what we have."³⁹

On questions dealing with trustee terms, years of service and mandatory retirement ages, the three were split in their opinions. Dr. Daniels expressed strongly the need to leave the current policy as it is with trustees allowed to serve unlimited terms and no retirement age.⁴⁰ Forelines, who noted that his 19 years of service on a local board might have been too many, expressed support for a change to possibly two terms of six years each. He also noted that many private schools have retirement age limits for trustees and suggested such a policy might be appropriate for public schools.⁴¹

Scott also supported the concept of a two-term limit and also of setting trustee terms at six years. He also expressed support for some type of mandatory retirement age in the 72-75 year range.⁴²

Scott also advocated that some type of policy be developed at the state level which would set minimum attendance guidelines for trustees.

³⁸Scott.

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰Daniels.

⁴¹Forelines.

⁴²Scott.

"One of the worst things that can happen to a local board is to get a member who does not attend meetings and does not take an active part in board activities. I think to encourage attendance and participation we should have some guidelines for trustees which would give the local board help in getting deadwood off of the board."⁴³

To bring the question of local governance into even sharper focus at the state level in North Carolina, questions concerning the issue of local board appointments were sent to the key policy shapers at each institution, the chairman of the board of trustees and the institutional president. The results of this survey will be analyzed in Chapter IV.

⁴³Ibid.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

What other authors have said about the selection process for trustees--including how many should serve and how long they should serve on the board--has been discussed earlier. In Chapter III the selection process was studied from a national perspective reviewing how other states select trustees, how many serve on local boards, and how long they serve. Next, trustee selection in North Carolina will be examined. Additionally, the functions of the current system as perceived by certain leaders in this state system will be explored.

This chapter contains the results of a study of North Carolina Community College System (NCCCS) presidents and trustee chairmen concerning board of trustee governance. The findings are presented from the analysis of data collected from questionnaires which were mailed to all community/technical college and technical institute presidents and trustee board chairmen in the NCCCS. The questionnaires addressed several issues concerning local board governance. The survey achieved a high response rate. Of the 116 presidents and trustee chairmen to whom the survey was mailed, 100 (86.2 percent) responded.

Trustee Appointment Method

Authority for appointing members to local boards of trustees for NCCCS institutions currently rests with three groups: the governor, the county boards of commissioners, and the local boards of education. Each group appoints four members, who thus constitute the 12-member local trustee board.

The results of this study revealed that the institution presidents and trustee chairmen agree that the current appointment method of obtaining board members is effective. As shown in Table 3, seventy-two (76.6 percent) of the ninety-four presidents and board chairmen responding to a question rating the effectiveness of the appointment groups rated the current method with either a 4 or a 5, indicating strong effectiveness. Only twelve (12.8 percent) of the respondents rated the current method in the ineffective range (1-2). From the very high effectiveness ratings (4-5) and the lack of any significantly low ratings, it is apparent there is much support for the current process and that the leaders of the two-year institutions perceive the current process to be very effective.

TABLE 3

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND BOARD
CHAIRMEN REGARDING PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF CURRENT
APPOINTMENT METHOD FOR OBTAINING LOCAL TRUSTEES

Responses by presidents and board chairmen	Effectiveness of Appointment Method					Totals
	1 (Not effective)	2	3	4	5 (Effective)	
Number	2	10	10	37	35	94 ^a
Percentage	2.1	10.6	10.6	39.4	37.2	100.0
	Mean = 3.989, Median = 4.176					

^aIn this and subsequent tables the total number of cases varies slightly because missing responses were excluded. The number varies slightly from question to question.

Cross-tabulations of results in Table 4 reveal that general agreement on effectiveness held for both total respondents and for individual subgroups. The presidents were more likely to rate the current alignment lower than the trustees were. While 78.1 percent of the trustees rated the current procedure as effective (4-5), presidents were slightly less supportive in their ratings at 73.5 percent. However, the difference is only slight and again suggests strong degree of perceived effectiveness for the current appointment procedure from the top leadership of the community college system in North Carolina. Both the presidents and the trustee chairmen who responded to the survey indicated much support for the current method of its effectiveness.

TABLE 4

CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND BY BOARD
CHAIRMEN REGARDING PERCEIVED EFFECTIVENESS OF CURRENT
APPOINTMENT METHOD FOR OBTAINING TRUSTEES

Subgroups	Effectiveness of Appointment Method					Totals N (%)
	1 (Not Effective) N (%)	2 N (%)	3 N (%)	4 N (%)	5 (Effective) N (%)	
Presidents	1(2.0)	5(10.2)	7(14.3)	19(38.8)	17(34.7)	49(54.4)
Board Chairmen	1(2.4)	5(12.2)	3(7.3)	15(36.6)	17(41.5)	41(45.6)
Totals	2(2.2)	10(11.1)	10(11.1)	34(37.8)	34(37.8)	90(100.0)

Pearson's R = 0.04006, Significance = 0.3539

In another analysis of the data, the responses of the president and trustee chairman from the same institution were paired together for

comparison to match these top leaders' views on this issue. Considering the question of the effectiveness of the current procedure, twelve of the twenty-nine presidents and their trustee chairmen who responded to the survey agreed on the ranking, all giving the current system effective ratings. Six presidents and their chairmen gave the system a rating of 4 while six more presidents and trustees rated the system with a 5 for very effective. Surprisingly, all of the pairs who agreed on the ratings were in the high category (4-5) indicating strong effectiveness. Of the remaining seventeen pairs who responded, trustees rated the procedure slightly more effective than did the presidents in seven of the cases. Overall, from the survey results, there were no wide ranges in responses indicating that most presidents and their board chairmen were generally in agreement on the ratings. From these results, there appears to be little real difference in the perceptions of either group of respondents on the effectiveness of the current appointment procedure.

Some differences in ratings were seen, however, in a comparison of larger schools in the North Carolina Community College System with the system as a whole. According to the Spring 1984 budget full time equivalent (FTE) reports,¹ the six largest schools--Central Piedmont Community College, Fayetteville Technical Institute, Cape Fear Technical Institute, Guilford Technical Community College, Forsyth Technical Institute and Wake Technical College--had a mean rating of 4.13 when responding to the question concerning appointment effectiveness. This comparison of the

¹North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges, Spring Quarter Enrollment Report (Raleigh, North Carolina, 1984), p. 3.

five presidents and four trustee chairs from the larger schools was slightly higher than the overall mean ratings of all of the two-year schools (3.980).

An additional analysis of the data from the different types of two-year institutions (community college/technical college/technical institute) concerning the question of appointment effectiveness again showed support among the presidents and chairs. A cross tabulation comparing the response from community colleges to those of technical colleges and technical institutes revealed few differences and much support for the current appointment procedure. The mean for community college responses for overall perceived effectiveness was 4.00 to 3.88 for technical institutes and technical colleges.

As further evidence for the overall support of the current policy, the respondents who were asked to explain briefly their answers to the first question concerning appointment effectiveness generally made favorable comments on the eighty-one surveys which included comments. While some of the presidents and trustee chairmen used the opportunity to criticize the current policy, most of the respondents were very positive in their comments, again adding evidence to the fact that there is much support for the current procedure.

Comments of support were added by both groups and six of the responding presidents noted, in effect, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." Four more of the presidents suggested the current appointment system provided a wider perspective to the college governance structure by using three different appointing groups. Other supporting comments made by the

presidents included "provides good balance for appointments," "quality of appointments has been good," and "works better than a board chosen in other ways."

However, several of the presidents took the opportunity to offer some criticism of the method and to point to what they called a "conflict of interest" between the board of education-appointed trustees and the college board as a whole. One president cited what he called "split loyalties at budget time," noting the potential problem faced when board of education members also serve as college trustees. Three other presidents also cited the potential problems and conflict of interest when board of education members are also board trustees.

Trustees offered fewer comments on their returned surveys, but the comments they did make were more supportive of the effectiveness of the current procedure than those of the presidents were. One trustee noted that the current process provided the college with a "good cross section of people from the community", while another noted "the current system works well in providing good local trustees." However, several trustees added that the political nature of appointments was a negative influence, calling them "political payoffs" and appointments based on "politics and not qualifications."

Commissioners Rated Most Effective

After rating the current appointment procedures, the respondents rated the appointment effectiveness of the three groups who name trustees to community college boards in North Carolina. As a group, the respondents rated the county commissioners as the most effective in making appointments to the local boards (Table 5). Of the ninety-eight respondents to this

question of appointment effectiveness for the three groups, seventy-one (72.5 percent) rated the commissioners in the effective range (4-5) in making qualified appointments to the local board of trustees. The combined results also showed that the board of education was rated as effective by sixty-one (62.9 percent) of the presidents and trustee chairmen whereas the Governor was rated as effective by a slightly lower number, fifty-eight (59.2 percent).

The mean for the commissioners was 3.980 of a possible 5.0 as compared to 3.639 for the effectiveness rating of the board of education and 3.602 for the Governor. In addition to having the lowest mean in this category, the Governor also received the largest number of ineffective ratings, twenty-two (22.40 percent). The board of education also received some negative responses from the groups with eight respondents rating the board of education with the lowest possible rating (1). All three groups rated about the same in the moderate range (3), and in fact, all three appointing groups were rated effective (4) by thirty-three respondents each in the survey. The significant difference in the survey results is seen in the highest ratings (5), where county commissioners received much higher rankings than their counterparts.

The presidents, in the cross-tabulation of results (Table 6) tended to rate the commissioners as more effective in their appointments than did the trustee chairmen. The trustees gave commissioners eight ratings in the low range while the presidents gave that same group only three low ratings. Interestingly, no president gave the commissioners a rating of 1.

TABLE 5

PERCEPTIONS OF PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN REGARDING
EFFECTIVENESS OF DIFFERENT APPOINTING GROUPS, BY
NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF RESPONSES

Appointing Groups	<u>Effectiveness of Appointing Groups</u>					Totals	Mean	Median
	1	2	3	4	5			
	(Not Effective)				(Effective)			
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)		
County Commissioners	2(2.0)	9(9.2)	16(16.3)	33(33.7)	38(38.8)	98(100.0)	3.980	4.167
Boards of Education	8(8.2)	11(11.3)	17(17.5)	33(34.1)	28(28.9)	97(100.0)	3.639	3.879
Governor	2(2.0)	20(20.4)	18(18.4)	33(33.7)	25(25.5)	98(100.0)	3.602	3.773

TABLE 6

CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE
CHAIRMEN REGARDING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COUNTY
COMMISSIONERS IN APPOINTING QUALIFIED MEMBERS
TO THE LOCAL BOARDS OF TRUSTEES

	Not Effective			Effective		Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
President	0(0%)	3(5.9%)	7(13.7%)	21(41.2%)	20(39.2%)	51(54.8%)
Trustee	2(4.8%)	6(14.3%)	8(19.0%)	10(23.8%)	16(38.1%)	42(45.2%)
Column Total	2(2.2%)	9(9.7%)	15(16.1%)	31(33.3%)	36(38.7%)	93(100%)

Pearson's R = 0.17588

Significance = 0.0459

The trustees, however, gave the boards of education much higher ratings than did the presidents who responded. The trustees rated the boards of education in the higher range 69 percent of the time, as opposed to only 54 percent for the presidents in that same range (Table 7). The presidents rated the board of education moderately effective 28 percent of the time. Nine of the fifty presidents responding to the question rated the board of education in the low range. The trustee also

had some low rankings for the boards of education as ten of the forty-two or almost one-quarter of the respondents placed the boards of education in the low range. The difference in the two results can be seen in the moderate category where presidents tended to rate the boards of education while fewer trustees, 14-3, rated the boards in this category. If a 3 rating were considered neutral ground, then trustees were either strongly supportive or somewhat negative about appointments made by the boards of education.

TABLE 7

CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEES
REGARDING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE BOARDS OF
EDUCATION IN APPOINTING QUALIFIED MEMBERS
TO THE LOCAL BOARD OF TRUSTEES

	Not Effective			Effective		Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
President	3(6.0%)	6(12.0%)	14(28.0%)	16(32.0%)	11(22.0%)	50(56%)
Trustee	5(11.9%)	5(11.9%)	3(7.1%)	14(33.3%)	15(35.7%)	42(44%)
Column Total	8(8.7%)	11(12.0%)	17(18.5%)	30(32.6%)	26(28.3%)	92(100%)

Pearson's R = 0.06785

Significance = 0.2602

Both the presidents and their trustee chairmen rated the Governor low in making effective appointments (Table 8). There was only a slight variation in their ratings in the high category, 61.9 percent compared with 58.8 percent, for the trustees and the presidents, respectively.

TABLE 8

CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE
CHAIRMEN REGARDING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE
GOVERNOR IN APPOINTING QUALIFIED MEMBERS
TO THE LOCAL BOARD OF TRUSTEES

	Not Effective			Effective		Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
President	1(2.0%)	10(19.6%)	10(19.6%)	18(35.3%)	12(23.5%)	51(54.8%)
Trustee	1(2.4%)	8(19.0%)	7(16.7%)	15(35.7%)	11(26.2%)	42(45.2%)
Column Total	2(2.2%)	18(19.4%)	17(18.3%)	33(35.5%)	23(24.7%)	93(100%)

Pearson's R = 0.02433

Significance = 0.4085

There were some differences between the survey results of the six largest schools in the system and the other survey results concerning appointment effectiveness. The respondents from the larger schools rated

the Governor lower with a 3.33 mean as compared to the 3.60 mean of other schools (Table 9). Respondents from the largest schools rated the commissioners lower with a 3.56 mean, as opposed to an overall rating of 3.98, while the difference was smaller when comparing the effectiveness of the boards of education, 3.78 to 3.63 overall.

TABLE 9

RESPONSE MEAN COMPARISONS OF THE SIX LARGEST SCHOOLS IN THE
NCCCS WITH ALL SCHOOLS IN THE SYSTEM ON PERCEIVED
EFFECTIVENESS OF APPOINTING GROUPS

	Effectiveness of Appointing Groups	
	6 Largest Schools	CC System
	Mean	Mean
Board of Education	3.78	3.63
County Commissioners	3.56	3.98
Governor	3.33	3.60

In the statistical analysis of the group effectiveness rating considering paired responses, it is apparent that the presidents and their trustee chairmen were more likely to agree on their ratings of the Governor, as to both effectiveness and ineffectiveness (Table 10). Nine of the trustees and their presidents agreed on a high rating, while four of the pairs also agreed on a low rating indicating ineffectiveness for the

Governor's appointments. The presidents and trustees, when paired together, had the least agreement on the ratings for the boards of education, where only five of the 28 pairs (17.80 percent) agreed.

TABLE 10

DISTRIBUTION OF AGREEMENT BY PAIRED RESPONSES OF PRESIDENTS
AND THEIR BOARD CHAIRMEN ON THE EFFECTIVENESS
OF APPOINTING AGENCIES

	Agreement on Effectiveness of Appointing Groups									
	1		2		3		4		5	
	(Not Effective)			(Effective)						
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
County Commissioners	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	1(3.6)	3(10.7)	4(14.3)	8(28.6)				
Boards of Education	1(3.6)	0(0.0)	1(3.6)	2(7.0)	1(3.6)	5(17.8)				
Governor	0(0.0)	4(14.3)	2(7.1)	5(17.9)	4(14.3)	15(53.6)				
Column Totals	1(3.6)	4(14.3)	4(14.3)	10(35.7)	9(32.1)	28(100.0)				

As additional evidence of how closely the groups were together on the ratings of the three appointing agencies, no appreciable difference was detected when comparing community colleges and technical colleges/technical institutes. The means of all three grouped very closely with a range of no more than .17 being noted in any of the three ranges of means (Table 11).

TABLE 11

RESPONSE COMPARISONS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND TECHNICAL
SCHOOLS ON EFFECTIVENESS OF APPOINTING GROUPS

Groups	Effectiveness of Appointing Groups	
	Community Colleges	Technical Schools
	Mean	Mean
County Commissioners	3.97	3.86
Governor	3.69	3.46
Board(s) of Education	3.46	3.60

Political Considerations

Overwhelmingly, the respondents picked the Governor as the most likely to make appointments to the boards of trustees based on political considerations. On a ranking scale of 1 to 3, (with 1 as the most political and 3 the least), the combined response rated showed 90.5 percent agreement that the Governor was the most likely to use political considerations in making trustee appointments (Table 12).

However, the respondents were less sure of the rankings for the other two appointment groups. While the county commissioners were rated as second most likely to make appointments based on political considerations, the respondents indicated that they believed the boards of education also make politically based decisions for appointments. Twenty percent of the presidents and their trustee chairmen rated the board of education in the 1-2 category range.

TABLE 12

CROSS-TABULATIONS OF COMBINED RESPONSES OF PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN

RATING THE INFLUENCE OF POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON TRUSTEE

APPOINTMENTS BY THE GOVERNOR, COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,

AND BOARDS OF EDUCATION

Appointing Groups	Political Considerations				
	Most Political N (%)	Somewhat Political N (%)	Least Political N (%)	Mean	Median
Governor	86(90.5)	6(6.3)	3(3.2)	1.126	1.05
County Commissioners	11(11.6)	75(78.6)	9(9.8)	1.979	1.987
Board of Education	5(5.3)	14(14.7)	76(80.0)	2.747	2.875

From the results of Table 12, it is apparent that the Governor, who is farther removed from the local community college service area, is perceived by the respondent groups as making the most politically motivated appointments. The Governor's position is of course politically partisan, and his appointments are seen by both the presidents and trustee chairmen as being the most political in nature by a wide margin in the survey. Trusteeship appointments are just one of many patronage or political "non-jobs"--positions which are recognized as an honor or hold prestige but pay the holder no salary--which the Governor as the state's chief executive can make.

The commissioners, who are elected in partisan elections, are also seen as somewhat political by the responding groups but to a considerably lesser degree than that attached to the appointments made by the Governor. The fact the commissioners serve in the same community and are closer to the community college operation may add to their perceived credibility in making appointments.

The boards of education meanwhile were perceived by the survey groups as the least political in their appointments. Board of education members are either appointed or elected in non-partisan elections and are apparently seen as less political in nature by the survey respondents.

From the cross-tabulation of the results by president and trustee chairmen, the trustees were apparently more likely than the presidents to rate the appointing groups as more political. While both groups agreed on the political nature of the appointments by the Governor, the trustees were more likely to rate the county commissioners and the boards of education as highly political also. In Table 13, five of the trustees

rated the commissioners as most political, while four also rated the boards of education as most political, compared to zero for the presidents in that same category.

In reviewing the survey results on this question, it is interesting to note that none of the responding presidents rated the boards of education as most political as compared to four (10.5 percent) for the trustee chairmen for that same question. The appointed chairmen apparently see the local school boards as more partisan than do the college presidents.

Conversely, none of the presidents saw the Governor as the least political while three trustees (7.9 percent) rated the Governor as least political. North Carolina trustees are appointed and fully one third of the board is named by the Governor. It cannot be determined with the survey instrument used who appointed the board chairmen who were surveyed. Thus, some of those who responded to the survey could have been appointed by the Governor and this could influence their response to the question of political consideration by the state's chief executive.

Again there was little difference when comparing the six larger schools in the system with the total survey results. The mean responses of the six largest schools were 1.11 as compared to 1.12 rating political considerations by the Governor in making appointments (Table 14). The difference between means for the ratings of the county commissioners by the larger schools was more pronounced. The respondents from the largest schools gave the commissioners a less political rating with a mean of 2.11 as compared to 1.97 for the overall mean.

There was little difference when the results for the board of education were compared. The larger schools gave the boards of education a mean score of 2.89, as compared to an overall mean of 2.74 for all schools.

TABLE 13

CROSS-TABULATIONS OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND BY TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN RATING
 THE INFLUENCE OF POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON TRUSTEE APPOINTMENTS
 BY COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, BOARDS OF EDUCATION, AND THE GOVERNOR

Appointing Groups	Most Political (1)		Somewhat Political (2)		Least Political (3)		Totals		Pearson's R	Significance
	Pres. N (%)	Bd. Chair N (%)	Pres. N (%)	Bd. Chair N (%)	Pres. N (%)	Bd. Chair N (%)	Pres. N (%)	Bd. Chair N (%)		
Ct. Com.	4(7.7)	5(13.2)	43(82.7)	30(78.9)	5(9.6)	3(7.9)	52(57.8)	38(42.2)	0.08169	0.2220
Bds. of Ed.	0(0.0)	4(10.5)	6(11.5)	6(15.8)	46(88.5)	28(73.7)	52(57.8)	38(42.2)	0.24429	0.0102
Gov.	48(92.3)	33(86.8)	4(7.7)	2(5.3)	0(0.0)	3(7.9)	52(57.8)	38(42.2)	0.15458	0.0729

When the presidents and their trustee chairmen paired together were considered, twenty-one out of twenty-nine teams agreed on the rating of the governor, with twenty of those teams agreeing that the governor was the most political. Eighteen pairs agreed, with more variation, however, on the political considerations of the county commissioners.

Fourteen of those pairs rated the commissioners second in political consideration, while three teams rated the commissioners as most political; and one president-trustee combination rated the commissioners as the least political.

The presidents and trustees also agreed eighteen times on the ratings of the boards of education, with sixteen teams agreeing they were least political while two teams actually rated the boards of education as most political.

TABLE 14

RESPONSE MEAN COMPARISONS OF THE SIX LARGEST SCHOOLS IN THE
NCCCS WITH ALL SCHOOLS IN THE SYSTEM ON INFLUENCE OF
POLITICAL CONSIDERATIONS BY APPOINTING GROUPS

	Political Considerations	
	Six Largest Schools	Total Responses
Governor	1.11	1.12
County Commissioners	2.11	1.97
Boards of Education	2.89	2.74

When community college responses with those from technical schools were compared, the results were supportive of the overall findings. Respondents from technical colleges/technical institutes were slightly more likely than community college respondents to rate the Governor as less political in making appointments, with a mean of 1.205 to 1.081 overall. Responses from technical colleges/technical institutes produced a mean of 2.02 when considering the county commissioners on this question while community college respondents had a mean total of 1.946 for that same group. Both groups had identical means, 2.75, when the boards of education were considered.

Models for Appointment Authority

The combined respondents to the survey rated the current appointment model of four trustees each by the Governor, the county commissioners and the local boards of education, respectively, as their most preferred model when given a choice between the current model or three other models with different appointment formulas (Table 15). These substitute models incorporated portions of the current appointment formula with several changes which reflect suggestions made over the past several years as to alterations to the appointment system.

The mean comparisons in Table 15 show strong support for the current appointment model and also little enthusiasm for the three suggested models. The combined tabulation showed that Model C (5 appointments by the county commissioners and Governor) was actually selected the most preferred the second largest number of times but fewer ratings in the other categories dropped the mean on this model to third below Model B

(12 members with four appointments each by the Governor, county commissioners and General Assembly). From the survey, there is little evidence to support changing the procedure to Model D (giving appointment power only to the commissioners and General Assembly).

The cross-tabulation of results from this question showed that while both the presidents and the board chairmen agreed on Model A as their most preferred model, there was some disagreement among the respondents on their other three choices. In Table 16, the presidents and trustee chairmen had slight differences of opinion on the positioning of Models B and C. The presidents actually selected Model C with appointments by the commissioners and Governor and a ten-member board as their most preferred model eleven times as compared to seven most preferred selections for Model B, 12 members appointed equally by the Governor, commissioners, and legislature. The presidents are apparently less interested in appointments by the General Assembly than are the trustees.

Both groups gave equally low ratings to Model D, which gave the appointments to the commissioners and the General Assembly only. This model had the fewest most preferred ratings and the highest number of least preferred ratings from both respondent groups.

From the overall ratings, strong support for the current appointment model can be seen.

When comparing the six largest schools with the entire system, the results change very little. The nine respondents from the largest schools gave Model A a lower mean rating, 1.33 to 1.46 overall, while they rated Model B also slightly better with a mean of 2.22 compared to 2.57 for the total responses.

TABLE 15

MEAN COMPARISONS OF OVERALL RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN
 RATING PREFERENCES FOR VARIOUS MODELS FOR APPOINTING
 TRUSTEE BOARD MEMBERS

Appointment Models	Appointment Model Preference						N
	Most Preferred (1)	Moderately Preferred (2)	Somewhat Preferred (3)	Least Preferred (4)	Mean	Median	
^a Model A	68(69.4)	17(17.3)	10(10.2)	3(3.1)	1.469	1.221	98
^b Model B	12(12.9)	35(37.6)	27(29.0)	19(20.4)	2.570	2.486	93
^c Model C	15(16.0)	24(25.5)	30(31.9)	25(26.6)	2.691	2.767	94
^d Model D	2(2.2)	8(8.6)	20(21.5)	63(67.6)	3.548	3.762	93

^aModel A = 12 members: current appointment formula (4 Governor, 4 county commissioners, 4 boards of education)

^bModel B = 12 members: 4 gubernatorial appointments, 4 county commissioner appointments, 4 General Assembly appointments

^cModel C = 10 members: 5 gubernatorial appointments, 5 county commissioner appointments

^dModel D = 10 members: 5 appointments by county commissioners, 5 appointments by the General Assembly

TABLE 16

CROSS-TABULATIONS OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND BY TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN
 RATING PREFERENCES FOR VARIOUS MODELS FOR
 APPOINTING TRUSTEE BOARD MEMBERS

	Most Preferred		Moderately Preferred		Somewhat Preferred		Least Preferred		Totals		Pearson's R	Significance	
	1		2		3		4		P	BC			
	Pres. N (%)	Bd. Ch. N (%)	Pres. N (%)	Bd. Ch. N (%)	Pres. N (%)	Bd. Ch. N (%)	Pres N (%)	Bd. Ch. N (%)	N	N (%)			
^a Model A	32(61.5)	31(75.6)	12(23.1)	5(12.2)	7(13.5)	3(7.3)	1(1.9)	2(4.9)	52	41	93(100.0)	0.08752	0.2021
^b Model B	7(14.0)	5(12.5)	14(28.0)	20(50.0)	17(34.0)	9(22.5)	12(24.0)	6(15.0)	50	40	90(100.0)	0.14557	0.0855
^c Model C	11(22.0)	4(9.8)	16(32.0)	6(14.6)	11(22.0)	18(43.9)	12(24.0)	13(31.7)	50	41	91(100.0)	0.23643	0.0120
^d Model D	1(2.0)	1(2.5)	4(8.0)	4(10.0)	13(26.0)	6(15.0)	32(64.0)	29(72.5)	50	40	90(100.0)	0.03655	0.3662

^aModel A = 12 members: Current appointment formula (4 Governor, 4 county commissioners, and 4 board of education.
^bModel B = 12 members: 4 Governor, 4 county commissioners, and 4 by the General Assembly.
^cModel C = 10 members: 5 Governor, 5 county commissioners.
^dModel D = 10 members: 5 county commissioners, 5 by the General Assembly.

At the same time, while the largest schools rated the first two models higher, they also rated Models C and D lower than the survey as a whole. The nine respondents rated Model C with a mean of 2.78 compared to 2.69 for the total responses and 3.89 compared to 3.54 for Model D.

In another review of the question on rating models by pairing the responses of the presidents with their board chairman, the two agreed fifteen out of twenty-nine times that Model D was the least preferred. Although they agreed on Model D, the pairs split on their opinion on the other three models. On Model A, thirteen combinations agreed: eleven pairs selected the current procedure as their first choice while the other two ranked it second or third. On Model B, nine pairs agreed but split their choices while on Model C, seven combinations agreed on the rankings.

A comparison of means between community colleges and technical colleges/technical institutes showed no significant difference in the rankings of the four models (Table 17).

TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF MEANS BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND TECHNICAL
COLLEGES/TECHNICAL INSTITUTES IN RANKING SUGGESTED
APPOINTMENT MODELS FOR TRUSTEES

Models	Community Colleges	Technical Schools
A	1.514	1.500
B	2.698	2.444
C	2.682	2.750
D	3.395	3.694

Alternative Models

Of the one hundred respondents, only nine made suggestions for models different from those offered for review, and only one of those nine actually addressed the question appropriately. This response to the question offered an appointment model of twelve trustees with one change from the current procedure. The president who responded appropriately to the question identified a model which gave four appointments each to the Governor and the county commissioners but removed the board of education as an appointing body and replaced it with the State Board of Community Colleges.

Of the other eight responses, all were deemed invalid, since they answered both the question concerning rating the other four models and also listed a suggested model. The questions were mutually exclusive. The survey requested respondents to rate either the four listed models or make a suggestion for a new procedure. However, for information purposes, the results of those invalid responses are reviewed.

Of the four presidents who responded to the question concerning development of an alternative model, three reduced the number of trustee members. Two of those responses reduced the trustee number to eight with the Governor and the commissioners each appointing four members, while another response suggested a model with eight members, which gave three appointments each to the Governor and the county commissioners and 2 to the boards of education. One suggested model reduced the number of trustees to nine with each current agency appointing three members. Another model by a president was for twelve-member board, with the Governor and commissioners appointing six each. Of the four trustees who responded,

three of the four suggested more radical changes than did the presidents. One trustee suggested reducing the board membership to ten, with the Governor and commissioners appointing four members each and the board of education two each. A second response reduced the number to ten, allowing the Governor to appoint four and the commissioners six.

Another trustee suggested leaving the current total at twelve with the following appointment formula: four trustees by the board of education, two each by the Governor and county commissioners, and four by the trustees themselves. The fourth trustee suggested a model which retained twelve members but gave appointments to four agencies: the county commissioners, the board of education, the Governor, and the Chamber of Commerce in the community the college serves.

Elected Boards

Of all the questions asked the presidents and their trustee chairmen, the one which drew the most similar response addressed the election of community college trustees in North Carolina. While the election of trustees is a procedure used in many other states, as shown in Chapter II and III, trustees and presidents in North Carolina agreed 99 out of 100 times in this survey that the present appointment procedure was much more preferred than election of trustees (Table 18).

A review of the question concerning election of trustees by president/trustee combinations showed solid opposition to the idea in this state. Of the twenty-nine pairs in the survey who responded to this question, twenty-eight presidents and their trustee chairmen agreed that elections were not the best procedure for this state. One combination was divided on this issue.

TABLE 18

CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES FROM PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEES
 CONSIDERING THE ELECTION OF TRUSTEES IN NORTH CAROLINA.
 (RESPONSES WHICH WERE NOT CLASSIFIED IN EITHER
 GROUP WERE ALSO INCLUDED)

	Yes	No	Total
President	1	52	53
			53.0%
Trustee	0	42	42
			42.0%
Unknown	0	5	5
			5.0%
Column	1	99	100
Total	1.0%	99.0%	100.0%

Pearson's R = 0.08839 Significance = 0.1909

When comparing the large schools with the entire survey, the results are about the same. All nine respondents from the larger schools responded negatively to the question of elections, which follows the pattern of the other schools in the survey.

There was no difference when community colleges were compared to technical colleges/technical institutes.

Length of Terms and Service for Trustees

Of all the questions in the survey, the presidents and trustees who responded had the most disagreement over the issue of limiting the terms for community college trustees. When trustees and presidents were asked, "Would you favor limiting the length of service for a trustee?" The ninety-nine respondents were almost evenly divided on the question. By a margin of 52 to 47, the respondents favored not limiting trustee service (Table 19).

TABLE 19

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION BY PRESIDENTS AND BY TRUSTEE
CHAIRMEN REGARDING LIMITING THE LENGTH
OF TRUSTEE BOARD SERVICE

Category	Code	N	Percentage
Yes	1	47	47.5
No	2	52	52.5
Total		99	100.0%

Mean = 1.525

Median = 1.548

The cross-tabulation of trustees and presidents showed they were evenly split on the question of limiting trustee service (Table 20). By slim margins, both groups were opposed to limiting service, but the differences were statistically small: 51.9 percent against 48.1 percent for the presidents and 52.4 percent against 47.6 percent for the trustees.

TABLE 20

CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND BY TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN CONSIDERING LIMITING THE LENGTH OF SERVICE FOR TRUSTEES ON LOCAL BOARDS. (RESPONSES WHICH WERE NOT CLASSIFIED IN EITHER GROUP WERE INCLUDED.)

Limit Length of Trustee Service			
Subgroups	Yes	No	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
President	25(48.1)	27(51.9)	52(52.5)
Trustee	20(47.6)	22(52.4)	42(42.4)
Unknown	2(40.0)	3(60.0)	5(5.1)
Column Totals	47(47.5)	52(52.5)	99(100.0)

Pearson's R = 0.02347

Significance = 0.4088

When the question of unlimited service for trustees was compared by community colleges and technical colleges/technical institutes, little difference was detected. From the survey results, community college respondents were more likely to respond negatively to the suggestion of limiting service while technical school respondents were more likely to favor such a move.

An analysis of the returns on this issue, when presidents and their trustee chairmen were compared, was about evenly divided. Of the twenty-nine combinations, nine pairs responded negatively, while eight responded in a positive manner and twelve combinations split, revealing considerable differences of opinion on this question of limiting trustee service between the two-year college presidents and their board chairmen. In a number of schools, apparently the president and his own board chairmen are of different opinions on this crucial question concerning local board governance.

The trend for the larger schools in the system was somewhat different than the results from the other schools. The six largest schools registered a 6 to 3 favorable response to the question on limiting terms for trustees. Three of the presidents and three trustee chairmen from these larger schools supported limiting terms.

The forty-seven presidents and trustees who did favor limiting trustee service made a variety of suggestions concerning proposed terms and years of service. By far, the most respondents suggested limiting trustees on the community college boards to two terms while others suggested as few as one term and as many as four (Table 21). Of the forty-seven responding to this question, twenty-nine (61.70 percent) favored

the two-term concept. One term was the second most frequently mentioned suggestion made by those responding. The mean for responses to this question was 2.2 terms.

TABLE 21

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND
TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN FOR LIMITING TRUSTEE SERVICE

Suggested No. Of Terms	Number	Percentage
1	8	17.02
2	29	61.70
3	5	10.63
4	3	6.38
5	1	2.12
9	1	2.12
Totals	47	100.0

Mean = 2.2

In the cross-tabulation analysis of these results, the presidents are shown to be more supportive of the shorter term concept with five presidents even favoring just one term of service for the trustee while only two trustee chairmen selected one term as their most preferred option (Table 22).

TABLE 22

CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN ON
 PREFERENCES FOR THE NUMBER OF TERMS A TRUSTEE SHOULD
 BE ALLOWED TO SERVE ON THE BOARD

Terms in Years for Trustees							
Subgroups	1	2	3	4	5	9	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)
Presidents	5(19.2)	15(57.7)	2(7.7)	2(7.7)	1(3.8)	1(3.8)	26(56.5)
Trustees	2(10.0)	14(70.0)	3(15.0)	1(5.0)	0(0.0)	0(0.0)	20(43.5)
Column Totals	7(15.2)	29(63.0)	5(10.9)	3(6.5)	1(2.2)	1(2.2)	46(100.0)

Pearson's R = -0.10413

Significance = 0.2455

Missing cases = 9

Table 22 indicated that those favoring the limited term concept do in fact support much shorter terms. Surprisingly, even the trustees who are appointed and fall under the unlimited term policy in North Carolina, favor setting some limit on the number of terms trustees can serve. Of those responding to this question, fourteen of the trustees (70 percent) actually favor a limit of two terms.

The cross tabulation by years of suggested service also revealed that in addition to favoring fewer terms for trustees, presidents also favored shorter terms in number of years. The presidents selected four years as their most preferred term length while trustees favored longer terms of six and eight. Eight years was the single most preferred term length as selected by the trustees, which is also the current length of term for North Carolina community college trustees (Table 23), while there was also support for a six-year term among trustees.

When the results of this question are examined by comparing president/trustee pairs, four trustees and their presidents agreed on the number of terms, two, but none agreed on the number of years these terms should be. When the larger schools were compared to the rest of the system, all six responded affirmatively to limiting the length of service and listed two terms as their top choice; four of those responding suggested eight-year terms while two recommended four-year terms.

Trustee Characteristics

The responding presidents and trustees, when given a list of eight characteristics from which to select the top four they believed trustees should possess, almost uniformly identified four key characteristics in one group and then a second group received only marginal support.

TABLE 23

CROSS-TABULATION OF RESPONSES FROM PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE
CHAIRMEN TO PREFERENCE FOR LENGTH OF
TERMS FOR TRUSTEE SERVICE

Length of Terms in Years					
Subgroups	4	6	8	9	Total
	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	N (%)	
Presidents	13(50.0)	7(26.9)	5(19.2)	1(3.8)	26
Trustees	3(15.0)	8(40.0)	9(45.0)	0(0.0)	20
Totals	16(34.8)	15(32.6)	14(30.4)	1(2.2)	46(100.0)

Pearson's R = 0.32565

Significance = 0.0136

By far the item cited most often by both groups of presidents and trustees was the need for the trustee to understand the role and mission of the college (Table 24). Of the ninety-five respondents to this question, ninety listed this item as one of the four they selected. A combined rank order of the items revealed that leadership qualities, stature in the community, and sufficient time for trustee duties were the next three items listed.

When the rank order of items was cross-tabulated by presidents and by trustees, however, there were some slight differences. In Table 25 the presidents listed stature in the community, sufficient time for trustee duties and leadership qualities as their second, third and

TABLE 24

RANK ORDER OF IMPORTANCE OF TRUSTEE CHARACTERISTICS AS
SELECTED BY PRESIDENTS AND TRUSTEE CHAIRMEN

Trustee Characteristics	Rank	
	N	(%)
Understanding role and mission of the college	90	(94.0)
Leadership qualities	73	(78.0)
Stature in the community	72	(76.0)
Sufficient time for trustee duties	67	(72.0)
Strong supporter of the college in the past	36	(38.0)
Middle-of-the road viewpoint	23	(24.0)
Strong political connections	17	(17.0)
Potential for financial support	4	(4.0)
Totals	95	(100.0)

fourth selections, while the trustees reversed this order to some extent (Table 26).

Also from the cross-tabulations, it is apparent the presidents place more importance on political ties for trustees than the trustees do themselves. The presidents ranked political considerations and middle-of-the-road viewpoint sixth 20.8 percent of the time, while trustees rated the political connections characteristic lower, with only six of the trustees responding listing that as one of their top four choices.

Also, the presidents at least considered the financial contribution potential from trustees with four presidents listing this as one of their top four selections. Significantly, no trustee picked this item as one of their top four selections, a fact that was statistically significant at the 0.0351 level.

TABLE 25

RANK ORDER OF RESPONSES BY PRESIDENTS
ON SELECTED ITEMS

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Understanding role and mission of the college	49	92.5
Stature in community	43	81.1
Sufficient time for trustee duties	39	73.6
Leadership qualities	38	71.7
Strong supporter of the college in the past	20	37.7
Middle of the road viewpoint	11	20.8
Strong political connections	11	20.8
Potential for financial support	4	7.5

TABLE 26

RANK ORDER OF RESPONSES BY TRUSTEES
ON SELECTED ITEMS

	Number of Responses	Percentage
Understanding role and mission of the college	41	97.6
Leadership qualities	35	83.8
Stature in community	29	69.0
Sufficient time for trustee duties	28	66.7
Strong supporter of college	16	38.1
Middle of the road viewpoint	12	28.6
Strong political connections	6	14.3
Potential for financial contributions	0	0

When pairing the presidents and their trustee chairmen together for analysis, it is apparent there is much agreement among the groups. Out of a potential of 116 answers to the question on selecting four items, the combinations selected the same items eighty-three times or 71 percent of the time.

When the items selected by the respondents from the six largest schools were compared, the results were almost identical to the overall trend. Of the nine presidents and trustees listed in this category, seven selected the same top four items.

Additional Desirable Trustee Characteristics

Generally the presidents and trustees made comments on additional desirable trustee characteristics in two broad categories: personal traits and leadership/management traits. The general personal traits desired by the presidents who responded included open-mindedness, reasonableness, integrity, honesty, loyalty, willingness to change, concern for people, unselfishness, common sense, and commitment. Trustees named similar traits and added several, including good Christian principles, compassion, vision, enthusiasm, community respect, and trust.

In the area of management/leadership skills, the presidents listed items such as ability to influence public policy, understanding the differences between making and administering policy, commitment to low-cost education and open-door policy, ability to consider all aspects of a problem, and ability to analyze and solve problems.

The trustees listed many of these characteristics and added such items as understanding the state community college system, knowledge of the college service area and the people it serves, fiscal responsibility and sound judgement, ability to represent the college in the public sector, knowledge of business and industry in the college service area, and interest in education.

Summary

From the results of the study, there is apparently a great deal of agreement on the current local governance structure among the leaders of the community college system in North Carolina.

By large margins, both groups surveyed--the community college presidents and the chairmen of the boards of trustees--expressed strong

support for the current appointment method of trustees. When asked to rate the overall effectiveness of the current appointment method for naming local trustees, the two groups rated the current policy as effective on seventy-two out of ninety-four valid survey returns. On only twenty-two returns--or less than 24 percent--did those responding to the question of overall effectiveness rate the current policy with a rating less than effective, in the 1-3 range on the survey scale.

In further substantiation of the position of strong support for the current appointment method, when the responses from the question of effectiveness were broken into two groups and analyzed by cross-tabulation, both the presidents and their trustee chairman gave equally high marks to the current policy.

The survey results also revealed that the responding groups were more likely to rate the county commissioners as the most effective in making appointments to the local boards of trustees while the board of education and the Governor were rated somewhat effective and less effective by the groups.

While listing the Governor as least effective in making appointments to the local board, the presidents and trustee chairmen also rated the Governor as the most political when it came to naming trustees. When two groups were asked which of the three appointing agencies gave the most political considerations to the appointments, the overwhelming majority selected the Governor as the most political followed by the county commissioners and then the board of education was rated as least political.

As additional evidence of their support for the current appointment procedure, both groups selected the current model as their most preferred

by far when asked to compare the current model with three additional ones which would use different appointing agencies.

The survey also revealed that the two groups were almost unanimous in their opposition to the election of trustees to community college boards in North Carolina. Survey results showed ninety-nine negative responses and only one positive response to a question concerning trustee elections.

While there was little overall disagreement among the respondents on most questions, one question did raise considerable differences in opinion. The question which created the most disagreement in responses dealt with the idea of limiting trustee terms in North Carolina. The survey respondents split almost evenly, 52 to 47, against limiting terms. The split in opinion on this key question was evident in both groups as the cross-tabulation of results showed the presidents against limiting terms, 27 to 25, and the trustees by a similar margin, 22 to 20.

Of those responding in support of limiting terms, most favored limiting the trustee to two terms on the board; presidents generally favored limiting terms to four years, while trustees favored longer terms--six years or the current eight-year terms.

Both groups also agreed that the four top characteristics the trustee should possess were understanding the role and mission of the college, leadership qualities, stature in the community, and having sufficient time to carry out trustee duties.

A review of the comments made by the presidents and trustees about the current system indicated strong support for the current alignment of four trustee appointments each by the Governor, commissioners and board of education. Some respondents did raise questions about possible conflict

of interest by board of education members who also are appointed as trustees. But, the overall comments registered on the surveys were most supportive of the current procedure.

Findings

Overall, the research in Chapters III and IV produced numerous findings which are significant in the study of governance in the North Carolina Community College System.

The original research produced the following findings:

1. Nationally, more than 60 percent of the community college and technical school systems have trustees that are appointed at either the state or the local level.
2. Of the thirty-one states that appoint their trustees, the Governor is the chief appointing official in twenty-five of these states.
3. Additional appointing agencies used nationally include boards of education, county commissioners, and mayors.
4. Nineteen states have boards of trustees that are elected either at the state or local levels.
5. Duties and responsibilities of these boards range from few, in states which have strong centralized systems of community college governance, to powerful in states with more decentralized governance.
6. Membership on elected boards averages seven trustees nationally.
7. Average membership on appointed boards is about 10.
8. Both elected and appointed boards serve terms of approximately five years.
9. Extensive selection criteria are seldom used in making appointments to trustee boards. State statutes pertain to residency only for most trustees.

10. Only three states set limits on the length of service for a trustee.

11. None of the states set a mandatory retirement age.

12. In comparison with other states in the nation, North Carolina trustee boards are larger with 12 members.

13. North Carolina's power-sharing formula for spreading board appointment authority to three agencies is exceptional.

14. North Carolina law, which includes the Governor in the appointment process, reflects the national tradition of giving the chief executive of the state input into the educational programs of that state.

15. Splitting the power to appoint trustees between local and state levels was designed to develop a broad base of support for the new educational system.

16. Community College law 115D was rewritten in 1979 to allow the new state-level Board of Community Colleges to supervise the system. However, the appointment formula for trustees was not changed at that time.

17. In North Carolina, the responding presidents and trustees, both together and as separate groups, rated the current appointment method of obtaining trustees as effective on 72 out of 100 surveys returned.

18. While the survey indicated strong support for the system, the respondents also noted that politics are involved in appointments, which can be a negative influence. The potential for political payoffs and conflicts of interest in the current system was noted.

19. County commissioners are most likely to appoint qualified members to the local boards, followed by the boards of education, and then the Governor.

20. The Governor is by far the most politically conscious when naming trustees, followed by county commissioners, and then boards of education.

21. The current appointment model of four trustees each by the Governor, county commissioners and boards of education is the most preferred of four models listed. The least preferred model was one which gave appointment authority to only the commissioners and General Assembly.

22. Trustees and presidents polled were strong in their opposition to having elected boards of trustees in North Carolina.

23. Trustees and presidents were evenly split on the issue of the length of service for trustees with 52 favoring retention of the current policy of unlimited service, and 47 favoring limitation of service.

24. Of those 47 supporting a limit, trustees and presidents were almost evenly split with the majority preferring two terms and a range from four to eight years.

25. Characteristics selected by both groups as most important for trustees were; understanding the role and mission of the college, possessing leadership skills, stature in the community, sufficient time for trustee duties. Political connections and potential for financial support were the least preferred items.

26. The results of the question concerning trustee characteristics follow closely the results of a study completed in 1968 by Rauh where trustees surveyed listed sufficient time and stature in the community as two of their top trustee traits.

27. Additional characteristics suggested were: integrity, open mindedness, trust, ability to analyze and solve problems, and ability to recognize when policy setting stops and policy administration begins.

28. Most of the additional comments from the survey centered around support for the system and its longtime usefulness.

CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to review the local governance structure of community colleges in North Carolina in relation to three questions concerning board of trustee appointments: (1) What are the appropriate criteria for selection of trustees? (2) By what method are trustees selected for community college services? (3) What is the length of term for a trustee? A framework for local board governance has been developed from the material gathered to answer these questions.

The need for this study was first posed by a special state-wide commission given the task of developing plans for the community college system into the next century. That group raised the issue of local board governance and noted that to help implement the needed changes in the system over the next two decades, leadership at the local level would have to be effective and focused.

Through a review of the historical development of the community college system in North Carolina, it was evident that emphasis for two-year college governance was on local control. The original emphasis of the community college bill placed the focus of control on the local governing board, the board of trustees. A review of the literature was designed to focus on several themes including (1) the role and function of the board of trustees, (2) the trustee selection process, (3) trustee characteristics, and (4) length of service and terms for trustees.

In addition to the review of the literature, a survey of the local governance structure of all 50 states was undertaken. From a review of the state statutes governing two-year colleges in the states, a statistical analysis of each state was developed focusing on the type of local board each state had, whether the board was appointed or elected, the number of board members, the appointing agencies, and length of term. Additionally, an analysis was made of the North Carolina community college law, as it pertained to trustee appointments. This review of community college trustee law included interviews with several officials involved in writing the original law and several who serve in the system today in leadership roles.

Furthermore, a survey of presidents and board of trustee chairmen at all 58 two-year schools in the North Carolina system was used to gain information on how these influential participants in the governance formula felt about selected questions concerning trustee appointments and service.

In the first chapter of this study, several questions concerning the issue of community college governance were posed. These questions included:

(1) What are the criteria upon which the selection of local boards of trustees are based?

(2) By what methods or by what governing agencies are local trustees selected (elected or appointed)?

(3) What is the length of service for board of trustee members?

North Carolina law follows the national trend where only minimum criteria are established. Several states identify specific occupations

as criteria for selection, and other states use age and residency requirements as eligibility criteria. But, for the most part, these criteria apply only to electorate qualifications and do not address the central issue of criteria for membership as a trustees.

Generally, there are no specific criteria established for community college trustee appointments in this state or others. No laws reviewed for other states addressed the issue of criteria for membership, although such writers as Rauh, Potter, Nason, Corson, and others cited in the literature reviewed noted a variety of characteristics and traits that trustees should possess to be effective in their position.

It is recommended that the characteristics cited in the survey should be used at least as a broad yardstick in making trustee appointments. Other considerations should also be made based on (1) minority and female representation on the board commensurate with service area population data, and (2) the needs of the institution in regards to its service area characteristics and focus of educational programs.

Appointments to a board of trustees should be more carefully considered and selection should be a more deliberate process than the random procedure that is currently administered.

Question two, the issue of how trustees are selected, hits at the heart of the local control issue. Whoever appoints or elects the trustees has a very strong hand in shaping the structure of the local two-year college. There are two main options for selection of a board, appointment or election.

Nationally, most of the boards of trustees are appointed, although 19 states do have some type of election for trustees at the state or

local levels. In the 31 states which have some form of appointed board, the Governor is the chief appointing officer. Other appointment agencies included: state legislatures, mayors and other governmental officials. In North Carolina three agencies make appointments: the Governor, county commissioners and boards of education.

The survey results of this study of community college leaders in this state indicated strong preference for leaving the board appointment power as it currently operates. It is therefore recommended that the current appointment policy be continued in this state.

Question three asked respondents what should be the length of service for trustees. The North Carolina General Assembly recently dealt with this issue during the current session by reducing the length of trustee terms from eight to four years. This reduction in term length brings the North Carolina policy more in line with the national average for trustee terms, which is about five years. Until this recent reduction in trustee terms, North Carolina trustees served the third longest term in the nation.

While trustee terms may be of relatively short duration, trustees generally may serve an unlimited number of terms. Only a few states have laws which limit the number of terms for which a trustee may be appointed. Heilbron suggested trustees should serve long enough to become familiar with the operation of a college, so as to be effective, but not so long as to lose their enthusiasm in the position.

When the North Carolina General Assembly made the change in trustee terms, no change was made in the number of terms a trustee may serve,

which allows trustees in this state continued unlimited time of service on the local board, if they are reappointed.

It is suggested that trustees should be allowed to serve a maximum of three terms. This action would open up the boards to new representation from the community on a regular basis and in a consistent manner to provide new input for the boards.

The trustees and presidents responding to question one identified most frequently four characteristics as criteria upon which the selection of local boards of trustees should be based: (1) understanding the role and mission of the college, (2) leadership qualities, (3) stature in the community, and (4) sufficient time for trustee duties. However, while these characteristics may represent desired trustee traits for all trustees to possess, further investigation revealed that these characteristics were not necessarily the selection criteria identified by a review of community college laws. This investigation revealed that criteria different from these are used in making trustee selections, and few of these are very extensive or selective in nature.

Conclusions

From the survey response and the findings, it is apparent that the presidents and trustees have great interest in the issue of trustee appointment. The high return rate, 86 percent, with 100 of 116 surveys returned, and the diverse responses added evidence to the conclusion that after almost twenty-five years, there is still much interest and some concern among the influential leaders of the two-year college system concerning the whole area of trustee selection and service.

Based on the review of the literature, study of community college laws in other states and the survey of community college leaders in North Carolina, the following conclusions have been made:

(1) While the survey results indicated some concern, no clear consensus emerged as to how to improve the current appointment formula. It was noted that additional study should be made of the issue and some minor changes should be considered in the future.

The fact that the presidents and trustees who responded are divided almost evenly among themselves on the key issue of limiting trustee service would suggest the need for additional study. The issue of trustee tenure is directly concerned with the issue of local governance, especially since North Carolina community college trustees have considerable authority over the two-year schools.

(2) While there are some distinct differences between the North Carolina trustee appointment method and that of other states, there are also some strong similarities, particularly the Governor's appointment power. The survey of states on the national scene indicated that the Governor was the major appointing authority in a majority of states. Moreover, the power-sharing arrangement in North Carolina is not unlike that in several other states where local agencies also make appointments to the community college board.

(3) Generally, North Carolina community college trustees boards are larger than their counterparts in other states. The larger boards can be explained by the fact that there are three different appointing agencies for the North Carolina system.

However, the need for the longer term of eight years, over three years longer than the average term found in the national survey is questionable. Of the respondents to the state survey who indicated a change was needed concerning length of trustees' service in North Carolina, only fourteen or 29 percent suggested a term as long as eight years, and many of these responses came from trustees themselves, who apparently were not eager to limit their own terms on the local board of trustees. The presidents were apparently much more willing to limit the length of service for trustees as the respondents in this group selected four years as the term of service they most preferred.

Even the trustees who favored continuing with an eight-year term for board members generally favored limiting the number of terms a trustee could serve. Both the trustees and the presidents generally favored a limit of two terms for trustees.

The literature reviewed noted that terms for trustees should be long enough for them to gain a working knowledge of the institutions so they can make a contribution on the board but not so long that they become bored and ineffective on the job. Clearly, a happy medium should exist and from the results of the survey, presidents and trustees who supported a change believe that two terms might be the optimum service period for trustees.

However, it is important to remember that a majority of the respondents favored leaving the current policy as is, with no limit on the service of trustees. With such a divided response on this question, it is difficult to assess whether a policy limiting trustee service would be supported by a majority of the trustees and their presidents. While over

85 percent of the presidents in the system were polled in this survey, only about 6 percent of the actual trustees who serve on local boards were polled since the survey covered only trustee chairmen. There are 696 trustees on community college boards in the state and their opinions on this issue need to be considered.

Several states have a policy limiting trustee service and this is something North Carolina may want to consider in the future, especially since there is divided opinion on the issue.

(4) While the trustees and their presidents were about evenly divided on the issue of trustee service, they generally were in agreement on the overall effectiveness of the three appointing agencies. Less than 10 percent of the respondents found the current method ineffective while 80 percent gave the current method high marks for effectiveness.

However, the respondents did tend to give the board of education and Governor lower marks in overall appointment effectiveness. The commissioners were clearly the most highly rated of the three groups.

Some of the comments indicated the possible conflict of interest between the board of education appointments and the trustee board. One president noted that the current method allowing boards of education appointment power did produce "split loyalties at budget time," since the local board of trustees and the board of education both seek financial support from local sources.

Other comments from presidents and trustees alike questioned the overall political nature of the appointment process in the current policy, and one noted that "friendship and political connections were more important than qualifications," in the current appointment method.

However, as one president noted, "the system seems illogical but it has worked well." Others noted that the system worked better than other methods and that with three appointing agencies, the board had a broader base of community support.

One trustee noted that the current method "provides us with a good cross section of people from the community and adds to the local control emphasis." Another trustee added that the three appointing agencies give the board more local control in selecting trustees since the commissioners and the board of education represent a wide range of people and interest.

Generally, the trustees, who are themselves appointed by the system, were more supportive in the comments on the current system. Presidents, who must work with these appointed boards, were also supportive but less so. While both groups pointed to the political nature of the system, neither felt that strong political connections was a principal requirement for a trustee. Neither group selected this item as a top choice when considering the list of traits a trustee should have.

(5) Both the trustees and the presidents agreed that the Governor's appointments appeared to be the most political while the board of education appointments are least political. Commissioners stood in the middle on this question.

Interestingly, two trustee chairmen responding to this question said that the Governor was actually the least political in his selections, while three other trustee chairman selected the local board of education as the most political. However, most of the respondents agreed that the Governor, who depends on local political sources in most cases for names to select for appointments, was most likely to be political when appointing

a new trustee. One trustee chairman suggested that the Governor should consult with the local board for nominations for vacancies he is responsible to fill. One president suggested that the Governor contact the president for some local input.

(6) Follow-up supporting data for the overall effectiveness of the current appointment method can be found in the fact that, of the four models which were presented for consideration, both groups selected the current appointment model as their most preferred choice over 75 percent of the time.

The two groups split when it came to selecting their second choice. The presidents were more supportive of a model which left appointments with the commissioners and the Governor, while the trustees liked as their second choice a model shifting appointments from the board of education to the General Assembly. The trustees were more supportive of a larger board while the presidents like the idea not only of a smaller board (10 members as opposed to the current 12) but also of taking appointments away from the board of education and shifting them to the Governor.

A variety of new ideas emerged when both groups were asked to give their own most preferred model for trustee appointments if it were not listed in the four given models. Most of the suggested models changed the appointment totals and also gave appointment authority to new groups. One president suggested cutting the number of trustees to nine and allowing the current trustees to name three new members themselves, while two presidents listed models which cut the board of education out of the appointment formula leaving the commissioners and the Governor as the two appointing agencies. A fourth president replaced the board of education with the State Board of Community Colleges and still another

suggested an eight-member board with three appointments by the Governor, three by the commissioners, and two by the board of education. Trustee suggestions included cutting the board of education total to two and reducing the board total to ten members. Two trustees recommended the local board itself have appointment authority. One recommended a twelve-member board with four appointments from the board of education, two from the Governor, two from the commissioners, and four by the trustees while another suggested a twelve-member board with two appointments each by the Governor, school board, and commissioners and six by the trustees. Another trustee suggested adding a new group to the appointment authority, the chamber of commerce, with the chamber naming three new members, as would the current three agencies.

Since there were so few additional suggestions from the respondents, it is difficult to assess the interest in a different appointment approach. Clearly, with the results of the questions concerning board appointment effectiveness, there is considerable support for the current alignment. However, the suggestions offered do provide several innovative possibilities, including appointments by the State Board of Community Colleges.

From these suggestions, it can be seen that the presidents were much quicker than the trustees to cut the school board out of the formula. Three of the five presidents who responded deleted the school board from their suggested models while all four trustees who responded included the school board. School boards have 232 total appointments to community college trustee boards in the state; more than likely, some of these are board chairmen and were included in the survey.

(7) The one question which drew almost unanimous agreement dealt with the idea of trustee elections in North Carolina. Only one president favored the election of trustees; the rest of the presidents and all of the trustees were in total agreement against the election of trustees. One trustee noted that the election of trustees might work well in other states but not in North Carolina.

(8) There was also agreement on the four characteristics the two groups felt were most important for trustees to possess. Their top choices were understanding the mission and role of the college, stature in the community, sufficient time for trustee duties, and leadership qualities. Both groups selected understanding the role and mission of the college most often, indicating their recognition of the importance of this need.

Both groups also agreed that the potential for financial contribution to the college was least important of the characteristics listed. Interestingly, four presidents listed this item as one of their most preferred items, while no trustees (the ones who would be making such a financial contribution) listed that as a top four item. Apparently, trustees do not feel that being a member of the board includes any overt financial consideration of support for the college.

From the results of the survey, it is also apparent that neither group put much emphasis on the need for a trustee to have strong political connections. Both groups rated this item as low on the scale of eight items. While both groups admitted that politics was involved in the selection process through their answers to earlier questions on the survey, few of the presidents or trustees felt strongly about this being a key trait trustees should possess.

In listing additional characteristics they felt trustees needed, several presidents and trustees listed integrity, honest, willingness to change, and other traits in both the personal and management category.

Several presidents noted that trustees should be able to distinguish between the role of policy maker and policy administrator. As one president noted, the trustee needs to know where "policy making stops and administration begins." Apparently this is an issue that presidents, who deal very closely with the board, see as a potential problem. The role of the governing board was cited in the literature review as crucial to effective management. The board hires the president and apparently many of the presidents want the opportunity to handle administration as an internal function of the college administration, not a function of the local board.

Another suggestion put forth by several respondents was that board of trustee members should not be members of boards of education or county commissioners. Several noted conflicts when school board members or commissioners were also college trustees. The local board of education and the college trustee board often compete for local tax dollars for operating and capital expense funds and also for some of the same students and programs.

In addition, several respondents noted the overall political nature of the current appointment method. One trustee explained that "politics and good quality board members are strange bedfellows." One respondent also noted that the problem of patronage and political appointments was not conducive to good board membership. "Patronage does not help the problem of a board getting well-rounded community leadership."

Another president noted that many times good potential trustees do not come forward and seek appointment or want to serve because there is little emphasis placed on the job trustees do at the local level. "This is not considered a very important position and good people do not always seek out appointment."

Another trustee, also talking about the political nature of the board, explained that "I have found our present system of selecting trustees makes it very difficult to maintain a well-rounded board, particularly with respect to the need quality of business and industry representatives." However, one trustee noted that politics was a "fact of life" and something that the board would have to continue to live with.

(9) Overall, the comments were favorable to the current policy. There were suggestions to reduce the terms, reduce the number of trustees, have appointees screened or interviewed before they took a position on the board, and others. However, few respondents--presidents or trustees--had any strong suggestions for making radical changes in the current policy. It appeared that while there was some support for making minor corrections to the current alignment, there is no consensus for wholesale changes such as election of boards, which was plainly opposed by the survey respondents. As one president noted, "It does not look like it should work, but it does." Another noted that the system had worked for almost 25 years without major problems and there was no need to change now.

From the comments of the community college system leaders who were interviewed, again the consensus appeared to be in favor of some minor alterations but no major surgery. All three leaders interviewed had suggestions for minor changes such as looking at a possible retirement age

and some guidelines for attendance at board meetings. Currently, nothing in the trustee appointment law requires trustees to attending meetings. Community college system President Scott suggested that some attendance guidelines be established to make sure a college has an active and interested board.

While both the presidents and trustees made some suggestions for changes and showed differences of opinion on some issues, the results viewed as a whole indicate broad support for a policy which has been in effect for almost twenty-five years.

While the very nature of the system's governance has changed dramatically at the state level, going from the State Board of Education to the State Board of Community Colleges, the local control issue has remained unchanged and from the survey results, there is little support for major renovations in the system.

Nevertheless, some interesting views emerged from the presidents and board chairmen about local governance. For instance, both groups agreed that the appointments by the state's chief executive tend to be more political in nature than those made by the county commissioners or boards of education. Yet, in the question of overall board appointment effectiveness, the groups rated the governor's appointments as about equally effective as those of the local board of education, which is much closer to the scene than the Governor.

When given the option of ranking their most preferred appointment model and presented with the chance to select a model which excluded appointments by the Governor, a large majority of those responding selected the current model, including appointments by the Governor, as most preferred.

In conclusion, the study indicated that presidents and board chairs are generally very supportive of the system and from the comments gleaned from the returns, there are few radical suggestions for change. The researcher suggests strong support for the current alignment comes from a number of avenues including the longevity of the current policy which has been in place for more than 20 years and the familiarity of the community college leaders with its operation. Also, the researcher suggests that of equal weight in this consideration is the lack of support for any other policy and an apprehension of how a new policy would be implemented.

At the same time, the leaders also may fear an erosion of local power from the two-year institutions towards a more centralized system in Raleigh. If the current appointment alignment were changed, appointments could be shifted away from the local level. While many leaders might not like the current local appointments made by the Board of Education, there is little support from the survey to indicate they would trade those appointments for ones made by a state-level group. Any shift in the appointment policy would have a negative impact on the local control of the institutions.

In considering the strong support of the presidents and trustee chairmen for the present policy, one must also take into consideration the nature of the group being surveyed. The current policy has indeed apparently worked well for those in power in the system. The policy they are supporting has allowed them to develop strong power bases and to maintain this power over a number of years. As a group, the presidents in the NCCCS tend to be older and to have been in their current position

for a number of years. Trustees on community college boards also tend to be older and serve for long periods, especially since there is no limit on the number of terms they may serve.

Another characteristic of the group being surveyed is that they are overwhelming white and male. Only one black currently serves as a community college president and no females currently hold the office of president in the 58-school system. Also, there are few blacks who serve as trustees. For this group, the survey results indicate the policy has worked well. How it has worked for those outside the current system might be a different story.

Short of a broad base of support from the presidents, trustee chairmen, and state leadership, it appears that major changes are not desired in the current appointment policy. Changes in the appointment policy would require action by the General Assembly, which has never formally addressed the issue of local governance and appointments to the community college boards. Without mandate from the colleges, trustees, or state leadership, such changes do not appear likely at this time.

Recommendations

Based on the data presented and analyzed in this study the following recommendations are made regarding the question of board of trustee governance in the community college system in North Carolina:

1. The General Statute Code regarding trustee appointments for community college trustees should be written so as to prohibit county commissioners and board of education members from appointing their own members to these boards.

2. General statutes should be written to establish the maximum number of consecutive terms for trustees at three terms.
3. The term of office for a trustee in the community college system should be reduced to four years.
4. A mechanism should be established in each community college service area to allow municipalities, public agencies, and other assemblage groups to make recommendations to the three appointing organizational groups when trustee terms expire and before new trustees are appointed. This mechanism should provide the appointing agency with more community input into the appointment process. Expired terms for trustees should be announced as open and the public should be invited to submit recommendations to the appropriate appointing agency.
5. In making appointments to the trustee board, the three appointing agencies should consider the local service area and try to insure adequate representation on the board for women and minorities, thus broadening the base of support from the community for the board.
6. In making appointments to the board, the three appointing agencies should seek to provide effective leadership by reviewing the background of the potential trustee and his possession of the characteristics predetermined as essential.
7. Each board should offer new members orientation sessions which should provide them with a better understanding of the history and philosophy of the two-year college system in North Carolina and the role of their institution in the overall educational needs of the service area.
8. Each board should work closely with the institution's president to develop guidelines and areas of responsibility which will help to

prevent either the trustees or the president from over-stepping appropriate boundary lines. Policy making is a proper role of the board, and policy administration is a proper role of the president.

9. More attention should be focused on the role of the local board of trustees in the operation of the two-year college system in North Carolina in hopes of better informing the public and gaining additional citizen involvement in its actions and activities.

10. A mandatory retirement age of 70 should be established for board of trustee members.

11. Schools in the system should be encouraged to establish advisory boards in order to utilize the expertise of former trustees who have retired.

12. Total board of trustee membership should be reduced to 10 members with the following appointment formula:

- (a) four appointments by the county commissioners
- (b) three appointments by the board of education
- (c) three appointments by the Governor

13. Each board should develop guidelines which establish minimum trustee attendance policies.

Suggestions for Further Study

Based on an analysis of the data the following recommendations for additional study are made:

(1) Analyze the actual appointment process by the three appointing agencies looking for potential or actual conflicts of interest issues among these appointing agencies.

(2) Demographic analysis of the composition of community college trustee boards focusing on membership for minorities and women in relation to service area population should be done.

(3) Analysis of the governance process and potential change by enlarging the political base and including other political leaders and the General Assembly should be done.

(4) As a follow-up to this study, an analysis of community college leaders as to why they do not want elected trustees should be done.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. Primary Sources

State Statutes

- Alabama. Code of Alabama. Volume B, 1975.
- Arizona. Revised Statutes Annotated. Volume 6A, 1975.
- Arkansas. Arkansas Statutes Annotated. Volume 7, 1980.
- California. West's Annotated California Code. Sections 7200-72342, 1978.
- Colorado. Colorado Revised Statutes. Volume 9, 1973.
- Connecticut. Connecticut General Statutes. Volume A, 1977.
- Delaware. Delaware Code Annotated. Volume 8, 1981.
- Hawaii. Hawaii Revised Statutes. Volume 4, 1976.
- Idaho. General Statutes, State of Idaho. Chapter I, 1977.
- Indiana. Burn's Indiana Statutes Annotated. Title 20, 1975.
- Illinois. Illinois Annotated Statutes. Chapter 122, 183.
- Kansas. State of Kansas General Statutes. Volume 5A, 1980.
- Kentucky. Kentucky Revised Statutes. Volume 7, 1980.
- Louisiana. West's Louisiana Statutes. Volume 13B, 1982.
- Maine. Maine Revised Statutes. Volume 11, 1983.
- Massachusetts. Annotated Laws of Massachusetts. Chapters 9-18A, 1980.
- Michigan. Michigan Statutes Annotated. Volume II, 1984.
- Minnesota. Minnesota Statutes Annotated. Volume 10B, 1979.
- Mississippi. General Statutes of Mississippi. Chapter 402, 1964.
- Nevada. Nevada Revised Statutes. Volume 16, 1979.
- New Hampshire. New Hampshire General Statutes. Chapter 379, 1983.

- New Jersey. General Statutes of New Jersey. Chapter 18A, 1981.
- North Carolina. North Carolina General Statutes Cumulative Supplement. 1981.
- North Dakota. North Dakota General Code. Volume 3B, 1981.
- Ohio. Ohio Code Supplement. Title 33, 1983.
- Oklahoma. Oklahoma Statutes Annotated. Title 70, 1972.
- Rhode Island. General Laws of Rhode Island. Volume 3A, 1981.
- South Dakota. South Dakota Codified Laws. Volume 5, 1982.
- Tennessee. General Statutes of Tennessee. Chapter 8, 1983.
- Washington. State of Washington Code. Section 28B-50.130, 1982.
- West Virginia. West Virginia Code Supplement. 1984.
- Wyoming. Wyoming Statutes. Chapter 21, 1977.

Interviews

- Chesson, Parker. College of the Albemarle, Elizabeth City, North Carolina. Interview, 15 February, 1985.
- Daniels, David. Wilkes Community College, North Wilkesboro North Carolina. Interview, 30 January, 1985.
- Forelines, John. Granite Falls, North Carolina. Interview, 4 February, 1985.
- Herring, Dallas. Rose Hill, North Carolina. Interview, 5 February, 1985.
- James, Gerald. Eden, North Carolina. Interview, 18 July, 1985.
- McDaniel, Jesse. Lenoir Community College, Kinston, North Carolina. Interview, 14 February, 1985.
- Scott, Robert. Kinston, North Carolina. Interview, 29 January, 1985.
- Stroud, Hugh. Kinston North Carolina. Interview, 27 February, 1985.
- Vanore, Andrew. North Carolina Attorney General's Office, Raleigh, North Carolina. Interview, 21 February, 1985.

Letters

- Beard, Sharon. Board of Regents, State of Louisiana. Letter, 13 December, 1984.
- Brough, Aphrodite. Higher Education Board, State of Missouri. Letter, 25 October, 1984.
- Clark, Wanda. Research & Planning Office, University System of Georgia. Letter, 1 November, 1984.
- Foster, Gordon. Board of Regents, State of South Dakota. Letter, 23 October, 1984.
- Galbraith, Don W. Chancellor's Office, Virginia Community College System. Letter, 24 May, 1983.
- Herot, Henry G. State Board For Technical & Comprehensive Education, State of South Carolina. Letter, 26 October, 1984.
- Iowa. Office of Associate State Superintendent of Area Schools and Career Education Branch of Public Instruction. Des Moines, Iowa. Letter, 18 November, 1984.
- Johnston, Thomas S. Nebraska Technical Community College Association. Letter, 15 October, 1984.
- Kelly, David T. Community College and Continuing Education Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System. Letter, 23 May, 1983.
- Kroll, John. State Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, State of Wisconsin. Letter, 5 November, 1984.
- Lannan, Bill. Montana University System. Letter, 25 October, 1984.
- McGrath, Wayne M. State Board of Community Colleges of Arizona. Letter, 9 November, 1984.
- Maestas, Sigfredo. Commission on Postsecondary Education, State of New Mexico. Letter, 23 October, 1984.
- Meandy, William N. Association of Community College Trustees. Letter, 20 November, 1984.
- Tsunoda, Joyce S. Community College Division, University of Hawaii. Letter, 28 December, 1984.
- Vermont. Office of Chancellor, Vermont State College. Waterbury, Vermont. Letter, 9 November, 1984.
- Wilkins, Bill. Mayland Technical College Board of Trustees. Letter, 31 January, 1984.

Documents

Florida State Board of Education. Administrative Roles for the Operation of Florida's Community and Junior Colleges. Tallahassee, Florida. State Board of Education, 1982.

Maryland State Board of Community Colleges. Code of Maryland Regulation. Annapolis, Maryland. Maryland State Board of Community Colleges, 1984.

Montana University System. Policy and Procedures Manual. Helena, Montana. Montana University System, 1983.

North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges. Community College Laws of North Carolina. Raleigh, N.C. State Board of Community Colleges, 1981.

North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges. Educational Leadership for the Future. Raleigh, N.C. Department of Community Colleges, 1984.

North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges. North Carolina Community Colleges Annual Report. Raleigh, N. C. Department of Community Colleges, 1984.

North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges. Summary of Institutional Budget Request: Fiscal Year 1984. Raleigh, N/C. Department of Community Colleges, 1984.

North Carolina State Board of Community Colleges. 1983-1984 Spring Quarter Enrollment Report. Raleigh, N.C., Department of Community Colleges, 1984.

North Carolina State Board of Education. Community College Special Bulletin. Raleigh, N.C., State Board of Education, 1960.

North Carolina State Board of Education. First Five Years, 1963-1968: A Progress Report. Raleigh, N.C. State Board of Education, 1969.

North Carolina State Board of Education. North Carolina Community College Report, 1963-1970. Raleigh, N.C. State Board of Education, 1970.

North Carolina State Board of Education. Progress Report, North Carolina Community College System 1958-1971. Raleigh, N.C. Department of Community Colleges, 1971.

North Carolina Trustees Association of Community College Institutions, Inc. Directory of Members, 1982-1983. Raleigh, N.C. 1983.

Pennsylvania General Assembly. Act 484, The Community College Act of 1963. House Bill 1066, Session 1963.

- University of Alaska Board of Regents. Regents Policy. Anchorage, Alaska, Board of Regents, 1983.
- Utah State Board of Regents. Utah Higher Education Act of 1969. Salt Lake City, Utah: 1980.
- Virginia Community College System Board. Virginia Community College System Manual. Richmond, Virginia, Community College System Board, 1980.
- Washington Board for Community College Education. The Washington Community College System. Olympia, Washington. Washington Board for Community Colleges, 1983.

B. Secondary Sources

Books

- Bent, Dale H; Nie, N. H; Hill, C. H.; Jenkins, J. H; and Steinbrenner, K. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.
- Berder, Louis W., and Richards, Richard C.; Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.
- Blackman, John H. Trustees Responsibilities for Community Colleges & Technical Institutions. Raleigh: North Carolina State Board of Education, 1970.
- Bowen, Howard R. The State of the Nation & the Agenda for Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1982.
- Cohen, Arthur M. and Drawer, Florence B. The American Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- Cohen, Jacob; Ewen, Robert B.; and Welkowitz, Joan. Introductory Statistics for the Behavior Sciences. New York: Academic Press, 1982.
- Corson, John J. The Governance of Colleges & Universities. New York: McGraw Hill, 1975.
- Costner, Herbut L.; Mueller, John H.; and Schuessler, Karl F. Statistical Reasoning in Sociology. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1977.
- Drake, Sandra L. A Study of Community & Junior College Boards of Trustees. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community & Junior Colleges, 1977.

- Evans, N. Dean and Neagley, Ross L. Planning & Developing Innovation in the Community College. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Fisher, Ben C. A Manual for College Trustees. Raleigh: Edwards & Broughton Company, 1965.
- Freeman, Jack E. "Comprehensive Planning in Higher Education," In New Directions for Higher Education, pp. 40-50. Edited by Joan D. Millet. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.
- Gleazer, Edmund J., Jr. This is the Community College. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.
- Grafe, Gale. The Trustee Profile of 1976. Washington, D.C.: Association of Community College Trustees, 1977.
- Harnet, Rodney T. "Trustee Power in America," in Power & Authority, Edited by Harold L. Hodginson & Richard Meeth. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- Heilbron, Louis H. The College & University Trustee. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.
- Herron, Orly, Jr. The Role of the Trustee. Scranton, Pennsylvania: International Textbook, 1969.
- King, Robert L. and King, Maxwell C. President-Trustee Relationships: Meeting the Challenge of Leadership. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community & Junior College, 1977.
- Ladwig, Dennis. "Comparison of Governance Effectiveness of Appointed & Elected Boards of Education/Trustees." Ed.D. Dissertation, Nova University, 1981.
- Mills, Peter K. Trustees & The Process of Institutional Change. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University, 1972.
- Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Nason, John W. The Future of Trusteeship. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards, 1974.
- Nason, John W. "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," in Handbook of College & University Trusteeship, pp. 27-45. Edited by Richard T. Ingram, San Francisco:
- Pray, Thomas C. A New Look at Community Colleges Boards of Trustees, Presidents and Their Relationship. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community Junior Colleges, 1975.

- Rauh, Morton A. The Trusteeship of Colleges & Universities. New York: McGraw Hill, 1969.
- Segner, Kenyon B. A History of the North Carolina Community College Movement, 1927-1963. Kenartsville, N.C.: James Sprunt Press, 1966.
- Tedler, Mitchell and Wilson, Richard E. Community College Trustees: Responsibilities and Opportunities. Washington, D.C.: American
- Thornton, James W. Jr. The Community Junior College. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1972.
- Williams, Donald T. Jr. President/Professors & Trustees. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Wise, W. Max. "Configuration in Governing," in The Troubled Campus, pp. 120-140. Edited by G. Kery Smith. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1970.

Zeisel, Hans. Say it With Figures. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Zoglin, Mary Lou. Power & Politics in the Community College. Palm Springs, California: FTC Publishing Company, 1976.

Journals

- Corson, John J. "Boards vs. Superboards." Association of Governing Boards Reports, March/April 1979, pp. 20-23.
- Devore, P. Cameron. "The Role & Responsibility of the Community College Board of Trustee." Occasional Report 16(1970): 5-11.
- Goddard, Jeanne and Polk, Charles H. "Community College Trustees: Elected or Appointed?" Association of Governing Boards Reports 18 (May/June 1976): 37-40.
- Goddard, Jeanne; Lacombe, Vaughn A.; and Polk Charles H. "Trustee Selection: Who Gets What, Who Pays What?" New Directions for Community Colleges 4 (August 1976): 22-27.
- Hampton, William. "Community College Trustees Represent the Total Community." College & University Business 54 (February 1973): 44-46.
- Henderson, Algo D. "The Role of the Governing Board." Association of Governing Boards Reports 10 (October, 1967).
- Moody, George V. "State-Local Partnership in Junior College Governance." New Directions for Community Colleges Volume 6 (Fall 1978): 67-74.

News & Observer. Raleigh, N.C. 6 January, 22 February, 1985

Potter, George E. "Trustee Responsibilities." New Directions for Community Colleges Volume II (Autumn 1976).

Shoemaker, Elwood A. "Local Control of Community Colleges: Still Operating in Pennsylvania." New Directions for Community Colleges Volume (Fall 1978) 63-68.

"Trusteeship: More Than a Seat on the 50 Yard Line." Chronicle of Higher Education, 10 December, 1979, p. 56.

APPENDIX

Christy, Virginia. "Florida School Laws." Florida Statutes, Chapter 240, State Report. Tallahassee, Florida, 1983.

240.313 Community College districts; establishment and organization of boards of trustees.

- (1) Each community college district authorized by law and the Department of Education is an independent, separate, legal entity created for the operation of a community college.
- (2) Community college district boards of trustees shall be comprised of five members, when a community college district is confined to one school board district, and not more than nine members, when the district contains two or more school board districts, as provided by regulations of the state board.
- (3) Trustees shall be appointed by the Governor, approved by four members of the State Board of Education, and confirmed by the Senate in regular session; however, no appointee shall take office until after his appointment has been approved by four members of the State Board of Education; further, the State Board of Education shall develop rules and procedures for review and approval of the appointees. Prior to the time the Governor appoints any member of any community college district board of trustees, the school board or boards in the community college district may submit to the Governor for his consideration the names of two or more persons for each office.
- (4) Members of the board of trustees shall receive no salary but may receive reimbursement for expenses as provided in s.112.061, including mileage to and from official board meetings.
- (5) At its first regular meeting after July 1 of each year, each board of trustees shall organize by electing a chairman, whose duty as such is to preside at all meetings of the board, to call special meetings thereof, and to attest to actions of the board, and a vice chairman, whose duty as such is to act as chairman during the absence or disability of the elected chairman. It is the further duty of the chairman of each board of trustees to notify the Governor, in writing, whenever a board member fails to attend three consecutive regular board meetings in any one fiscal year, which absences may be grounds for removal.

- (6) A community college president shall be the executive officer and corporate secretary of the board of trustees as well as the chief administrative officer of the community college, and all the components of the institution and all aspects of its operation are responsible to the board of trustees through the president.
- (7) The board of trustees shall have the power to take action without a recommendation from the president and shall have the power to require the president to deliver to the board all data and information required by the board in the performance of its duties.

Delaware Code Annotated. Volume 8, 1981. The Michie Company Charlottesville, VA, 1974. 9102. Boards of Trustees--Creation

There shall be a Board of Trustees of the Delaware Technical and Community College which shall be a state agency. (14 Del.C. 1953,1953, 9102; 55 Del. Laws, c. 374, 1; 58 Del. Laws, c. 19, 1.)

9103. Same--Composition; qualifications; chairman; appointment; term; compensation; vacancy; quorum.

- (a) The Board shall consist of 7 trustees.
- (b) The trustees shall be appointed by the Governor by and with the consent of a majority of the members elected to the State.
- (c) Six trustees shall be appointed for terms of 3 years each, from the date of appointment.
- (d) No more than 4 trustees shall be members of the same political party.
- (e) Each trustee shall be a citizen of the United States, a qualified voter of this State and a resident of this State for at least 3 years preceding his appointment.
- (f) A trustee shall continue to reside in the political subdivision of which he was a resident at the time of his appointment.
- (g) In case of a vacancy on the Board for any reason other than expiration of the term of office, the Governor shall fill such vacancy for the unexpired term by and with the consent of a majority of the members elected to the Senate.
- (h) No member of the Board shall receive any compensation for his duties except that he may receive his actual travel expenses.

- (i) Four members of the Board shall constitute a quorum. A majority of the members present at any meeting and constituting a quorum shall be sufficient for any action by the Board. (14 Del. C. 1953, 9103; 55 Del. Laws, c. 374, 1.)

9104. Purpose and Object

The purpose of the College shall be to operate or make available public institutions of learning for persons who have graduated from high school or who are unable to attend public high schools. (14 Del. C. 1953, 9104; 55 Del. Laws, c. 374, 1; 56 Del. Laws, c. 35; 58 Del. Laws, c. 19, 2.)

9105. Powers and duties of Board.

- (a) The Board may establish such institutions of learning throughout the State as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this chapter.
- (b) The Board may contract with the University of Delaware, or with any other institution or organization, so that the University or other institution or organization shall establish or offer a 2 year college parallel program, and the Board shall provide necessary funds to meet the entire cost of the establishment or operation of such program, and shall furnish facilities, equipment and supplies therefor. If the Board shall enter into such a contract with the University of Delaware, the Board of Trustees of the University of Delaware shall have, with respect to such 2 year college parallel program, the same powers which it has with respect to the affairs of the University of Delaware by virtue of its charter or the statutes of this State.
- (c) The Board shall have custody of and be responsible for the property of the institutions and shall be responsible for the management and control of said institutions.
- (d) For the effectuation of the purposes of this chapter the Board, in addition to such other powers expressly granted to it by this chapter, shall have the following powers:
 - (1) To select such officers, except the chairman, as it may deem desirable, from among its own membership;
 - (2) To adopt or change the name of the institutions established by it;
 - (3) To adopt and use a seal;
 - (4) To sue and be sued;
 - (5) To determine the educational program of the institutions;

- (6) To appoint members of the administrative and teaching staffs of the institutions and to fix their compensation and terms of employment;

Code of Alabama. Vol. 13. The Michie Company, Bobbs-Merrill Law Publishing, Charlottesville, VA, 1975.

16-3-1 Composition: election; term of office.

The state board of education shall be composed of the governor as an ex officio member and eight members elected as hereinafter provided. One of such members shall be elected by the qualified electors of each congressional district at the general election held in 1970. Of the eight members elected by congressional district in 1970, those members elected from the first, third, fifth and seventh congressional districts shall serve for two years; those elected from the second, fourth, sixth and eighth districts shall serve for four years. Thereafter, the members of the board shall serve for terms of four years each, and the member from each congressional district shall be elected by the qualified electors of the district at the general election immediately preceding the expiration of the term of office of the member representing such district on the board and every four years thereafter. Each member shall hold office from the first Monday after the second Tuesday in January next after his election and until his successor is elected and qualified. (School Code 1927, 26; Code 1940, 52, 6; Acts 1969, Ex. Sess., No. 16, p. 39. 1.)

16-3-2 Officers.

The governor shall be the president of the board of education, and the board shall elect a vice-president from its members annually. The state superintendent of education shall be secretary and executive officer of the board. (School Code 1927, 27; Code 1940, T. 52, 7; Acts 1969, Ex. Sess., No. 16, p. 39. 2.)

16-3-3 Qualifications of members.

The members of the board shall be qualified electors of the state of Alabama, and each member shall be a qualified elector in the district which he represents. No person who is an employee of the board or who is or has been engaged as a professional educator within five years next preceding the date of the election shall be eligible for membership on the board. For the purposes of this section the term "professional educator: shall include teacher, supervisor or principal of any public or private school; instructor, professor or president of any public or private university, college or junior college or trade school; any state, county or city superintendent of education; or other person engaged in an administrative capacity in the field of education. (School Code 1927, 29; Code 1940, T. 52, 8; Acts 1969, Ex. Sess., No, 16, p. 39. 3.)

16-3-4. Removal of members.

The governor may remove any appointive member of the board for immorality, misconduct in office, incompetency or willful neglect of duty giving to him a copy of the charges against him and, upon not less than 10 days' notice, an opportunity of being heard publicly in person or by counsel in his own defense. If any member shall be removed, the governor shall file in the office of the secretary of state a complete statement of all charges against such member of his findings thereon, together with a complete record of the proceedings. (School Code 1927, 30; Code 1940, T. 52. 9.)

Minnesota Statutes Annotated. Vol. 10B, West St. Paul, 1979.

136.61 State board for community colleges; selection and administration

Subdivision 1. The State board for community colleges shall consist of seven members appointed by the governor with the advice and consent of the senate. They shall be selected for their knowledge of, and interest in community colleges of Minnesota. One member shall be a full-time student at a community college at the time of appointment or shall have been a full-time student at a community college within one year before appointment to the state board for community colleges.

Subd. 1a. The membership terms, compensation, removal of members, and filling of vacancies on the board shall be as provided in section 15.0575 except that the term of the student member shall be two years.

Subd. 2. Repealed by Laws 1976, c. 134, 79, eff. July 1, 1976.

Subd. 3. The state board for community colleges shall elect a president, a secretary and such other officers as it may desire. It shall fix its meeting dates and places. The commissioner of administration shall provide it with appropriate offices.

Subd. 4. Repealed by Laws 1976, c. 134, 79, eff. July 1, 1976.

136.62 Powers of board

Subdivision 1. The state board for community colleges shall possess all powers necessary and incident to the management, jurisdiction, and control of the community colleges and all property pertaining thereto. Such powers shall include, but are not limited to, the enumeration contained in this section.

Subd. 2. The board may determine the exact location and site for each community college.

Subd. 3. Repealed by Laws 1977, c. 293, 9.

Subd. 4. Subject to the other provisions of sections 136.62 and 136.63, the board shall appoint the heads of each community college, the necessary teachers and supervisors, and all other necessary employees. All such appointed persons shall be subject to the provisions of Chapter 43 in the same manner as such state civil service act is applicable to similar persons in the employee of the state university board.

Subd. 5. Candidates for twelve-month administrative positions and for academic positions who have been invited by the state community college board for interview may be reimbursed for travel and subsistence expenses in the same manner and in the same amounts as state employees.

Colorado Revised Statutes. Vol. 9, Bradford-Robinson, 1973.

23-60-206. College council. (1) The governor shall appoint a five-man college council for each community and technical college under its governance, composed of residents from the area in which the community and technical college is located and serves, which council shall meet at least quarterly with the chief administrative officer of the college. Not more than three members of any such council shall be from the same political party. The junior college committee of any local junior college shall be designated as the first college council when such local junior college joins the state system, and members thereof shall serve for the duration of their terms. Upon expiration of such terms, new appointees shall be so designated that the college council will at all subsequent times include at least two members familiar with occupational education needs. Of members first appointed, three members shall be appointed for four years and two members for two years. Thereafter, terms of members appointed to the council shall be for four years. Members of the college council shall receive twenty dollars per day for meetings attended and shall be reimbursed for actual and necessary expenses incurred in the conduct of official business.

(2) Each college council has the following duties with respect to the community and technical college for which it was appointed:

- (a) To review the qualifications of individuals seeking an appointment as chief administrative officer of the college and to employ, subject to the prior approval of the board, the chief administrative officer;
- (b) To recommend the annual budget to the board, through the chief administrative officer;
- (c) To recommend, to the chief administrative officer and through him to the board, proposals regarding occupational and other curriculums, student services, and public service activities and to adopt any such proposals approved by the board;

- (d) To confirm appointments to the professional staff as recommended by the chief administrative officer;
- (e) To review campus development plans and program plans for individual buildings for recommendation to the board through the chief administrative officer;
- (f) To advise in such other areas of management as are deemed advisable to the board and, generally, to be a liaison between the college and the region it serves.

West's Annotated California Codes. California Code Commission, St. Paul, Minnesota, West Publishing Company, 1978.

72021. Election of governing board by wards

In every community college district which was divided into five wards on or before September 7, 1955, one member of the board shall be elected from each ward by the registered voters of the ward. On or before January 1st of a fiscal year the governing board of the district may rearrange the boundaries of the wards to provide for representation in accordance with population and geographic factors or may abolish the wards.

72022. Trustee areas

The county committee on school district organization, upon petition of the governing board of any community college district, may provide for the establishment, rearrangement, or abolishment of trustee areas in any community college district or increase or decrease the number of members of the governing board, in the same manner as trustee areas may be provided for in other districts under Sections 5020 to 5024, inclusive.

When trustee areas are established or rearranged under this section, governing board members shall be elected for four-year terms, and shall be either five or seven in number. The number of trustee areas shall not be less than two nor more than seven. The terms of trustees shall, except as otherwise provided, be staggered so that as nearly as practicable one-half of the trustees shall be elected in each odd-numbered year.

Subject to provisions of this section, any resident and registered elector of the school district not disqualified by the Constitution or laws of the state is eligible to candidacy for, and appointment and election to, the governing board of a community college district in which trustee areas have been provided under this section.

When trustee areas are established or rearranged under this section, the petition to the county committee by the governing board shall provide for election of trustees by one of the following methods:

- (a) Election of an elector residing in and registered to vote in the trustee area he seeks to represent, by only the registered electors of the same trustee area;
- (b) Election, of an elector residing in and registered to vote in the trustee area he seeks to represent, by the registered electors of the entire community college district.

(SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE)

This survey is designed to obtain your opinion on the appointment process for the board of trustees at community colleges/technical institutes/technical colleges in North Carolina. Information gained from this survey will be used to compile a report on the position of presidents and board chairmen on the issues surrounding board appointment power.

- (1) There is some debate today about the current alignment of appointment powers to local boards of trustees for community colleges/technical institutes/technical colleges. Currently, the local board is composed of 12 members with four appointments each from the Governor, county commissioners and board(s) of education. Please rate the effectiveness of this current appointment method in obtaining board members. Indicate your response by circling a number.

(Not effective) 1 2 3 4 5 (Effective)

- (2) Explain briefly the basis for your answer to question 1. Use the space below for your answer and the back of this page if you need additional space.

- (3) Consider separately the three appointing agencies for board membership. Please rate the effectiveness of each in appointing qualified members to the local board. Indicate your answer by circling a number for each group.

	(Not Effective)					(Effective)
Governor	1	2	3	4	5	
County Commissioners	1	2	3	4	5	
Board(s) of Education	1	2	3	4	5	

- (4) From your experience in working with a local board, which agency do you believe is most likely to include political considerations in the appointment process? Rank the three agencies listed below in order of their political consideration in making board appointments. Use the following scale: 1: the most political, 2: somewhat political and 3: the least political.

Governor _____

County Commissioners _____

Board(s) of Education _____

- (5) Listed below are several different models for board appointment authority. Please rate each model on a scale of 1, 2, 3, and 4 with 1 being the most preferred, 2 moderately preferred, 3 somewhat preferred and 4 least preferred.

(a) 12 members _____
 4 Governor
 4 County Commissioners
 4 Board(s) of Education

(b) 12 members _____
 4 Governor
 4 County Commissioners
 4 General Assembly

(c) 10 members _____
 5 Governor
 5 County Commissioners

(d) 10 members _____
 5 County Commissioners
 5 General Assembly

(6) If your most preferred model for board appointment authority is not given in number 5, please list the model you would like to see used in North Carolina.

(7) Board members are elected in some states. Would you favor the election of trustees in this state?

Yes No
 Please Circle

(8) Currently, board members serve 8-year terms and can be reappointed for an unlimited number of terms.

(a) Would you favor limiting the length of service for a trustee?

Yes No
 Please Circle

(b) If your answer to (a) was yes, please circle the appropriate number below for both the number of years of each term that you would recommend.

Terms	Years
1	2
2	4
3	6
4	8

(9) From the items listed below, select four you feel are the most important for a community college/technical college/technical institute trustee to possess. Please check four items.

- | | |
|--|---|
| Stature in the community | Middle-of-the road viewpoint |
| Sufficient time for trustee duties | Leadership qualities |
| Potential for financial contribution | Strong political connections |
| Understanding of role and mission of college | Strong supporter of the college in the past |

(10) Name additional characteristics you feel are important for a trustee to possess.

Any comments that you would like to make concerning this issue will be appreciated either in this space or in a separate letter.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION! PLEASE MAIL THIS COMPLETED SURVEY TO ME IN THE ENCLOSED STAMPED, SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE.