

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

UMI[®]



**An analysis of perceptions toward governance and working relationships among Iowa School
Board members, single-district superintendents, and shared-district superintendents**

by

Steven Lynn Oberg

**A dissertation submitted to the graduate faculty
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

Major: Education (Educational Administration)

**Program of Study Committee:
William K. Poston, Jr., Major Professor
Donald Hackmann
Robert Martin
Mack Shelley
David Williams**

Iowa State University

Ames, IA

2002

Copyright @ Steven Lynn Oberg, 2002. All rights reserved.

UMI Number: 3051490

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3051490

**Copyright 2002 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.**

**ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346**

Graduate College
Iowa State University

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation of
Steven Lynn Oberg
has met the dissertation requirements of Iowa State University

Signature was redacted for privacy.

Major Professor

Signature was redacted for privacy.

For the Major Program

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT	vi
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Purpose of the Study	4
Research Questions	5
Hypotheses of the Study	6
Assumptions of the Study	7
Delimitations of the Study	8
Definition of Terms	8
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
Introduction	10
Historical Development of the School Board	12
Historical Development of the Superintendency	14
Governance Tasks Performed by the School Board	16
Governance Tasks Performed by the Superintendent	22
Relationship between the Board and Superintendent	24
The Shared Superintendent	35
Summary	37
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY	40
Introduction	40
Population of the Study	40
Development of Instrument	41
Data Instrument and Procedures	43
Validation of the Instrument	45
Data Collection and Analysis	46
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS OF THE DATA ANALYSIS	48
Introduction	48
Sample Participants – Superintendents	49
Sample Participants – School Board Members	52
Hypotheses of Study	54
Summary	66

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	68
Overview of Study	68
Summary and Conclusions of the Findings	72
Limitations of Study	84
Implications for Future Research	84
Appendix A: Iowa State University Professors in validity test of instrument	87
Appendix B: Validity Letter	89
Appendix C: Validity Research Study	91
Appendix D: Single District Superintendent Pilot Letter	97
Appendix E: Shared District Superintendent Pilot Letter	99
Appendix F: Single District Superintendent Research Study Letter	101
Appendix G: Shared District Superintendent Research Study Letter	103
Appendix H: Superintendent Reminder Letter	105
Appendix I: Superintendent Research Study Form	107
Appendix J. School Board Member Research Study Form	112
Appendix K. Human Subjects Form	117
REFERENCES CITED	120
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	126

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	Variables of the Study.....	45
Table 2.	Superintendents' Survey Return Rate.....	50
Table 3.	Superintendents' Formal Education.....	51
Table 4.	Superintendents' Gender.....	51
Table 5.	Board Members' Survey Return Rate.....	52
Table 6.	Board Members' Formal Education	54
Table 7.	Board Members' Gender.....	54
Table 8.	Board Members' Mean Scores for Governance Tasks and Significance Levels	56
Table 9.	Board Members' Mean Scores for Working Relationship and Significance Levels.	57
Table 10.	Superintendents' Mean Scores for Governance Tasks and Significance Levels	60
Table 11.	Superintendents' Mean Scores for Working Relationship and Significance Levels.	62
Table 12.	Board Members' Mean Scores for Current Superintendent Grade and Significance Levels	64
Table 13.	Superintendents' Mean Scores for Current Superintendent Grade and Significance Levels	66

ABSTRACT

Conflict between superintendents and school boards existed in the early 1800s and continues to exist today. This adversarial conflict in the working relationship results when one of the parties exceeds the other's subjective boundary as it pertains to involvement in the governance process and working relationship. The study examined six hypotheses regarding the perceived degree of involvement of Iowa single superintendents, shared superintendents, and those superintendents' school board members.

The study was designed to determine whether or not school board members perceived their superintendent differently if the superintendent was a shared superintendent rather than a single superintendent. The study also revealed if the shared superintendent perceived their role differently than that of a single superintendent.

School board members and superintendents were selected from the K-12 public school districts in the State of Iowa. District superintendents and their school board members participated in the quantitative study. The sample totaled 68 superintendents and 362 board members. There was a 69% return rate for superintendents and 42% for school board members.

Data were collected by means of a survey instrument. The descriptive statistics procedures used in this study included frequency distributions, percentages, and measures of central tendency. The inferential statistics procedures used in this study included equality of variances test, t-test for significant difference, and percentages.

Of the six hypotheses, only one was upheld. This study backs up the related literature in revealing that the working relationship that a school board and its superintendent create

and foster is equally as important as the day-to-day governance tasks that are outlined in college textbooks.

This study affects how districts can and should make the decision about sharing superintendents. It is essential that school boards weigh all of the factors-both financial and political-in how sharing a superintendent can affect the district.

Regardless of whether a superintendent is shared with two or more districts or serves in a single district, it is important that those who prepare future superintendents look at the programs to determine if enough time is spent on helping administrators to develop the relationship-building skills as outlined in this study. The key stakeholders in education need to redefine the training that all superintendents and their board members need in order to be the visionaries that school systems have come to expect.

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

“Everyone seems to be looking for the Lone Ranger of Education – you know the miracle worker who will fix all of the educational deficiencies in the United States with one silver bullet”. (Kimmelman, 1998, p. 52).

The challenges facing today's public education systems are great. These issues include declining budgets, increased accountability, low morale, parent and student rights, collective bargaining, political issues, and teacher shortages. These challenges have a direct effect on the perceived performance of the superintendent by the school board.

The concept of the local school board originated in the New England schools in the early 1800s and this model rapidly spread throughout the nation. Around this same era, the first superintendents were hired, thus forever forging the link between the boards of education and the superintendent (Kirst, 1991).

The challenge was created not only to link the superintendent and school boards within a district but also to foster and develop a working relationship between the two entities. The unfortunate outcome of these relationships was the often-noted friction between the boards and superintendents. Many school boards have become bogged down in micromanagement of the district and have lost confidence in the role of the superintendent (Todras, 1993). Friction between the superintendent and the school board underlies much of the disharmony that often characterizes the relationship between these two parties. Friction reduction or elimination may help boards and superintendents focus on district issues and problems, rather than on each other's behavior (Katz, 1993). Most school boards want the months of warm relationships that occur among the superintendent and the board members to

continue indefinitely. However, these relationships can break down due to several factors (Rogers, 1992).

This study is designed to determine the various perspectives as well as differences between, and working relationships of shared superintendents versus single district superintendents and school boards in matters of educational governance. It also assesses the levels of involvement of the board with whom the shared superintendent and single district superintendent are working. This study will reveal areas of strengths and weaknesses that enable the development of appropriate strategies to help school boards and shared superintendents improve their working relationships. The research also will reveal information that school boards should consider when making the important decision to share a superintendent or not share.

Statement of the Problem

Iowa schools are facing and will continue to face a major problem with leadership over the next several years. The School Administrators of Iowa indicate that 50% of superintendents will retire in the next six years, with over half of the practicing superintendents currently between the age of 46 and 55 years of age (Lutz & Dietzenbach, 1998). Steps must be taken to assure that quality leaders will be available for the schools in Iowa. Research must be conducted to provide future leaders with the tools to develop a positive relationship with school boards. As the need for school superintendents increases many schools will be faced with the possibility of sharing a superintendent with another district. As indicated by Jess (1991) one of the reasons school share superintendents is the financial savings. A second reason to share superintendents would be help facilitate

reorganization (Bratlie, 1992). Another possible aspect for a shared superintendent is the shortage of superintendents to fill the position (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2002).

The complex challenge of understanding the degree of involvement in the educational process by the school board and shared and single district superintendents needs to be addressed. Sharing a superintendent is a complex process of understanding and cooperation. A concrete step toward meeting this challenge will be to conduct a quantitative research study that will expand upon the existing literature in the area of educational leadership.

Superintendents often report that job stress is a primary reason of low job effectiveness and satisfaction (Lutz & Dietzenbach, 1998). In light of the current literature on the relationship building process between the school board and single and shared superintendents, this study will examine that perception. The primary research questions posed will be: What are the factors that lead to a strained relationship between the shared superintendents and their local school boards compared to the strains that develop between a single district superintendent and school board? How can those relationships be fostered to develop a more positive working environment?

The research gathered from school board members and superintendents concerning their working relationship will be used to prompt modification of the superintendent's behavior or the school board's behavior and lead to attempts to understand and coordinate working styles as a means of promoting board/superintendent harmony. Universities, colleges, and the Iowa School Board Association can utilize the results to develop appropriate workshops and curriculum better prepare school board members and superintendents better for the possibility of sharing superintendents. By fostering board/superintendent harmony, the development of trust, understanding, expectations, shared

vision, long-term communication, effective decision-making, and positive community links could become an everyday occurrence in school districts in either a shared or single situation.

Purpose of the Study

With the decreasing pool from which school boards have to select superintendents, the need to develop a quality working relationship between the board and superintendent is critical. As districts are faced with declining enrollments and declining budgets, the need to save resources becomes great. The possibilities of sharing a superintendent with another school district could become a reality for more districts. The development of trust, understanding, expectations, shared vision, long-term communication, effective decision-making, and positive community links is an ongoing process that is necessary for any superintendent to survive in education today.

This study seeks to assess the various perspectives, differences, and working relationships of shared and single district superintendents and school boards in matters of educational governance. This study will examine the relationship between the congruence of the school board and shared and single district superintendent perceptions of their working relationship and their perceptions of their roles, how they exchange information, and the collaborative planning between the two entities.

The purpose of this study was fourfold: (1) to examine what school board members perceive as their degree of involvement in the educational governance process pertaining to the performance of particular educational governance tasks, (2) to examine what shared and single district superintendents perceive as their degree of involvement in the educational governance process as it pertains to the performance of particular educational governance tasks, (3) to examine what school board members and shared and single district

superintendents perceive as each other's working relationship as it pertains to the performance in the school setting, and (4) to examine what school board members and shared and single district superintendents perceive as their own and each other's performance ratings as they pertain to establishing and maintaining an effective working relationship.

The results of the study should prove useful in five major ways: (1) to provide empirical data for the development of training and in-service programs for school boards and superintendents in the area of educational governance and development of a positive working relationship, (2) to assist school boards in the decision-making process of sharing a superintendent with another district, whereby a closer examination may be made by the respective parties as to their possible effective working relationship, (3) to serve as a facilitation tool for enhanced communication between participating school boards and superintendents as to their degree of involvement in the educational governance process, (4) to help school boards and superintendents develop a more comprehensive and deeper understanding of their own and each other's degree of involvement in the educational governance process, and (5) to help generate benchmarks for school boards and superintendents in educational governance tasks and relationships.

Research Questions

This study will examine the following questions regarding the perceived relationship between the school board and the superintendent by answering the following research questions.

1. How do Iowa school board members perceive their degree of involvement in performing educational governance tasks?

2. How do Iowa school board members perceive their performance in the school board-superintendent working relationship?
3. How do Iowa shared and single district superintendents perceive their degree of involvement in performing particular educational governance tasks?
4. How do Iowa shared and single district superintendents perceive their performance in the school board-superintendent working relationship?
5. What are the perceived performance levels of Iowa school board members and shared and single district superintendents in maintaining an effective working relationship?
6. How do shared and single district superintendents and school boards differ in perceptions of involvement and performance?

Hypotheses of the Study

This study will examine the following hypotheses regarding the perceived degree of involvement of school board members and superintendents in performing educational governance tasks and their perceived performance in establishing and maintaining an effective working relationship:

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the performance of educational governance tasks held by school board members who have a shared superintendent or a single district superintendent.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the performance of educational governance tasks held by a shared superintendent versus a single district superintendent.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the performance ratings given by the school board members of the ability of a shared superintendent to

communicate with the school board to establish an effective working relationship versus a single district superintendent.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in performance ratings by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the ability of the school board to communicate with the superintendent in to establish an effective working relationship.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the performance ratings by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the current “grade” of the school board and the superintendent relationship as scored by the school board.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference in the performance ratings by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the current “grade” of the school board and the superintendent relationship as scored by the superintendent.

Assumptions of the Study

The study was based on the assumption that subjects will respond honestly to the research study questionnaire and that perceptions of the superintendents and school board members adequately represent the relationship between the two parties. The study presumes that the respondents will have understood correctly the directions and contents of the instrument. It is understood that the study will include only practicing superintendents in the state of Iowa and current Iowa school board members. It is understood that the subjects participated voluntarily and answered the research study responses truthfully and accurately.

Delimitations of the Study

The following are the limitations of the study:

1. The data represent the current situation at the time of the research study and may be influenced by factors beyond the control of the present investigator such as special conditions in specific school settings at the time of the research study.
2. The study was confined to a selection of all practicing public shared superintendents (20) and their school board members in the state of Iowa during the 2000-01 school year.
3. The study includes 38 individual public school superintendents and their school boards.
4. The study applied quantitative procedures through the utilization of a closed-ended, multiple-choice response. The instrument will limit the quantitative data collected and exclude other potential quantitative data collection procedures.
5. The data were collected at a specific time of the school year and may not reflect the overall perceptions of the relationship.

Definition of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following definitions are used:

Educational governance - The process of governing the local educational system by the school board through policy, oversight, and employment of a chief executive (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000).

Perception - The meaning, recognition, and interpretation that one gives to environmental stimulation. Perception is a process whereby the mind interprets and recognizes what the body has sensed.

Performance rating - A grade or rating superintendents or school board members will assign themselves and each other in their working relationship.

School - An organization that serves to educate students; it can span K-12 or PK-12.

School Board - An elected body of persons who set policy and govern the operation of the local public education system as defined by state law (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000).

School Board Member - An elected individual representative, currently serving on a public Iowa school board (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000, p. 9).

Superintendent - A paid executive who serves as the chief administrative officer of the school district and directs and oversees the entire operations of a school system. The Superintendent reports to the local school board (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000, p. 49).

Shared district superintendent – A superintendent who serves two or more public school boards and school districts.

Single district superintendent – A superintendent who serves only one public school board and school district.

Strained Relations - A non-productive relationship that is fosters mistrust, provides little input for decision making, not fair, poor management principles, and provides little support for a quality education system.

Vision - the power of perceiving something not actually present to the eye (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000, p. 24).

Working Relations –A productive relationship that is firm, objective, fair, can be trusted, provides sound management principles, provides input in decision making and provide for a quality education system (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000, p. 56).

CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This literature review will focus on six main areas of information. The review will begin with a look at the historical development of the school board and superintendent positions. The review will explore the governance tasks performed by the school board and the superintendent and review the relationship that exists or does not exist between the school board and the superintendent. The last section that relates the most to this research study is the literature dealing with the role of the shared superintendent in today's schools.

A review of the literature reveals that there are several areas that the school board and superintendent need to develop more fully to create and foster a positive relationship. The literature indicates the importance of a positive and trusting relationship between the board and superintendent. The development of the school board, relationships between the superintendent/school board, and superintendent governance issues were well documented in the literature. Literature was lacking in the history of the superintendency and very scarce in the area of shared superintendents.

From the beginning of education in the United States, the people of a local community traditionally have directed the governance of the public school. The conflict between the superintendent and board of education developed with the first superintendent position in the 1800s. Hale (1988) suggested that there is a relationship between the congruence of the school board and superintendent perceptions of their working relationship. Hale's research indicates that school board members were more comfortable talking to the superintendent, when there was a great deal of understanding between the board and superintendent. Hale also found that the positive working relationship between the

superintendent and the school board was not related to the length of time the superintendent or the board was in office.

In today's ever-changing education plane, applicants for principal and superintendent positions are becoming more difficult to find. More people earn an administrative degree but choose not to pursue a career in educational administration. The trend also is changing to include more women receiving their administrative degree, yet the number of female administrators has not increased. (McAdams, 1998).

There are several reasons cited for the increased number of personnel with administrative degrees and the great number of unfilled positions, these including loss of job security, volatility of an administrative position, and the lack of mobility for a family with dual incomes. The changing nature of school administration in terms of professional status, complexity of tasks, time demands, and accountability plays an overwhelming role in the decision of many teachers who are contemplating leaving the teaching ranks to move to an administrative position (School Administrators of Iowa, September-December, 2001).

The job of an administrator is interesting and challenging, yet fewer people are willing to take on this role (McAdams, 1998). A study conducted by Dr. Troyce Fisher, Executive Director, School Administrators of Iowa (September-December, 2001) indicates that the responsibilities of school administrators will have to be restructured if adequate time is to be given to their role as instructional leaders. Expectations from staff, students, parents, supervisors, board members, and patrons will need to be redefined. Fisher explains that school administrators must be willing to re-examine their priorities and be able to delegate duties and embrace professional development opportunities that emphasize instructional

leadership as the system moves into expectations for more accountability for student achievement. The role of strong leadership in schools is critical.

Lutz and Dietzenbach (1988) project 50.9% of superintendents to retire. Iowa school districts are facing an urgent and very real shortage of qualified school administrators to lead the educational system in the 21st century. In the next three years, an estimated 100 superintendents and 350 principals are expected to retire (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2002). Over 2,000 Iowans who are endorsed for administrative positions are currently employed in the education system in non-administrative positions. Women and racial/ethnic minorities continue to be underrepresented among the state's school administrators. Compared with other states, Iowa ranks low in the number of women superintendents and low in the number of racial/ethnic minorities in all administrative positions. Finally, enrollment in graduate-level school administration programs has declined state-wide (School Administrators of Iowa, 2002).

Steps must be taken to provide future superintendents and board members with the skills needed to manage the schools of tomorrow effectively.

Historical Development of the School Board

The evolution of educational governance under the control of a local district system is a unique American inspiration (Knezevich, 1975). Horace Mann's vision of a network of a common school system for America has fueled public education since the beginning of the nation (Houston, 1996). Mann was deeply serious about the significance of public schools. He was able to show what social ills lay before the people if the nation did not achieve salvation through a common school system (Howe, 1996).

The passage of the Massachusetts School Ordinance of 1642 formed the authority of local townsmen to be responsible for education at the local level (Flinchbaugh, 1993). Since the student population was small, and education was free, and compulsory education was not yet mandated, the lay committee's duties were limited. The responsibility of raising revenue, employing and dismissing teachers, and adopting textbooks and curriculum was the extent of the committee's duties.

In 1721 the city of Boston, formed a subcommittee of selectmen who were in charge of visiting schools and reporting what they found to the town school committee. The National School Boards Association (1982) reported that in 1789 Massachusetts enacted a law requiring every town to have a committee to oversee the schools. As the concept of school boards grew across the nation, legislation was enacted in each state that made school board members agents of the state (Flinchbaugh, 1993).

As the United States forged into the nineteenth century, two education principles took root that changed the role of the school board. The first principle advocated that education was good for the public and therefore should be provided at public expense, thus developing free public education. The second principle was that the general public should control the system, which soon would become too, large for the public to manage (Sergiovannit, 1992).

As school systems expanded and issues became more complex, the resources of lay school committees were insufficient to cope with the day-to-day problems involved in the overall governance of schools (Kirst, 1992). During the past 50 years the basic operation of the school board has not changed (Good, 1988). Lay school committees were expected to perform legislative, executive, and administrative governance tasks that they largely were unqualified to handle. It soon became evident to the lay committees that someone had to be

appointed who could spend necessary time in administering school operations (Griffiths, 1966). The superintendent was one of the last major administrative positions created. It was created out of the lay committee's failed governance of the district (Grieder, 1969).

Historical Development of the Superintendency

Griffiths (1966) categorized the evolution of the superintendent into three eras. The first era, from the development of the position to the early 1910's, depicted the superintendency as a clerical position. This position was clerical for the school lay committee that directed the actions of the superintendent. The second era, from the 1910's to the 1950's, developed the position of the superintendent into the role of financial and business manager. This era also witnessed an increase in curriculum, students, and staff. The third era, from the 1950's to the present, has depicted the role of superintendent as a professional administrator. The educational governance tasks performed by the superintendent have become increasingly complex in today's ever-changing attitude toward public education (Danzberger, 1992).

Horace Mann advocated that the superintendent's position be established. Mann maintained an increase in educational standards and a decrease in political influence would occur with the superintendent position (Danzberger, 1992). From the beginning, adversarial conflicts developed between committee members and superintendents. Americans traditionally have distrusted executive power. Trust, as the research indicates, is a key factor in the relationship between the superintendent and the school board (Knezevich, 1975). Even with these conflicts, the early 20th century found most schools were beginning to appoint a superintendent to perform the day-to-day administrative tasks of the school. This appointment provided needed relief for the lay committees to perform their regular

employment. The school board retained the legal authority to govern while delegating more routine tasks to the superintendent.

Throughout the 20th century the role of the superintendent developed into a professional administrator with emphasis on the managerial concept (Finchbaugh, 1993). With this managerial concept the conflict management aspect of the superintendent/board relationship persists.

Stapley (1957) conducted a study concerning school board member effectiveness. School board members and superintendents were asked to describe situations where the behavior of board members was a key factor regarding board effectiveness. Behavior patterns were categorized into six skill areas:

1. Acceptance of the principle of board unity and subordination of the member interests to that unity.
2. Demonstrating initiative, informed leadership, and insight in board planning and policy-making.
3. Effective understanding of the executive function and the willingness to support it when administering board policies.
4. Effectiveness in maintaining personal relationships.
5. Effectiveness in maintaining staff and group relationships.
6. Courageous action for the good of the schools despite outside pressures and influence (Stapley, 1957, p. 51).

Stapley felt these skills were essential to have successful board members.

The superintendent position has been an embattled one. Zachary (1988) illustrated this by stating, "Many superintendents have felt like General Custer, surrounded in all

directions by an army of critics, special interest groups and political hacks” (p. 2). It has been primarily superintendents who have experienced the pressures associated with today’s education woes. Callahan (1962) commented on the dismal state of the decision-making abilities of the superintendents due to the pressures that they face from day to day.

Superintendents who survive difficult challenges during their tenure develop conflict management skills that will carry them through the embattled times. Conflict resolution, professional relationship building, and problem-solving skills are among the key characteristics that a superintendent needs to develop to have long-term success in a district (Iannaccone, 1981).

Limited research was found dealing with conflict management, relationship building, or the long-term success of a shared superintendent. All the literature dealt with governance issues, conflict management, and developing a long-term relationship in the arena of an single-district superintendent.

Governance Tasks Performed by the School Board

Volumes have been written pertaining to what particular tasks school board members should perform. “Since the educational governance is not specifically delegated to the federal government, it then falls under state control” (Alexander & Alexander, 1985, #55). By virtue of the Tenth Amendment, federal control over education is secondary to the power exercised by the states. Alexander and Alexander (1985) state:

Federal controls emanate from three sources: (1) acquiescence by states in accepting federal grants that are provided under the authority given the Congress by the General Welfare Clause; (2) standards or regulations that the Congress has authorized within the Commerce Clause; and (3) courts may constrain actions when they come in

conflict with federal constitutional provisions protecting individual rights and freedoms (p. 58).

These three sources significantly impact the local school district, but the vast majority of governance is exercised at the state and local level.

Under Iowa law, the Iowa Association of School Boards (2000) states that the school board has the authority to:

- Determine major educational needs, student learning goals, long-range goals, and annual improvement goals, and implement the means of attaining goals.
- Maintain adequate administration, school staff, personnel assignment policies, teacher qualifications, licensing requirements, facilities, equipment, grounds, graduation requirements, instructional requirements, instructional materials, maintenance procedures, and policies on extracurricular activities.
- Maintain attendance centers based upon the needs of the school-age pupils, and include in the educational program additional courses, subjects, or activities, that fit the needs of the pupils.
- Determine attendance centers for the district and the particular school each child will attend.
- Employ a superintendent, teachers, principals, and other licensed professional personnel and support personnel and determine their salaries.
- Act on recommendations to terminate the contract or immediately discharge any employee subject to the provisions of any applicable law.
- Appoint a secretary and a treasurer.

- Expel a student from school for violation of the rules established by the board or when the presence of a student is detrimental to the best interests of the school.
- Fix the time and place of regular and special meetings.
- Fill by appointment board vacancies occurring between elections
- Develop and adopt board policy governing all school district operations.
- Become members of the Iowa Association of School Boards and pay dues to the association.
- Use funds received through gifts and bequests in the general or schoolhouse fund, unless limited by the terms of the grant.
- Employ legal counsel and bear the costs of litigation.
- Allow all just claims against the corporation.
- Insure against loss of property.
- Provide transportation services.
- Acquire, hold, convey, lease, rent, and manage property, both real and personal.
- Incur indebtedness when authorized by the voters of the school corporation.
- Make rules for its own governance (p. 14).

This list is not comprehensive, but it does illustrate the authority vested in Iowa school boards. Traditionally, school boards have focused their responsibility on policy-setting and overseeing the administration of the school (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000).

The two broad educational governance task areas are policy-making and decision-making (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000). These responsibilities continue to be

major roles for the board, but changes in society demand leadership from school boards in the areas of vision, structure, accountability, and advocacy. The board needs to create a shared vision of what the community educational system should achieve. This vision must encompass the larger context of the district to include its racial, ethnic, and religious diversity. The vision must focus on the students, engage the community, and demonstrate a strong commitment to this vision through the board's decision process (Else, 1993).

The structure of the school system is developed through the shared vision. The board establishes the structure and creates an environment designed to ensure that all students have an opportunity to attain their maximum potential. This structure reflects local control by employing a superintendent, adopting a mission and goals, developing policy, and setting budgets (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000).

The board is accountable to the local community. It must determine that the district is actually moving toward the shared vision. The board continually must assess all conditions affecting the educational system. The board monitors student achievement, keeps the public informed of educational progress, ensures that all school functions are working together, provides appropriate staff and training opportunities, and fulfills all governance responsibilities as required by state and federal law (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000).

The board is also the chief advocate of the district's vision. The board serves as education's key advocate on behalf of the students and communities to pursue the shared vision. The board should seek out others who can help expand opportunities, support the students and families of the community, celebrate the learning and achievements of their students, and promote school board service (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000).

According to the report issued by the Task Force on School Governance (Twentieth Century Fund, 1992) school boards should be reconstituted to focus more on educational policy-making rather than day-to-day micromanagement tasks. The report indicated that school boards should concentrate on the "big picture" and stay out of day-to-day operations if they want to be perceived as legitimate and relevant. The task force proposed that the state legislatures give boards only policy-making authority. The task force identified seven areas in which state laws would specify boundaries for local boards. The seven broad areas identified by the Task Force on School Governance were:

1. Boards should end their quasi-judicial responsibilities, and should not preside over student or employee grievances. States should charter local mediation and arbitration panels to resolve complaints and disputes. States should allow jurisdictions to appoint or elect members of these panels.
2. States should relieve boards of their fiduciary responsibilities to approve contracts and purchase orders that are bid competitively. Small noncompetitive bids could also be eliminated from board agendas.
3. School boards should approve budget plans, but they should not approve specific payments of expenditure items in approved budgets.
4. Boards need not approve all change orders in construction projects unless they have a major impact on board policy. For large projects, school board members should consider a community-building committee that includes some board members as well as individuals from outside appointed by the boards. This building committee could approve change orders and oversee construction, leaving more board time for educational policy.

5. **Boards should not hire, fire, or promote specific personnel except for the superintendent and a few overall administrators at the top of the system. Boards should not interview principals. These jobs should be filled according to the personnel policies of the board. Boards should be notified of all appointments and conduct periodic reviews to ascertain whether board personnel policies are being followed. These board responsibilities should be modified for small school districts where there are only a few administrators; in these districts, the board might approve them all.**
6. **Boards should not approve such detailed items as pupil field trips, inter-district pupil transfers, specific staff development activities, and bus routes.**
7. **Boards should permit chairs to serve for more than one year so that experience in policy leadership can be enhanced (pp. 22-23).**

The intent of these seven areas is to demonstrate how state law specifically could discourage school board time being spent on routine administrative tasks and increase the time spent on actual policy-making tasks.

Many workshops and handbooks have been developed to help school board members define their role in today's education setting.

The Iowa Association of School Boards (2000) states four key roles for all Iowa school board members: (1) The board creates a shared vision of the community's educational system. (2) The board applies the shared vision by providing structure for the community's educational system. (3) The board determines that the district is actually moving toward the shared vision. (4) The board is the chief advocate of the district's vision in the community (pp. 15-17).

In today's education setting, assessment is the key to success for all levels of the educational field. The research from Nikolai (1998) indicated that school board members should take part in planned programs of evaluation and notes that thirteen states have mandated training for new and continuing board members.

Just as all other areas of school personnel are assessed and evaluated, school board members also need evaluation as well as training for improving board performance. Board members should be evaluated as a whole board, not as individuals. The board should set goals and develop standards against which they will evaluate themselves. This evaluation process should include strategies for improving the board's performance (National School Board Association, 1982).

With the indicated success of training for board members that typically do not share a superintendent, the question must be raised as to what type of training is needed for school board members that share a superintendent.

Governance Tasks Performed by the Superintendent

The Iowa Association of School Boards (2002) explains that the expectations of the superintendent of schools shall be the executive officer of the board and have such powers and duties that may be prescribed by the rules adopted by the board or by law. Konnert and Augenstien (1990) explained their historical analysis of the superintendency by stating that:

“contemporary attitudes towards and expectations of the superintendent are products of the history of the superintendency” (p. 3).

The superintendent is the board's consultant and advisor on all matters concerning the school district. The superintendent is expected to contribute to the board's deliberations by providing reports, information, and recommendations. Recommendations should be on both

the board request and upon self-directed initiative. As the chief advisor to the board it is the superintendent's role to keep board members thoroughly informed about the educational issues and conditions of the district, problems ahead, and alternative forms of action to deal with the problems (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000).

As the chief advisor to the board the following is a partial list of the functions and duties of a superintendent as prescribed by the Iowa Association of School Boards:

Develop and recommend personnel policies necessary for efficient function of the school staff, provide information to the school board on vital matters pertaining to the school system, prepare and submit to the board a preliminary budget, recommend all candidates for employment, submit an annual report of the operation of the school system to the board (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000, p. 50).

Once the school board has established a policy, it becomes the responsibility of the superintendent and the staff to execute those decisions. The board should then be involved as little as possible in the daily operations. The administration should implement the board's policies and develop rules and regulations to meet the policy's intent. As the chief executive officer, the superintendent sets the tone for the entire system. The superintendent's job is to:

Carry out policies, rules, and regulations established by the board, prepare regulations and instruct school employees as may be necessary to make the policies of the board effective, direct all purchases and expenditures in accordance with the policies of the board, formulate and administer a program of supervision of the schools, develop a program of maintenance and improvement or expansion of buildings, site facilities and equipment (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000, p. 51).

The superintendent has become a specialist in the field of education. Divergent viewpoints exist regarding the particular educational governance tasks performed by the superintendent. There is no clear delineation regarding which particular educational governance tasks are performed by the school board and which particular educational governance tasks are performed by the superintendent. The school board does establish the board policy and the superintendent administers it, but the division and degree of involvement in the process is difficult to determine. Many conflicts occur between the superintendent and the school board due to the inability to differentiate between policy-making and administration (Smith, 1986).

The dual role of the superintendent as educational leader and chief executive officer of the district may at times place the superintendent in a difficult position. Besculides (2000) explains the need for relaxation and behavior changes. Superintendents must be able to delegate authority and empower those around them. Disagreement between the superintendent and board members on specific issues is not necessarily bad. Many times it can be very useful to bring out all the facts of a specific issue. Open discussion by the board and superintendent can be very healthy in building a positive relationship.

The role of the superintendent is that of the chief executive officer of the board. Although the superintendent cannot vote at a board meeting, it is essential that the superintendent be present at all meetings. The superintendent may call upon outside help to discuss problems of the board (Besculides, 2000).

Relationship between the Board and Superintendent

“Matchmaker, matchmaker, make me a match.” That could well be the anthem for the scores of school boards and superintendents that are faced each year with finding a new

superintendent or position. As in any marriage, the success of the union depends on the quality of the match. Benzinger (1987) summarized the school setting as:

“a formal organizational entity operating in a maze of needs and behaviors of the individual members and the goals and expectations of the institution” (p. 79).

Mukensnabe (1981) conducted a study in Texas to analyze and clarify the school board and superintendent relationship. Mukensnabe summarized the study by emphasized that the relationship begins with the hiring process. Many times in the hiring process the type of relationship that the school board and the superintendent are expected to have is overlooked. McAdams (1996) discovered that school boards fit typically on continuum that reaches from dysfunctional, to complacent, to collaborative.

McAdams (1996) found that the dysfunctional board will send mixed messages on critically important issues to the superintendent. When a board has a history of dissension, the quality of the superintendent effectiveness is undermined by the counterproductive actions of that board.

The complacent board (McAdams, 1996) typically looks for someone to manage the status quo, however comfortable it might be. This type of board might have a good working relationship and have surface tranquility in the district, but little will be done actually to enhance the education of the students.

Finally, McAdams (1996) found that the collaborative board is the most effective school board. This board will seek a superintendent who honors their differences but also complements their shared vision. This board will take great interest in the superintendent, in hopes that this person will become a respected, long-term member of the community.

Once the school board has clarified its own commitment to excellence, the superintendent search can begin. The board should focus on their commitment of leadership, and with that in mind begin a search for a superintendent with the same qualities. The board must also ensure that the superintendent has the needed professional competencies to perform the necessary functions to operate the system (McAdams, 1996).

Haugland (1982) compared professional competencies needed by a superintendent as perceived by school board members and by the superintendents. The top three competencies identified and ranked by the school board members include: (1) personnel management, (2) school finance, and (3) curriculum development. Top competencies ranked by the superintendents were: (1) superintendent/board relations, (2) personnel management, and (3) public relations. Board members perceived personnel management, and superintendents perceived superintendent/board relations, as the most prevalent competencies resulting in dismissal, non-renewal, or requested resignation of the superintendent. In a study conducted in California between 1986 and 1989 (Giles & Giles, 1990) stated unequivocally that the board/superintendent disharmony was the major cause of superintendent turnover in California.

Kinn (1980) studied the perceptions of school board members and superintendents in Minnesota concerning the role of the superintendent. Kinn found eight areas of significant differences between the perceptions of superintendents and school board members: (1) textbook selection, (2) curriculum (3) personnel management including employment, benefits, and evaluation, (4) fiscal management and budgeting, (5) community relations, (6) facilities management including maintenance and building construction, (7) implementation and administration of policies, and (8) policy formulation and recommendations (pp. 211-213).

Kinn (1980) also found that there was a lack of consensus between school board members and superintendents as to the role of the superintendent. Kinn concluded that when the role of the superintendent is unclear, in turn this will affect the way in which the role is perceived by the school board. Without a clear role for the superintendent to follow from the board, the relationship between the board and the superintendent will be lost.

The board–superintendent relationship must establish itself as firm, objective, and fair. This relationship should maintain a productive environment and continue to grow as the district moves forward. Positive relationships need to be reinforced when board members address complaints when dealing with personnel and the superintendent. They also must remember that a board member is considered a board member only when the board is in session. When confronted with a personal complaint from an individual, the board member's job is to listen and politely refer the individual to the appropriate staff member (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000).

It is critically important to enhance the relationship between the school board and the superintendent. Crawford (1972) states that no conflict resolution will occur without a uniform desire between the school board and the superintendent (p. 67). Shannon (1996) developed a list of 13 ways to nurture the board-superintendent relationship from the viewpoint of the superintendent. The first is to work with the board on a long-range and strategic plan. Everything that a superintendent proposes to the board should be based on that plan and direction. The reason for the long-range plan is simple-it focuses the board on its governance function.

The second aspect to nurturing this relationship is to view education as an area of human endeavor in which opinions may differ. Having respect for others and their opinions is needed, along with some flexibility to change your mind when the facts warrant it.

Shannon's third point is never to equate success in administrative leadership with peace and tranquility. This is an unrealistic goal in times of change in a society and as theories of school administration are changing.

The fourth point in fostering a positive relationship involves the recognition that K-12 education is much broader than the instructional program alone. Schools, administrators, and teachers must address the host of issues that accompany their students to school every day. Medical, emotional, and social problems are a way of life in the school setting.

Providing as much relevant information as possible to the board is the fifth aspect for a positive relationship. Board members want enough information to make informed decisions but not be overwhelmed with volumes of documents.

The sixth aspect is that the superintendent must be friendly to change regardless of where new ideas are generated. The superintendent should be aggressive in scouting good ideas to enhance instruction.

The superintendent must work closely, openly, and evenhandedly with the entire school board. Playing favorites is a sure prescription for disaster. Personal feelings for individual board members dictate the quality of information you provide to board members.

Number eight is to make the best use of resources that school board members represent. The superintendent must make good management of the resources available, and search for ways to utilize all board members' strengths.

The ninth aspect is similar; the superintendent must use school board members as liaisons to local, state, and federal government.

Shannon's tenth aspect of building a positive relationship deals with listening to fellow superintendents' war stories. It is important to learn from the stories for future reference.

The 11th point for superintendents is to encourage school board members to participate in training sessions. An informed board member who is conversant with the public governance issues, techniques of board service and, principles of organizational operation, and who has a sense of responsibility to board deliberations has proven to be a more effective board member.

Points number 12 and 13 focus on respect for the public education system and for the school board as a governance entity with individuals deserving of respect. School boards are part of the political system, and mutual respect for the governance and legitimacy of this system is important. Regardless of the individual qualities of some of each board member, collectively they are the bosses; together they set educational policy.

Anstey (1993) states that superintendents should educate new board members instead of assuming that they know the rules and regulations of the district. The process of updating the policy manual is a key aspect of developing trust and understanding. This provides both parties with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. The process continues with regular in-service training conducted by the superintendent and with the board attending outside training tailored specifically for individual members (Fisher, 1993).

Else (1993) summarizes the relationship between a superintendent and school board into six general categories: building mutual trust and understanding, developing roles and

expectations, building a shared vision, ensuring long-term communication flow, making effective decisions, and developing positive links with the community. Without effective command of these six areas, the relationship between the superintendent and school board may become strained over time. An effective school board president also requires certain leadership qualities and personality characteristics which include: (1) trust, (2) effective communication, (3) responsibility versus authority, (4) control of meetings, (5) committee structure, (6) problem solving approaches, (7) board development, (8) superintendent relations, and (9) mission (Council, 1994). MacNaughton (1987) states the chief frustrations of a school board member involve community and board miscommunication, chronic under-funding, sacred cows, and the eroding of board authority.

An effective relationship depends on mutual trust, mutual loyalty, and clearly defined roles (Twiford & Harrison, 1986). Building mutual trust and understanding between the superintendent and school board is a long-term process. That begins with the first handshake between the superintendent and hiring board. The selection of a superintendent is one of the most critical decisions that a school board can make. Choosing an appropriate superintendent is fundamental for achieving the board's mission of the school corporation (Cochren, 1994). The person selected as superintendent not only must be eminently qualified but also must have a personal and administrative style that meshes well with the board's style (Twiford & Harrison, 1986).

Another key to developing trust and understanding is an ongoing evaluation process. This process should generate feedback on the board's performance as well as the superintendent's performance (Fisher, 1993). The usual board-superintendent relationship is inconsistent with site-based management and building autonomy. Many times school boards

want complete control over the issues in the district, while site-based management techniques allow the staff to be highly involved in the operations of the district. Boards should develop a clearly defined set of performance standards for authority and accountability, along with desirable collaborative management procedures (Johnson, 1994).

As the two parties begin their work together, mutual understanding develops. It is imperative that each party must have a comfortable feeling for their role and understand how it fits into the relationship. As the relationship develops, each party needs to be aware of the responsibilities that are a part of their role (Flynn, 1993). Board members need to understand the chain of command as a part of their role in the district, while the superintendent needs to be flexible and open to suggestions from the board (Geitzenauer, 1993).

Jones and Dunbar (1993) indicate that having a clear, compelling vision is a key characteristic of all effective schools. This vision helps the people within the organization determine priorities, sets high expectations, and encourages groups to plan together for improvement. The vision must be shared, developed, and implemented by all stakeholders. The stakeholders include the staff, students, and patrons (as well as the board and superintendent of the district).

The development of a clear vision and a mission statement is a major part of the change process that districts go through. The vision should reflect what that community, its families, and its staff want their children to know and be able to do at the end of their high school experience (Hoffmann, 1993)

As the superintendent and board continue to develop their relationship, expectations and definitions of roles must begin to be developed. When developing the roles and expectations, the vision for the school must be in focus at all times. The board and

superintendent must not lose sight of where they need to be in the future. That vision must be a shared vision including all key stakeholders (Jury, 1993).

Another expectation of an effective board-superintendent relationship is the development of long-term communication. Good communication always has been vital between the superintendent of schools and the school board. However, trust must be present in this relationship before both parties will communicate openly with one another. Without trust and an ethical attitude, the level of communication soon becomes ineffective (Bordwell, 1993).

A superintendent acts as the team's (board's) coach or leader and, as on any team, the coach has to be able to communicate with each player. However, there is no one "best" form of communication with any one board member. To be an effective communicator several forms of communication must be utilized (Daeschner, 1993).

There are two main types of communication that the superintendent may use with a board: formal and informal. Formal systems of communication tend to have a specific structure or format. Some examples of formal communication include board meetings, newsletters, workshops, strategic planning sessions, board policies, negotiations, and sub-committees. Some examples of informal communication include one-on-one contact, phone calls, social events, and community events (Bordwell, 1993).

Making effective decisions as a superintendent is an additional critical aspect of building the relationship with the board. Making a good decision builds upon the other aspects: trust, role recognition, a common vision, and good communication.

To react to changing societal conditions, decision-making and conflict resolution skills need to be practiced and improved upon to build a lasting working relationship

(Gunderson & Cooper, 1993). One possible way to improve the decision-making process is to adopt the concept of vertical decision-making. Vertical decision-making begins at the staff and community level. Within this process, input from the staff and community must be solicited when dealing with critical issues. The final decision is made on a consensus basis, having an end product upon which a majority of the stakeholders agree (Barney, 1993).

Fowler (1975) stated that as in any effective partnership one partner must perform certain tasks, while the other partner also must perform his share of the tasks. He compared the relationship between the superintendent and school board to a marriage, emphasizing that the two parties needed to work together and share responsibilities to have a successful partnership. To achieve a successful partnership, Fowler made six suggestions for the superintendent to follow: talk to all the school board members and not just a few, tell the school board what you believe and not what you think the school board wants to hear, keep surprises to a minimum, keep the school board informed, stay in charge, and admit your mistakes. Fowler had additional suggestions for maintaining a positive school board-superintendent relationship:

1. Try to understand and respect the difference between policy-making and administration.
2. Insist the superintendent offer recommendations and not just options on all important policy matters.
3. Keep fellow school board members in line.
4. Systematically appraise the performance of the superintendent.
5. Invite the superintendent to offer an annual evaluation of the school board.
6. Do not play games.

7. Establish communication channels and stay with them.

IASB and School Administrators of Iowa (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2002) have joined together to promote positive board-administrator relations in every Iowa school district. The primary goal has been to highlight techniques that will foster good working relationships between administrators and their board. The two organizations conducted an informal research study of Iowa board members and administrators who have been successful in building strong foundations. Their suggestions are:

1. Clarify roles and expectations for board members and superintendent.
2. Establish and implement a clear process for communication between board members and administration.
3. Actively work to build trust and mutual respect between the board and administrative team.
4. Evaluate the whole team.
5. Actively work on improved decision-making.

When adversity strikes a school district the effective superintendent needs to have any number of strategies to deal with the problem. Being flexible, focused, organized, and proactive are four strategies that Pardini (2001) addresses as necessary strategies for any superintendent.

If the board and a superintendent should decide that they no longer have confidence in one another, the appropriate thing to do is to call a meeting to discuss the problem and explore different solutions. To change a superintendent is not a matter to be taken lightly or decided on the spur of the moment. A board must give notice of the reasons for a dismissal

and follow the termination procedures outlined in law (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2002).

The superintendent also should provide the school board with ample time in finding a replacement for that district. The superintendent search is one of the most important actions that a school board takes. This process takes time and effort by all on the board (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000).

If superintendents and their boards truly are concerned about the future of education, they must recognize the importance of a positive relationship between a community and its schools. The school must develop a quality public relations program to restore the public's confidence in the schools (Davis, 1993). A well-planned community relations program is customer-oriented, provides feedback, builds accountability, and provides general information to the community (Grabinski, 1993). Superintendents today have less or shorter-lasting authority than their predecessors for reasons that include influence of special interest groups and the public's desire for flash instead of substance in personal character (Brubaker, 1995).

The Shared Superintendent

When a school board considers the question of sharing a superintendent between two or more districts, they often lack the necessary information to make a sound decision. They often do not consider the changes in roles, relationships, and responsibilities that must occur in such a situation. The review of literature exposed the dearth of research that actually has been conducted when dealing with a shared district superintendent. There is limited literature pertaining to the working relationship and governance tasks issues of a shared district superintendent.

Bratlie (1992) suggests that a shared superintendent arrangement be used only as a preliminary step to school reorganization. Bratlie explains that the issues that must be considered when making this type of decision include: (1) current school financial situation; (2) future financial savings; (3) school board members as strong supports, while community members and staff as the strong opposition; and (4) burnout by the superintendent. Heath (1980) recounts the pressures that prompted him to leave his position as a shared superintendent in two rural districts. Heath concluded that each district perceived he was "their" superintendent, and in the end the relationship pressures were too great.

The use of sharing any program needs to be analyzed in one of two ways: Will it reduce the district spending and/or will it improve the education for the students of the district? Partial school reorganization allows a middle-of-the-road response to decreasing enrollments, tight budgets, and increased federal/state demands to a small district. Sharing of personnel, including a superintendent, generally will reduce the district cost for what is typically the largest single payroll in the district. Improvement in education by sharing personnel comes only in the quality of the shared personnel (Rincones, 1988).

Jess (1991) reviewed the educational reform in Iowa and concluded that the biggest incentive for districts to share superintendents is the cost savings. In 1988, sixty-one percent of the shared superintendents believed that sharing was a good idea. It provided the leadership needed in small, rural school districts.

In Iowa, the concept of sharing superintendents originated in the 1980s in response to the agricultural recession. During this period, student K-12 populations decreased. Across the state, nearly every school system felt the decline and experienced the budget restraints. Encouraged by state financial incentives, many districts began to share staff, grades, and

administrators. As districts moved to reorganize, the shared superintendent provided an avenue to bring together two districts into one. This avenue could include the consistency of policy making, a shared vision for both districts, and overall communication between the two districts. The shared superintendent provided for larger purchasing power, coordinated curriculum, and general cooperation between the two systems (Decker, Robert, McCumsey, & Norman, 1990).

Guidelines for a successful sharing program include the hiring of one superintendent, joint planning by participating districts, clearly written objectives, voluntary participation, and equitable sharing. Problems that are related to sharing arrangements include school calendars, scheduling, transportation, benefits, and local pride. Phillips (1984) studied rural districts in Illinois that were contemplating sharing administrative staff and concluded districts should not share a superintendent in dissimilar districts. Shared ventures can expand the consistence from district to district in curriculum and allow for decreased expenditures through use of shared supplies, equipment, and fees (Hanuske, 1983).

Summary

Superintendent-school board working relationships are very complex. This review of literature looked at the history of the creation of school boards and superintendent positions. It also reviewed the typical roles or governance tasks of both the superintendent and the collective school board. It reviewed research on what a relationship between the board and superintendent is based upon and how the situation of being either a shared-district superintendent or single-district superintendent influences that relationship. When reviewing the literature pertaining to a shared superintendent, the author found limited information.

Much of the research that was discovered dealt with other aspects of sharing programs and staff than sharing the superintendent.

Many factors have been determined to be critical to the success or failure of administrators and the boards they work with. The literature reviewed suggests that this success or failure in reality lies within the hands of those who fill these leadership positions.

The emerging roles of both superintendent and school boards date back to the 1700s. These roles were developed out of necessity for governance and routine tasks. As school systems have expanded and become more complex, so, too, have the roles of each of these positions.

Two broad educational governance school board tasks are revealed in the literature: policy-making and decision-making. Traditionally, school boards have focused on setting policy and overseeing administration. However, this has been expanded in today's society to include developing vision, structure, accountability, and advocacy for the district.

The superintendent's role always has been primarily that of executive officer of the district; serving as both consultant and advisor to the school board. It is the responsibility of the superintendent to execute the policies and the decisions of the school board. This role also has expanded as the demands of today's educational system expand. The superintendent must become the specialist in the field of education that is continually changing and redeveloping.

It is the meshing of these two roles that defines the all-important superintendent-school board working relationship. Meshing becomes more complicated when dealing with a shared superintendent. The literature revealed many of the complex issues that arise when

developing, maintaining, and nurturing this relationship. It is a relationship that sets the tone for the entire district-its staff, students, and global community.

Finally, the literature reviewed examined the impact of sharing a superintendent on this ever-fragile working relationship between board and administrator. Through this examination it is clear that limited research has been conducted in this area. There are clearly defined guidelines that may enhance the relationship of a single-district superintendent and board that may pertain to the relationship of a shared superintendent and board. These include shared planning, joint planning, clear objectives, voluntary participation, and equitable sharing.

It is clear that there is much more literature about the governing roles of the superintendent and board members, versus the relationship upon which these two entities must build their roles. There is even less literature available on the impact of sharing a superintendent, as this is a new development for many districts who only now are feeling the impact of recession. The literature that is available points to the importance of finding a way to overcome any mistake about the importance of the relationship between these two entities, regardless of whether the district has a single or shared superintendent.

CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

This chapter explains the quantitative procedures used in conducting the study. The chapter is divided into the following six sections: (1) the population of the study, (2) development of the instrument, (3) data instrument and procedures, (4) validation of the instrument, (5) data collection and analysis, and (6) schedule of the study.

Population of the Study

The population of this study consisted of shared and single district superintendents and their current Iowa public school board members in Iowa. There were a total of 20 shared superintendents in public schools in the state of Iowa during the 2000-2001 school year. The researcher was one of the 20 shared superintendents and excluded those districts from the study.

The sampling frame included two shared superintendents and four single district superintendents. The sample included the eight school boards that the six superintendents represented.

The data collection sample included the remaining 17 shared superintendents who were surveyed and 34 single district superintendents. All the school board members of these shared and selected single district superintendents were surveyed. School board members who were elected or held an elected position during the 2000-2001 school year were included. The total number of superintendents who were selected to participate in the data research study was 51. The names and districts of superintendents were obtained by phone request from the Department of Education. The total number of school board members who were selected to participate was 362. This list was obtained from the Iowa Association of School Boards.

Due to the fact the quantitative instrument was obtaining empirical data of school board members' and superintendents' perceptions on the degree of involvement in the educational governance process and their relationships, it was the researcher's intentions to include only Iowa Public Schools, to control independent variables as much as possible.

Development of the Instrument

The instrument consisted of three parts. Part I consisted of demographic and selected variables; Part II measured educational governance; Part III measured the perceived working relationship that the superintendent has with the current school board. The instrument statements were obtained from the Maple Valley superintendent evaluation instrument, from the Iowa School Boards sample superintendent evaluation instrument and from local school board comments. The research instrument was developed and then sent to 10 Iowa State Professors for validation. The professors indicated if the research questions were an essential measurement for each research section. The research instrument was refined and sent to eight pilot schools for testing.

Three demographic and selected variable questions were research surveyed. The demographic data will represent independent variables including the following: (1) length of tenure as a school board member or superintendent, (2) level of formal education attained by the respondent, and (3) gender.

Twelve governance task statements were placed and grouped on the instrument for the respondents to answer. The purpose of the governance task statements was to have school board members and superintendents examine their degree of involvement in the educational governance process. In order to complete that task, the respondents must examine what particular educational governance tasks they are doing and to what extent.

Thirty-one statements measured the perceived working relationship that the superintendent had with the current school board members. The purpose of the working relationship statements was to have school board members and superintendents examine the current relationship that exists between the board members and the superintendent. To complete that task, the respondents must examine what particular relationship task was happening currently and to what extent.

Each item of the instrument is a statement regarding governance tasks or working relationships. In completing the instrument, the school board member or superintendent must select an appropriate response indicating what best describes their current district. Completion of the entire instrument provided 46 responses per board member and 47 responses per superintendent. The five responses available to the board members and superintendent for items in section II and the first 18 statements of section III were as follows: (1) Never, (2) Infrequently, (3) Sometimes, (4) Frequently, (5) Almost Always.

The five responses available to the board members and superintendent for items the last 13 statements of section III were as follows: (1) Failing, (2) Poor, (3) Average or Fair, (4) Very Good, (5) Excellent.

Two separate forms of the instrument were used in the study. One form is for school board members only and the other form is for superintendents only. To distinguish between the two separate forms, the school board member responses were recorded on blue paper and superintendent responses were recorded on red paper. Each form had the name of the instrument as well as "School board Member Form" or "Superintendent Form" printed at the top of the page.

For each part of the instrument, statements will be written which are applicable to the superintendent and their working relationship with the school board and the working relationship the school board has with the superintendent.

Data Instrument and Procedures

A self-developed research study was sent to practicing superintendents and board members was used to conduct the assessment, and to determine the characteristics of the relationships between the superintendents and their school boards. The overall design and organization of the research study emanated from the review of literature on effective board practice and board superintendent working relationships.

The use of two research studies was implemented, one for school board members and the other for superintendents. The instrument consisted of three parts: Part I demographic and selected variables, Part II educational governance, and Part III working relationship between the school board and superintendent.

The research study was sent to all shared public school superintendents and twice as many single public school superintendents. The single district superintendents were selected by matching the certified enrollment count of the shared superintendent districts to that of the single district superintendent school certified enrollments. Certified enrollments were obtained from the Department of Education, and the 2000-2001 certified enrollment was used for this study. Certified enrollment is the official number of resident students reported by each school district to the Iowa State Department of Education on the third Friday of September each school year.

The first step in assessing the levels of involvement of the board with which the superintendent were working was to gather current data dealing with involvement of the

working relationship and governance task. The information gathered revealed areas of strengths and weaknesses, and would facilitate in the development of appropriate strategies to improve working relationships between boards and superintendents.

The purposes of the instrument were to (1) obtain quantitative measurements on the demographic information of the school board members as it pertains to length of tenure in the position, highest level of formal education attained, and gender, (2) obtain quantitative measurements on the perceived degree of involvement by school board members and superintendents in the process of performing educational governance tasks, and (3) obtain quantitative measurements on the perceived performance of school board members and superintendents in establishing and maintaining an effective working relationship.

The method of the study was to conduct a self-assessment of the relationship between a shared superintendent and their school boards verses a single district superintendent and their school board in the form of a research study. Information gathered will identify areas of strengths and weaknesses that occur between the two parties and enable the appropriate improvement strategies to be developed to develop a positive working relationship.

Each form was four pages in length and contained the following corresponding parts: page one contains Part I (demographic information), page two contains Part II (educational governance task statements), and page three and four contains Part III (school board-superintendent working relationship statements). The forms varied slightly depending upon the Likert-type responses for each item. The respondents marked their answers directly on the scantron card to generate a computerized printout of the Likert-type responses. The variables of the study are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Variables of the Study

Demographic Variables	Relationship and Governance Tasks
Years Experience	Trust and Understanding
Education Level	Roles and Expectations
Gender	Shared Vision
	Communication
	Effective Decision Making
	Community Relations

Validation of the Instrument

A knowledgeable panel of Iowa State University professors validated the instrument in the fall of 2000. These professors have worked with school boards and superintendents in the State of Iowa and have background knowledge of the relationships between the two groups. Each Iowa State University professor was sent a research study instrument with guidelines to follow in the validation process. Each professor marked directly onto the research study instrument one of following responses:

- A. The task item is an essential measure of the educational governance functions or the school board-superintendent working relationship.
- B. The task item is useful, but not essential as a measure of the educational governance functions or the school board-superintendent working relationship.
- C. The task item is not necessary as a measure of the educational governance functions or the school board-superintendent working relationship.

The instrument questions were modified from the responses of the professors. The instrument was then pilot tested with eight public school boards and their superintendents in

the State of Iowa in the spring of 2001. Four instruments were sent to two shared superintendents and their four boards, and four other instruments were sent to four single district superintendents and their four school boards. Again, the instrument was modified based upon the responses of the pilot test results.

Data Collection and Analysis

The final form of the questionnaire was mailed in the fall of 2001 to the remaining 17 shared superintendents and their school board members and 34 single district superintendents and their school board members. The cover letter included an explanation of the procedures to be followed and their purposes, an offer to answer any inquiries concerning the procedures, and an instruction that the person was free to withdraw her/his consent and to discontinue participation in the project or the activity at any time without prejudice to the subject (45 CFR 46.116). In addition the subjects were informed of efforts to keep confidential any data they provided and specify the amount of time required to complete. Documents were written in language that is easily understandable.

Each superintendent received a mailing, which included individual packets for each board member, a packet for the superintendent and a return envelope. Each board member packet contained an envelope to return their responses in, a scantron card, and the research study with survey directions. The superintendent packet contained one or two research studies and scantron cards (depending on if they were a shared or single district superintendent) along with an envelope to return their response in. Once all the board members' envelopes were returned to the superintendent, the envelopes were placed in the return self-addressed stamped envelope and mailed.

Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the demographics and variables of the

instrument. The descriptive statistics included frequency distributions, percentages, and measures of tendency. The demographic data represented independent variables, including the following: (1) length of tenure as a school board member or superintendent, (2) level of formal education attained of the respondent, and (3) gender.

Inferential statistics also were used in the quantitative data analysis. To compare the unequal variances of responses an equality of variances test was conducted. A t-test was used to determine if there was a significant difference between the response variables. T-tests were used to compare how each group significantly differed from the another.

The SPSS statistical package was utilized in the analysis of the quantitative data. Steps were taken to obtain a valid interpretation of the quantitative data.

CHAPTER 4. RESULTS OF THE DATA ANALYSIS

The purpose of this research study was to assess the various perspectives of the working relationships between shared and single district superintendents and their school boards in matters of educational governance. This research examined the relationship between the congruence of the school board and shared and single district superintendent's perceptions of their working relationship and their perceptions of their roles, how the two groups communicate, and the collaborative planning between the two entities.

Introduction

The primary research questions were: What are the factors that lead to a strained relationship between the shared superintendents and their local school boards, compared to the strains that develop between a single district superintendent and school board? How can those relationships be fostered to develop a more positive working environment? A positive working environment is defined as a productive relationship that is firm, objective, fair, can be trusted, provides sound management principles, provides input in decision making and provide for a quality education system (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000, p. 56).

The data gathered from school board members and superintendents concerning their working relationship may be used to prompt modification of the superintendent's behavior or the school board's behavior, and can lead to attempts to understand and coordinate working styles as a means of promoting board/superintendent harmony. By fostering board-superintendent harmony, the development of trust, understanding, shared expectations, shared vision, long-term communication, effective decision-making and positive links the shared or single district superintendent will have a more positive working relationship with the school board.

This chapter is divided into two major sections. The first section presents the study response and results of the demographic data gathered from superintendents and school board members who participated in the study. It includes an analysis of the local tenure, total superintendency experience, educational degree level, and gender. The second section presents the statistical analysis of data for the six major hypotheses.

Sample Participants - Superintendents

This section describes the return rate of school board members and superintendents, with the demographics of each group. A total of 68 superintendent research studies were sent, including 34 research studies to single district superintendents and 17 to shared superintendents, who were asked to respond to the research study separately for each of their two shared districts. The shared superintendents were asked to complete two research studies, one for each district in which they worked. All data for shared district superintendents have two responses for each superintendent, one from each of the school districts that they are employed with. One shared superintendent only returned the research study for one of the two districts. The single district superintendents only completed one research study for the district they served. Of the 68 research studies that were mailed, 47 were returned, for a return rate of 69%. The single district superintendents had a return rate of 76%, with 26 research studies returned out of the 34 mailed. The shared superintendents had a return rate of 62% with 21 research studies returned out of the 34 sent. Table 2 describes the return rate for this study.

Table 2. Superintendents' Research Study Return Rate

Total Research Studies	Research Studies Returned	Percentage
68	47	69.12%
Single Research Studies	Single Research Studies Returned	Percentage
34	26	76.47%
Shared Research studies	Shared Research Studies Returned	Percentage
34	21	61.77%

The statistics indicated that the superintendents participating in the study had served an average of 6-8 years in their district as a superintendent. The single district superintendents had served on average 3-5 years, while the shared superintendents on average had served closer to 9-11 years. The average number of years that a superintendent had served in the current district similarly fell into the 3-5 year span. The single district superintendents had served in her/his current district 3-5 years on average. The shared superintendents on average had served in the 3-5 year range in the current district.

The local tenure statistic reflects the number of years of service as superintendent and does not include years of service in any other capacity. It also should be noted that total superintendency experience is the sum of the years of local tenure as a superintendent and the years of superintendent experience in other school districts.

The education index for supervisors was calculated as the average value of scores derived through a method that awarded one point for a master's degree, two points for a master's degree plus additional graduate hours, and three points for a doctoral degree. The mean score of 1.98 for the education index variable indicates that the participants were

functioning with an average educational base at the specialist degree level. The data indicated a substantial difference between the single and shared superintendents' mean of education levels, with the single district superintendents averaging 1.88 and the shared superintendents averaging 2.21. The results indicate a higher mean level of education for the shared superintendents than for the single district superintendents. Table 3 notes the number of superintendents at each level of educational attainment.

Table 3. Superintendents' Formal Education

	Master's Degree	Master's Degree Plus	Doctoral Degree	Total
<u>Single</u>	6	17	3	26
	Master's Degree	Master's Degree Plus	Doctoral Degree	Total
<u>Shared</u>	2	11	6	19
	Master's Degree	Master's Degree Plus	Doctoral Degree	Total
<u>Total</u>	8	25	9	45

The data in table 4 indicated that only 6 of 26 single district superintendents surveyed are female, or about 23% female representation.

Table 4. Superintendents' Gender

	Female	Male	Total
Single	6	20	26
Shared	4	17	21
Total	10	37	47
Percent	21.28%	78.72%	100%

The shared superintendents' percentage of female superintendents was somewhat lower, 19%, with only 4 of the 21 shared superintendents indicating that they were female. Combined statistics for these two groups indicate that only 21% of superintendents surveyed for this research were female

Sample Participants: School Board Members

The school board members had a lower research study return rate than the superintendents did. A total of 362 total research studies were sent, with 149 research studies returned, for a 41% return rate. Schools with a single district superintendent had a return rate of 47%, with 85 research studies being returned. Schools with a shared superintendent had a return rate of 35%, with 64 research studies returned. Table 5 describes the return rate for this study.

Table 5. School Boards' Research Study Return Rate

Total Research studies	Total Research Studies Returned	Percentage
362	149	41.16%
Single Research studies	Single Research Studies Returned	Percentage
181	85	46.96%
Shared Research studies	Shared Research Studies Returned	Percentage
181	64	35.36%

The statistics indicated that school board members participating in the study had served an average of 3-5 years. The single district superintendent board members had a

higher serving average score, (2.2 years), than did the shared superintendent board members, (2.0).

The scores were derived from a method that awarded one point if the school board member graduated from high school or received their GED. If the school board member received an associate's degree or vocational-technical degree they received two points. If the school board member had received a bachelor's degree then three points were issued; also, four points were issued for a master's degree and five for a doctoral degree. Different scales were used for the education index for board members than were used for superintendents. This is done to reflect the superintendent's requirement to obtain a master's degree. There is no educational requirement to qualify as a school board member.

A mean score of 2.19 for the variable "education" indicated that the participants were functioning with an average educational base at the level of an associate degree or vocational-technical degree. The results indicated little difference between the single and shared superintendent board members' degree of educational attainment, with the single district superintendent board members averaging 2.17 and the shared superintendent board members averaging 2.25. These results indicated a slightly higher average level of education for the shared superintendent board members than for the single district superintendent board members. Table 6 indicates the number of board members at each level of educational attainment.

Table 6. Board Members' Formal Education

	High School	Associate's	Bachelor's	Master's	Doctoral	Total
Single	20	18	29	4	3	74
Shared	31	16	21	5	1	74
Total	51	34	50	9	4	148
Percent	34.46%	22.97%	33.78%	6.08%	2.71%	100%

The data in table 7 indicate that 52 of 149 school board members that completed the research study were female, having a 35% female population. The shared superintendents' board member percentage of females serving was 33%, with 21 of 64 indicating that they were female. The single district superintendents' board member percentage of females serving was 36%, with 31 of 85 indicating that they were female.

Table 7. Board Members' Gender

	Female	Male	Total
Single	31	54	85
Shared	21	43	64
Total	52	97	149
Percent	34.89%	65.11%	100%

Hypotheses of the Study

The purposes of this study were threefold: (1) to examine what school board members perceive as their degree of involvement in the educational governance process pertaining to the performance of particular educational governance tasks, (2) to examine what shared and single district superintendents perceive as their degree of involvement in the

educational governance process as it pertains to the performance of particular educational governance tasks, and (3) to examine what school board members and shared and single district superintendents perceive as their own and each others' performance ratings as they pertain to establishing and maintaining an effective working relationship.

The statistical tests of the six major hypotheses were conducted using multivariate and univariate two-way analysis of variance. These tests were conducted to assess the relationship between the main effects of a district having a single district superintendent versus a district having a shared superintendent. The results of these tests follow.

Research Question 1: How do Iowa school board members perceive their degree of involvement in performing educational governance tasks?

To address Research Question 1, 12 research study questions were posed to the school board members involved. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the performance of educational governance tasks held by school board members who have a shared superintendent or a single district superintendent should be accepted. When reviewing the data, the mean degree of involvement in performing educational governance tasks was consistent between the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents.

When a 2-tailed t-test was used, only one research study item demonstrated a significant difference at the $p < .010$ level between the group means. Research study question number six on the school board research study asked the board members if the superintendent directs the school district's day-to-day operations. The single district superintendent school board members indicated that their superintendent almost always

directs the operations, while the shared superintendent school board members indicated that their superintendent frequently directs the operations.

As indicated in Table 8, of the 12 research study questions asked, eight questions had a higher mean for the single district superintendents than did the shared superintendents. Null Hypothesis one was accepted because of the congruence found in generally non-significant between the results for the two groups of school board members surveyed.

Table 8. Board Members' Mean Scores for Governance Tasks and Significance Levels

Question	Single District Mean	Shared District Mean	Assuming Equal Variances	Assuming Unequal Variances
4	4.09	4.13	.838	.836
5	3.87	3.67	.246	.254
6	4.51	3.94	.001	.001
7	4.18	3.98	.200	.202
8	3.86	4.00	.501	.490
9	4.25	4.36	.479	.465
10	3.36	3.22	.435	.432
11	3.95	3.81	.532	.533
12	3.51	3.43	.686	.684
13	4.16	4.13	.824	.823
14	4.29	4.39	.552	.548
15	4.15	3.89	.073	.080

Research Question 2: How do Iowa school board members perceive their performance in the school board-superintendent working relationship?

To address Research Question 2, the school board members involved answered 18 research study questions. As indicated in Table 9, all of the 18 research study questions asked, had a higher, although not always significantly so, mean for the single district superintendents than for the shared superintendents.

Table 9. Board Members' Mean Scores for Working Relationships and Significance Levels

Question	Single District Mean	Shared District Mean	Assuming Equal Variances	Assuming Unequal Variance
16	4.49	4.20	.018	.018
17	4.67	4.44	.041	.052
18	4.60	4.45	.182	.198
19	4.60	4.13	.000	.001
20	4.15	3.81	.028	.034
21	4.20	4.00	.144	.155
22	4.11	3.88	.136	.143
23	4.27	3.94	.028	.030
24	4.49	4.36	.247	.247
25	4.35	4.31	.764	.764
26	4.60	4.36	.049	.057
27	4.61	4.45	.173	.185
28	4.27	4.19	.560	.553
29	4.06	4.00	.698	.697
30	4.49	4.20	.017	.021
31	4.25	3.66	.000	.000

Table 9. (continued)

Question	Single District Mean	Shared District Mean	Assuming Equal Variances	Assuming Unequal Variance
32	4.09	3.47	.000	.000
33	4.26	3.67	.000	.000

The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the performance ratings given by the school board members of the ability of a shared superintendent to communicate with the school board to establish an effective working relationship versus a single district superintendent should not be accepted.

When reviewing the data the mean perception of an effective working relationship is not consistent between the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents indicating that the hypothesis should not be accepted. Table 9 shows that based on the results of a 2-tailed t-test there was a significant difference between the means of the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents.

As indicated by the responses of research study items 16, 17, 19, 20, 23, 26, 30, 31, 32, and 33, there was a significant mean difference ($p < .050$) between a single district superintendent and a shared superintendent on the school board research study with regard to communication and board relationships. Four responses had a significant difference of $p < .010$ level. Those four research study questions dealt with development of district objectives, communication between the board and superintendent, public trust, and whether the public feels they can communicate with the superintendent. As indicated by the mean of the responses to the research study, the perception of the communication skills of the single district superintendents was much higher than that of the shared superintendents.

These data all indicate that the shared superintendent is less connected to the school board and community and that this null hypothesis should be rejected.

Research Question 3: How do Iowa shared and single district superintendents perceive their degree of involvement in performing particular educational governance tasks?

To address Research Question 3, the superintendents answered questionnaire items similar to those answered by the school board members. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the performance of educational governance tasks held by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents should not be accepted. When reviewing the data the mean perception of governance tasks issues is consistent between the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents. As indicated in Table 10, all of the 12 research study questions although usually not significantly so had a higher mean for the shared superintendents than for the single district superintendents. All of the research study questions for the single district superintendents had a higher mean indicating that these issues are not consistent and the hypothesis should not be accepted.

When a 2-tailed t-test was used, there was a significant difference of $p < .050$ between the variances of the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents for only two questions. Questions 9 and 14 indicate significant differences between the perceptions of the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents. Because only two research questions indicated a significant difference is enough to not accept the hypothesis along with the mean data. Question nine dealt with maintaining final legal control over the budget, while question 14 maintained adequate safeguards against the

misuse of funds. In both questions the mean was higher for the shared superintendents than for the single district superintendents.

Table 10. Superintendents' Mean Scores for Governance Tasks and Significance Levels

Question	Single District Mean	Assuming Equal Variances	Shared District Mean	Assuming Unequal Variances
5	3.92	.507	4.14	.489
6	3.88	.820	3.95	.815
7	4.00	.100	4.62	.083
8	4.19	.755	4.29	.745
9	3.81	.024	4.67	.016
10	4.15	.076	4.62	.059
11	3.50	.946	3.52	.946
12	3.88	.630	4.10	.627
13	3.42	.792	3.52	.795
14	4.12	.060	4.62	.045
15	4.31	.710	4.43	.707
16	3.88	.946	3.90	.946

As indicated by the mean scores in Table 8, the school board members perceive that shared superintendents handle the budget and safeguard against misuse of funds just as effectively as do single district superintendents.

As indicated in Table 8, the school boards of single district superintendents indicated that their superintendent almost always directs the operations, while the shared superintendent school board members indicated that their superintendent frequently directs

the operations. Table 10 reveals the opposite; the shared superintendent has a higher mean score than that of the single district superintendent when directing day-to-day operations. The shared superintendent perceives a higher degree of involvement in directing the day-to-day operations than does the shared superintendent's school board.

Research Question 4: How do Iowa shared and single district superintendents perceive their performance in the school board-superintendent working relationship?

To address Research Question 4, the school board members involved answered 18 research study questions. The null hypothesis stating that there is no significant difference in performance ratings by shared superintendents than single district superintendents regarding the ability of the school board to communicate with the superintendent to establish an effective working relationship should not be accepted. When reviewing the data, the mean for working relationships was not consistent between the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents. As indicated in Table 11, 11 of the 18 research study questions had a higher mean for the single district superintendents than for the shared superintendents.

When a 2-tailed t-test was used, there was a significant difference between the means of the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents for one research study item. As indicated by the responses of research study item 31, there was a significant difference between a single district superintendent and a shared superintendent on the superintendent research study when dealing with communication and board relationships.

Table 11. Superintendents' Mean Scores Working Relationships and Significance Levels

Question	Single District Mean	Shared District Mean	Assuming Equal Variances	Assuming Unequal Variances
17	4.65	4.43	.191	.194
18	4.65	4.29	.107	.129
19	4.50	4.29	.288	.284
20	3.96	3.90	.822	.823
21	3.50	3.52	.936	.937
22	3.27	3.43	.610	.608
23	3.58	3.52	.848	.846
24	3.92	3.71	.495	.493
25	4.35	4.52	.332	.329
26	4.58	4.38	.287	.295
27	4.73	4.52	.185	.200
28	4.77	4.62	.356	.364
29	4.27	3.95	.221	.233
30	3.81	3.90	.720	.728
31	4.54	4.86	.019	.016
32	4.38	4.52	.389	.400
33	4.19	4.11	.688	.672
34	4.19	4.53	.084	.070

Question 31 asked if sufficient information was provided to the school board to make good decisions. As indicated by the mean score responses of research study items 17, 18, 19,

20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, and 33, the perception of the communication skill of the shared superintendent was higher on average than that of the single district superintendent.

Research Question 5: What are the perceived performance levels of Iowa school board members and shared and single district superintendents in maintaining an effective working relationship?

To address Research Question 5, the school board members involved answered 13 research study items. The null hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the performance ratings by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the current “grade” of the school board and the superintendent relationship as scored by the school board should not be accepted. When reviewing the data the mean current grade given to the superintendent by the school board is not consistent between the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents. As indicated in Table 12, all of the 13 research study questions had a higher mean for the single district superintendents than for the shared superintendents.

When a t-test for equality of means was used there was a significant difference of $p < .050$ between the means of the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents. As indicated in Table 12 the responses of research study items 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, and 45 show a significant difference between a single district superintendent and a shared superintendent on the school board research study when addressing the current “grade” the board members gave to their current relationship. The perception of the current “grade” the board members gave their working relationship was much higher when they were working with single district superintendents than with shared superintendents.

Table 12. Board Members' Mean Scores for Current Superintendent Grade and Significance Levels

Question	Single District Mean	Shared District Mean	Assuming Equal Variances	Assuming Unequal Variances
34	4.40	4.03	.001	.001
35	4.41	4.00	.057	.066
36	4.13	3.88	.115	.125
37	4.20	4.00	.053	.063
38	3.95	3.69	.013	.016
39	4.24	3.92	.028	.034
40	4.34	4.06	.005	.007
41	4.40	4.05	.004	.005
42	3.99	3.62	.018	.023
43	4.28	3.97	.245	.245
44	3.75	3.60	.000	.000
45	4.07	3.56	.009	.012
46	4.45	4.10	.147	.140

These results are consistent with the findings for research question number two, which indicated that school board members of shared superintendents do not have as high a perceived quality of working relationship with the superintendent as do the school board members of single district superintendents.

Research Question 6: How do shared and single district superintendents and school boards differ in their perceptions of involvement and performance?

To address Research Question 6, the superintendents involved answered thirteen research study items. The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the performance ratings by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the current “grade” of the school board and the superintendent relationship as scored by the superintendent should not be accepted. This should not be accepted because when reviewing the data the mean current grade of the working relationship was not consistent between the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents. As indicated in Table 13, 11 of the 13 research study questions had a higher mean for the single district superintendents than for the shared district superintendents, indicating that the single district superintendents perceived their “current grade” of their working relationship to be higher than the shared district superintendent.

When a t-test for equality of means was used there was no significant difference between the means of the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents, but since the difference in the mean scores the hypothesis should not be accepted. There was no significant difference between single district superintendents and shared superintendents on the superintendent research study in the “grade” the superintendents gave to their current relationship.

The perception of the current “grade” the superintendents gave their working relationship was somewhat higher when working with a single district superintendent than with the shared superintendent.

Table 13. Superintendents' Mean Scores for Current Superintendent Grade and Significance Levels

Question	Single District Mean	Shared District Mean	Assuming Equal Variances	Assuming Unequal Variances
35	4.58	4.33	.252	.264
36	4.62	4.38	.226	.241
37	4.19	4.14	.794	.790
38	4.23	4.10	.496	.491
39	3.88	3.71	.440	.436
40	4.12	4.00	.612	.624
41	4.54	4.24	.134	.147
42	4.58	4.29	.130	.150
43	4.19	4.14	.821	.826
44	4.35	4.24	.570	.570
45	3.88	3.90	.934	.935
46	3.85	3.86	.961	.961
47	4.60	4.33	.174	.175

Summary

Results were presented from investigating the perceptions of shared Iowa superintendents and their school board members, compared to perceptions of single Iowa superintendents and their school board members, regarding their working relationships and educational governance. A total of 46 Iowa superintendents and 149 school board members completed the research study and participated in this research effort.

The findings indicate that there is a significantly different perception of the relationship between what the school boards perceive and what is perceived by the superintendents participating in this study. The findings also indicate that what single district superintendents perceive about their relationship and governance issues is different than what shared superintendents perceive about their relationship and governance issues with their school boards.

A number of data processing procedures were used to analyze the research data. Included was a set of descriptive statistics, which presented the means, and standard deviations of the scores. The results of t-test for equality of means were used to study the sources of variation of the scores.

Chapter V will review, analyze, and draw conclusions from the data and statistical outcomes presented in this chapter.

CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter five concludes this research study. The chapter is divided into four sections. The first section presents an overview of the study. The second section presents a summary and conclusions based on the findings. Section three presents the limitations in this study. The final section suggests and recommends possible future research.

Overview of the Study

As education continues to become more complex, strains are placed on school boards and administrators. There are no easy answers to deal with the complex educational issues and no responses adaptable to all times and places. The most promising direction for the future is in strengthening school board and superintendent working relationships.

Conflicts between superintendents and school boards existed as early as the early 1800s (Hale, 1988). Researchers have studied elements that were believed to contribute to the problems between the superintendents and school boards of today. Some findings point to a lack of understanding of what role the superintendent holds and what role the board holds. This lack of understanding promotes conflict. Other research suggests that disharmony in the school board-superintendent working relationship occurs when lack of planning ensues and goal setting is not incorporated. Many conflicts occur between the superintendent and the school board from the inability to differentiate between policy-making and administration (Smith, 1986).

The progression of the superintendent position has been filled with a series of conflicts and battles. Zachary (1988) illustrated this role by stating, "Many superintendents have felt like General Custer, surrounded in all directions by an army of critics, special

interest groups and political hacks” (p. 11). Superintendents who survive high-risk periods in a tenure develop conflict management skills that will carry them through the embattled times. Conflict resolution, professional relationship building, and problem-solving skills are part of the package that a superintendent needs to develop to have long-term success in a district (Iannaccone, 1981).

According to the report issued by the Task Force on School Governance (Twentieth Century Fund, 1992), school boards should be reconstituted to focus more on educational policy-making rather than day-to-day micromanagement tasks. The report suggested that school boards should concentrate on the “big picture” and stay out of day-to-day operations if they want to be perceived as legitimate and relevant.

The school board and the superintendent need to have a positive working relationship for the system to function smoothly. As in any marriage, the success of the union depends on the quality of the match. Many times the expected type of relationship of the school board and the superintendent is overlooked in the hiring process.

The focus of this study was to examine the various perspectives, differences, and similarities of the working relationships of both shared and single district superintendents and their school boards in matters of educational governance. This study examined the relationship between the congruence of the school board and shared and single district superintendent perceptions of their working relationship, their perceptions of their roles, how they exchange information, and the collaborative planning between the two entities.

The purposes of this study were threefold: (1) to examine what school board members perceive as their degree of involvement in the educational governance process pertaining to the performance of particular educational governance tasks, (2) to examine

what shared and single district superintendents perceive as their degree of involvement in the educational governance process as it pertains to the performance of particular educational governance tasks, and (3) to examine what school board members, and shared and single district superintendents, perceive as their own and each other performance ratings as they pertain to establishing and maintaining an effective working relationship.

This study examined the following questions regarding the perceived relationship between the school board and the superintendent by answering the following research questions.

1. How do Iowa school board members perceive their degree of involvement in performing educational governance tasks?
2. How do Iowa school board members perceive their performance in the school board-superintendent working relationship
3. How do Iowa shared and single district superintendents perceive their degree of involvement in performing particular educational governance tasks?
4. How do Iowa shared and single district superintendents perceive their performance in the school board-superintendent working relationship?
5. What are the perceived performance levels of Iowa school board members and shared and single district superintendents in maintaining an effective working relationship?
6. How do shared and single district superintendents and school boards differ in perceptions of involvement and performance?

This study examined the following hypotheses regarding the perceived degree of involvement of school board members and superintendents in performing educational

governance tasks and the perceived performance in establishing and maintaining an effective working relationship:

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the performance of educational governance tasks held by school board members who have a shared superintendent or a single district superintendent.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the perceptions of the performance of educational governance tasks held by a shared superintendent versus a single district superintendent.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the performance ratings given by the school board members of the ability of a shared superintendent to communicate with the school board to establish an effective working relationship versus a single district superintendent.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference in performance ratings by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the ability of the school board to communicate with the superintendent to establish an effective working relationship.

Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the performance ratings by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the current “grade” of the school board and the superintendent relationship as scored by the school board.

Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference in the performance ratings by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the current “grade” of

the school board and the superintendent relationship as scored by the superintendent.

The sample used in this study was randomly selected from the K-12 public school districts in Iowa. District superintendents and school board members participated in the study.

The instrument consisted of three parts. Part I consists of demographic and selected variables; Part II measures the educational governance; Part III measures the perceived working relationship that the superintendent has with the current school board.

The analysis procedures used in this study included a set of descriptive statistics, which presented the means and standard deviations of the scores. The results of t-test for equality of means were used to study the sources of variation of the scores.

Summary and Conclusions of the Findings

This section presents the findings that resulted from the analyses of the data.

A total of 68 superintendent research studies were sent, including 34 research studies to single district superintendents and 17 to shared superintendents, who were asked to respond to the research study separately for each of their two shared districts. The shared superintendents were asked to complete two research studies, one for each district for which they worked. Of the 68 research studies that were mailed out, 47 were returned, for a return rate of 69%. The single district superintendents had a return rate of 76%, with 26 research studies returned out of the 34 sent. The shared superintendents had a lower return rate of 62%, with 21 research studies returned out of the 34 sent.

An indication that the shared superintendents have more demand on their time is foreshadowed by the lower return rate of the research study by the shared superintendents.

The lower return rate may also be accounted for because the shared superintendents were asked to complete two research study forms, one for each district that they serve.

The statistics indicated that the superintendents participating in the study had served an average of 6-8 years as a superintendent in schools. The single district superintendents had served on average 3-5 years, while the shared superintendents on average had served longer, 9-11 years. The average number of years that a superintendent had served in the current district similarly fell into the 3-5 year span. The shared superintendents on average had served on the high end of the 3-5 year range in the current district.

The data indicated that the shared superintendents had served longer as a superintendent. The age of the superintendent was not asked on the research study but one could assume that the shared superintendents had more experience in the field and served as a shared superintendent after several years as an single-district superintendent. The idea of more experience prior to serving as a shared superintendent could explain the finding of serving as superintendent for a longer period of time.

The mean score of 1.98 for the education index variable indicates that the participants were functioning with an average educational base at the specialist degree level. The data indicate a substantial difference between the single and shared superintendents' mean education levels, with the single district superintendents averaging 1.88 and the shared superintendents averaging 2.21. This result indicated a higher mean level of education for the shared superintendents than for the single district superintendents.

Once again, the data on the length of time that the shared superintendents served indicates that they are more experienced. The shared superintendents have a higher degree of education, which would agree with the previous finding that the shared superintendents have

more superintendent experience. Shared superintendents' greater experience and higher education level will be considered when discussing the six hypotheses later in this chapter.

The data indicate that 23% of the single district superintendents were female and 19% of the shared superintendents are female. The findings did not indicate a large difference between the percentages of shared or single female superintendents. This small number of female superintendents mirrors what research says about few females entering into the superintendent profession.

The school board members had a lower return rate than the superintendents did. A total of 362 total research studies were sent, with 149 research studies returned, for a 41% return rate. Schools with a single district superintendent had a return rate of 47%, with 85 research studies being returned. Schools with a shared superintendent had a return rate of 35%, with 64 research studies returned. This discrepancy also points to the difference of perceptions held by shared and single district superintendents and their boards.

The statistical analysis indicated that school board members participating in the study had served an average of 3-5 years as a school board member. The single district superintendent board members had a higher serving average score (2.2) than did the shared superintendent board members (2.0). As Kinn's (1980) research indicated in chapter II, there is a lack of consensus between school board members and superintendents as to the role of the superintendent. If the school board members are new to the board and in a constant state of turnover more often for the shared superintendent than the single-district superintendent, then one has to ask how is the role of the shared superintendent or his/her board members to be developed and maintained?

A mean score of 2.19 for the variable education indicated that the participants were functioning with an average educational base at the level of an associate degree or vocational-technical degree. The results indicated little difference between the single and shared superintendent board members' degree of educational attainment, with the single district superintendent board members averaging 2.17 and the shared superintendent board members averaging 2.25. These results indicate a slightly higher average level of education for the shared superintendent board members than for the single district superintendent board members.

The data indicate that 52 of 149 school board members surveyed are female, having a 35% female population. The shared superintendents' board member percentage of females serving is 33%, with 21 of 64 indicating that they were female. The single district superintendents' board member percentage of females serving is 36%, with 31 of 85 indicating that they were female. This small discrepancy does not indicate a major difference in the gender make-up of the shared or single-district boards.

Null Hypothesis 1 (ACCEPTED): The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the performance of educational governance tasks held by school board members who have a shared superintendent or a single district superintendent was accepted. When reviewing the data the mean degree of involvement in performing educational governance tasks is consistent between the shared superintendent and the single district superintendents.

Board members do not significantly differ in their perceptions of the performance of educational governance tasks by a shared superintendent or by a single district superintendent. This provides evidence that the school boards perceive that both groups of

superintendents are performing the governance functions necessary to the district and indicates that regardless of whether the superintendent is shared or in a single district, governance services are provided at an acceptable level to meet the school boards needs.

As indicated in the review of literature the superintendent is the chief advisor to the board and has the following functions and duties as prescribed by the Iowa Association of School Boards:

Develop and recommend personnel policies necessary for efficient function of the school staff, provide information to the school board on vital matters pertaining to the school system, prepare and submit to the board a preliminary budget, recommend all candidates for employment, submit an annual report of the operation of the school system to the board (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2000, p. 50).

The finding that the shared superintendent has a high educational level and more years of experience would indicate that the shared board members would perceive that the shared superintendent would have the ability to perform the required governance task needed. As indicated by the data, many of the beginning superintendents will start their career in an unshared setting, learning the position prior to becoming a shared superintendent.

Null Hypothesis 2 (NOT ACCEPTED): The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the performance ratings given by the school board members of the ability of a shared superintendent to communicate with the school board to establish an effective working relationship versus a single district superintendent was not accepted. When reviewing the data the mean perception of an effective working relationship was not consistent between the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents. As

indicated by the mean of the responses to the research study, the perception of the communication skills of the single district superintendents was much higher than that of the shared superintendents.

Board members do differ significantly in their performance ratings given to their superintendents ability to communicate with the school board and to establish an effective working relationship. As indicated in the literature, Kinn (1980) also found that there was a lack of consensus between school board members and superintendents as to the role of the superintendent. In the areas of advice, trust, planning, communication, and providing information to the board and the public, the single district superintendents have a higher performance rating than that of the shared superintendents.

The research suggests that the single district superintendent would have more time to provide and build an effective working relationship with the board members. The research would also suggest that there is no correlation between the educational level and administrative experience when developing a working relationship. Benzinger (1987) summarized the school setting as a maze of needs and behaviors. How does a superintendent develop a working relationship with two boards with this type of setting? The data supports that it is much more difficult to negotiate that maze when dealing with two separate boards and their expectations. School board members in a single district have much higher regard for their superintendents than do the shared board members.

Null Hypothesis 3 (NOT ACCEPTED): The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the perceptions of the performance of educational governance tasks held by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents was not accepted. When reviewing the data the mean perception of governance tasks issues was not consistent

between the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents. All of the 12 research study questions had a higher mean for the shared superintendents than for the single district superintendents.

Superintendents also differ significantly in their perceptions of the performance of educational governance tasks held by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents. The majority of single district superintendents reflected that they provided more educational governance than did the shared superintendents. This finding is in direct conflict with the data from the school board members. As Smith (1986) indicated many conflicts occur between the superintendent and the school board due to the inability to differentiate between policy-making and administration. This data could be directly related to the inability to differentiate between these two areas.

The school board members perceived that the shared and single district superintendents provided nearly the same educational governance. Single district superintendents therefore seem to perceive themselves as being better "governors" of their districts. They have a better understanding of what their role is and how to achieve success in that role.

Null Hypothesis 4 (NOT ACCEPTED): The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in performance ratings by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the ability of the school board to communicate with the superintendent to establish an effective working relationship was not accepted. When reviewing the data the mean for working relationships was not consistent between the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents. Eleven of the 18 research study questions had a higher mean for the single district superintendents than for the shared superintendents.

Shared superintendents' perceptions differ significantly from those of single district superintendents, as indicated by the performance ratings ability of the school board to communicate with the superintendent to establish an effective working relationship. In the areas of advice, trust, planning, communication, and providing information, the single district superintendents give the board a higher performance rating than that of the shared superintendents. This is directly reflected in the literature by Bordwell (1993), he indicates that effective decision making is a critical aspect of the relationship with the board and that good decision builds upon trust, common vision, and good communication.

The research suggests that the single district superintendent would have more time to provide and build an effective working relationship. As McAdams (1996) indicated that collaborative is need with the board to develop an effective working relationship. Time is needed to collaborate effectively and develop that relationship. This provides evidence that single district superintendents perceive themselves to have a better working relationship with the school board.

The data for both the superintendents and the school board members indicate a shared perception that the single district superintendent has a better working relationship with the board than the shared superintendent does. The review of literature supports the idea that a working relationship must be developed and nurtured. The development of a quality working relationship takes time, which is limited for the shared superintendent.

Null Hypothesis 5 (NOT ACCEPTED): The null hypothesis that there was no significant difference in the performance ratings by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the current "grade" of the school board and the superintendent relationship as scored by the school board was not accepted. When reviewing the data the

mean current grade given to the board-superintendent relationship was not consistent between the shared and the single board members. All of the 13 research study questions had a higher mean for the single board-superintendent relationship than for the shared. The perception of the current “grade” the board members gave their working relationship was much higher when they are working with single district superintendents than with shared superintendents.

School board members differ significantly in the performance ratings of shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the current “grade” of their working relationship as scored by the school board. All of the data from the single school board members indicate that they “grade” their working relationship higher than do shared members. This correlates with the findings from the literature and hypothesis number two, indicating that a single district superintendent has a higher performance rating in the area of communication and working relationships.

This relationship is at the crux of the employment success of a superintendent. If the school board does not perceive a positive working relationship between themselves and their superintendent, it will be difficult for the superintendent to survive within the system. This finding is backed by the research review conducted with this study and by Zachary (1988) in his dissertation which indicates that the defined role of superintendent is a critical aspect for any school board. Each of the boards reflects their own communities and the needs of that district. This can pull the superintendent in two very different directions.

Null Hypothesis 6 (NOT ACCEPTED): The null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the performance ratings by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents of the current “grade” of the school board and the superintendent relationship

as scored by the superintendent was not accepted. When reviewing the data, the mean current grade of the working relationship was not consistent between the shared superintendents and the single district superintendents. Eleven of the 13 research study questions had a higher mean for the single district superintendents than for the shared superintendents. The perception of the current “grade” the superintendents gave their working relationship was somewhat higher when working as a single district superintendent than as the shared superintendent.

Superintendents also differed significantly in the performance ratings given by shared superintendents versus single district superintendents with regard to the current “grade” of the school board–superintendent relationship. Again this was consistent with the finding from hypothesis number four and is consistent with the literature. The generalizations Crawford (1972) made over twenty years ago still hold true, superintendent-school board conflicts will continue unless a positive relationship is established. The single district superintendents perceived that they had a better working relationship with their boards than did the shared superintendents.

The findings of this study are significant. Of the six null hypotheses, only one was retained. This study supports the reviewed literature in revealing that the working relationship that a school board and its superintendent create and foster is at least as important as the day-to-day governance tasks that are outlined in college textbooks.

However, it is important to note that both school board members and superintendents find both relationship-building and day-to-day governance to be more effective for the single district superintendent than the shared. It is in looking at the differences between the roles of

the single district superintendent versus the shared superintendent that this researcher must emphasize the importance of this study.

This study would also indicate that the colleges and universities are providing quality training in the area of educational governance, while at the same time working relationships training may need to be upgraded in the education preparation setting. The development or improvement of relationship training at the college or university level will help prepare both the shared and single district superintendent to understand better and relate to their future school boards. The use of positive relationship building classes or workshops offered for practicing superintendents or aspiring superintendents could benefit this working relationship. This requirement could become part of the licensure requirements for superintendents and a requirement to renew the superintendent license.

Another aspect this study impacts is how districts can and should make the decision about sharing superintendents. It is essential that school boards weigh all of the factors-both financial and political-in how sharing a superintendent can impact the district. They must ask themselves how will this superintendent work with each of the shared boards? Research indicates that building trust and understanding is a long-term process. If the shared school board tenure is less than a single district superintendent's school board tenure how can trust and understanding be built? How will this administrator meet the needs of both districts efficiently and effectively?

If a shared superintendent seems to be the right "fit" for two or more districts, how will the selection of this superintendent take place? Cochren (1994) explained that this process begins with the first handshake between the superintendent and hiring board. The selection of a superintendent is one of the most critical decisions that a school board can

make. If the superintendent is already employed in one district and then becomes shared, the new school board will have no input in the selection process.

In what way will relationship skill building be a part of the applicant review process? How will the boards and the superintendent make intentional plans to develop and continue to foster this working relationship? How long will this relationship withstand the impact of the day-to-day governance of two or more districts?

Iowa schools are facing a difficult time ahead with much of its leadership retiring over the next few years and the role of superintendent not becoming any more attractive to those who hold certificates in administration. It is a time of finance cuts and legislative turmoil. Schools must find a way to fill these positions and to provide the necessary tools to administrators and their school boards to find success.

It is in defining the roles of both superintendent and school board members and in the development of an outline to create and foster solid working relationships that we will help schools to alleviate the conflict and to find success in providing leadership in education. Regardless of whether a superintendent is shared with two or more districts or in a single district, it is important that those who prepare future superintendents look at the programs to determine if enough time is spent on helping administrators to develop the relationship-building skills as outlined in this study. The key stakeholders in education need to redefine the training that all superintendents and their board members need in order to be the visionaries that school systems have come to expect.

Limitations of the Study

Limitations are inevitable in any study even when attempts are made to minimize them as much as possible. Those, in this study are discussed below. This study included both internal and external variables which can affect the results of this study.

Behavioral studies, such as this one, deal with concepts that are sometimes hard to place a value on. The subject matter with which this study deals does not have an absolute cause/effect relationship. The researcher can only interpret the data obtained from the participants that returned the research study. A researcher cannot be certain that participants accurately interpreted research study questions. School board members and superintendents may have interpreted the directions differently.

The population was limited to subjects only in the state of Iowa, and limited to only public school districts. All school board members were sent a research study instrument, but some districts had only a few school board members that returned the research study. This may cause the data to be weighed differently for some districts. Additionally, the research study was sent out only at one time of the year and perceptions may vary from one time of the year to another.

Implications for Future Research

This section describes the implications of this study for future research. Maintaining and nurturing the school board-superintendent relationship is extremely important in the development of effective educational systems. It would seem that the harmony that exists in the relationship could influence the quality of the system as a whole. The relationship should be studied further to help identify other variables that might help school boards and shared superintendents develop a more harmonious relationship.

It will be extremely important for shared superintendents and their boards to be conscious of the effort that will need to be made to maintain a positive on-going working relationship. Since both the shared superintendent and shared superintendent's school boards perceive that they have a less positive working relationship than that of a single district superintendent, this is an area where future research would be needed.

Open communication, trust, advice, shared planning, and providing information to the board are key characteristics that should be studied further to offer insight as to how they affect the working relationship between the school board and the shared superintendent. Additionally it is important to study how these key areas are being developed through the training of our superintendents. What are ways that Area Education Agencies, colleges, universities, the Iowa Association of School Boards, and School Administrators of Iowa can offer and train both board members and superintendents in developing a positive working relationship? Is it currently being addressed?

Additional research needs to be conducted in looking at how superintendents are being reviewed during the application process. Are the key relationship-building characteristics evaluated during a "typical" superintendent hiring process? How are these characteristics identified and evaluated? A key aspect of sharing a superintendent is when is the superintendent hired? Is the superintendent already working in one of the districts and then becomes shared, or are the two districts hiring the superintendent together? As stated earlier in the research, the hiring process is an important aspect of the relationship between the school board and superintendent. If a district is denied this process, what effect does that have on the working relationship?

This study should also be offered to other states. Would the variables found significant in this study be found important with other states' samples? Would the results be the same if the research study results compared one school board to the other school board of a shared superintendent? Does it make any significant difference in the working relationship where the superintendent resides?

The information from these additional studies would offer further insight into the school board/superintendent working relationship. Additional studies could also offer information for additional training needed for school boards and superintendents.

If the school board hires a single district superintendent or decides to share a superintendent with another district, the school board members and superintendents must be willing to accept that there may be differences in the working relationship established. In knowing that there are significant differences, the two parties can begin to explore issues and alternatives through communication and developing a common understanding for the situation. This will ensure a greater probability of finding the best answer and for providing the best educational system possible through the most productive working relationship, shared or unshared.

Appendix A: Iowa State University Professors Participating in Validity Test.

Dr. William K. Poston, Jr., EL&PS, N229 Lagomarcino Hall, ISU, Ames, IA 50011-3195

Dr. Fenwick English, EL&PS, N229 Lagomarcino Hall, ISU, Ames, IA 50011-3195

Dr. Betty Steffy, EL&PS, N244 Lagomarcino Hall ISU, Ames, IA 50011-3195

Dr. Russ Mullen, Agronomy, 1126 Agronomy Hall, ISU, Ames 50011-1010

Dr. Tony Netusil, 1817 Roosevelt Ave., Ames, 50010

Lt. Col. Herbert D. Strasser, 3319 Ross Rd., Ames, 50014)

Dr. Howard Shapiro, Vice Provost, 107 Beardshear Hall, ISU, Ames, 50011-2021

Dr. William Summers, Horticulture, 251 Hort, ISU, Ames, 50011-1100

Dr. Keith Whigham, Agronomy, 2104 Agron Hall, ISU, Ames, 50011-1010

Dr. Sande McNabb, 1232 Wisconsin Ave., Ames, 50014

Appendix B: Validity Letter.

December 26, 2000

Dear Dr. ,

Your help is needed to establish content validity an instrument to measure the perceptions Iowa superintendents and school board members regarding working relationships and governance. Your assistance would be an important part of my dissertation for the PhD degree at Iowa State University.

This instrument is being content validated with a panel of Iowa State University professors. I am targeting professors that have worked with school boards and superintendents in Iowa and have background knowledge of the relationships between the two groups. If you are willing to help, please read each task item and determine if the task item should be included in the instrument according to the following rating scale:

- A. The task item is an essential measure of the educational governance functions or the school board-superintendent working relationship.
- B. The task item is useful, but not essential as a measure of the educational governance functions or the school board-superintendent working relationship.
- C. The task item is not necessary as a measure of the educational governance functions or the school board-superintendent working relationship.

A rating sheet has been superimposed on the instrument for your convenience. Please mark your rating directly on the instrument provided. This researcher makes no claim that the listing of task items is inclusive of all aspects, duties, and responsibilities of the school board member and/or superintendent. The major area of concern is that the particular governance task items and the school board-superintendent working relationship items are an appropriate measure of the degree of involvement.

Enclosed are the following items: (1) one copy of the Superintendent Form (yellow color), (2) one copy of the School Board Member Form (salmon color), and a self addressed stamped enveloped. **Please mark directly on the instrument.** Please feel free to make any suggestions on its construction in terms of clarity, redundancy, and appropriateness.

Thank you for assisting me in the validity testing of my Governance Relationships Assessment Instrument. Please return in the provided envelope.

Energetically,

Steve Oberg
PhD Candidate, Educational Administration
Iowa State University

Appendix C: Validity Research Study.

**Perceptions Iowa Superintendents and School Board Members
Regarding Their Working Relationships and Educational Governance**

Superintendent Member Form

Purpose: In school districts throughout the State of Iowa, there are many perceptions about how the school board and superintendent relate to each other. The purpose of this instrument is to obtain measurements on the perceived degree of relationships that the school board member has with the superintendent.

Part I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

General Instructions: Mark all responses directly on the instrument. Use a No. 2 lead pencil for marking. Please select only one response for each question. The choices immediately follow the question. Please do not leave any item blank. Do not sign your name in order to ensure anonymity.

1. How many total years have you served as a superintendent as of October 1, 2000 including this current year?

Years served as superintendent _____ years
 Years served as superintendent in current district _____ years
 Years served as a shared superintendent in current districts . _____ years
A B C

2. What is your highest level of attained formal education?

- A. Master's degree from an accredited college or university including valid superintendent certificate.
- B. Master's degree plus additional graduate hours
- C. Doctoral degree from an accredited college or university

3. Gender (please circle) Female Male A B C
A B C

Please continue to the next page.

Part II. PERCEPTION OF THE DEGREE OF INVOLVMENT BY THE SCHOOL BOARD IN PERFORMING EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE TASKS

General Instructions: Mark all responses directly on this sheet. Use a No. 2 lead pencil for marking. Please select only one response for each question. Please do not leave any item blank. Do not sign your name in order to ensure anonymity.

Task Instructions: The following questions deal with a task performed by the superintendent with no input from the school board. Please circle the response which best describes your school district.

1 = Never 2 = Infrequently 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Almost Always

1. Issue regulations and directives necessary to carry out board policy.....1 2 3 4 5
A B C
2. Ensure the development of an adequate district-wide personnel evaluation system.
.....1 2 3 4 5
A B C
3. Direct the school district's day to day operations.1 2 3 4 5
A B C
4. Supervise appropriate programs for management training and staff development.
.....1 2 3 4 5
A B C
5. Maintain final legal control over the budget.1 2 3 4 5
A B C
6. Determine what items will be included on the school board meeting agenda.
.....1 2 3 4 5
A B C
7. Appoint people to serve on various citizen advisory committees.....1 2 3 4 5
A B C
8. Hire school professional staff and teachers.1 2 3 4 5
A B C
9. Decide which educational programs to approve, eliminate, or modify.....1 2 3 4 5
A B C
10. Maintain adequate safeguards against the misuse of funds.1 2 3 4 5
A B C
11. Establish an annual district budget in tune with district mission.1 2 3 4 5
A B C
12. Evaluate the educational programs in the district.1 2 3 4 5
A B C

Part III. PERCEPTION OF THE WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THE SUPERINTENDENT

General Instructions: Mark all responses directly on this sheet. Use a No. 2 lead pencil for marking. Please select only one response for each question. Please do not leave any item blank. Do not sign your name in order to ensure anonymity.

Task Instructions: The following questions deal with developing a relationship with the superintendent. Please circle the response which best describes your school district.

1 = Never 2 = Infrequently 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Almost Always

1. It is easy to give advice to the school board. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
2. I feel that I can trust the school board. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
3. The information I receive from the school board is accurate. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
4. The board and superintendent jointly develop district objectives. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
5. Time lines are set for planning. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
6. Goals and objectives are clearly set for the superintendent by the school board. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
7. The board clearly defines the roles and expectations that they have for the superintendent. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
8. The board evaluates the superintendent on the defined roles and expectations. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
9. I feel that board members understand the information they receive from the superintendent.
1 2 3 4 5
A B C
10. It is easy for school board members to talk openly in the school board meeting. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
11. Communication between the school board and the superintendent is open. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
12. I feel comfortable talking to the school board members. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
13. Programs to improve the school district include planning. 1 2 3 4 5
A B C
14. Improvement programs include a careful assessment of results. 1 2 3 4 5

.....1 2 3 4 5
A B C
 32. The ability of the superintendent to demonstrate leadership in developing community links.

.....1 2 3 4 5
A B C

Task Instructions: In your opinion, what is the basic nature of the relationship between the superintendent and the school board in your district?

- | | | | | |
|-------|-----------|----------|----------|----------|
| _____ | Excellent | A | B | C |
| _____ | Good | | | |
| _____ | Fair | | | |
| _____ | Poor | | | |
| _____ | Very Poor | | | |

Task Instructions: List one or two items that could be done to improve or maintain the working relationship between the superintendent and the school board in your district?

A B C

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Appendix D: Single District Superintendent Pilot Letter.

Iowa State University
March 12, 2001

Dear Ms. ,

Your help is needed in the pilot testing of my Governance Relationships Assessment Instrument. Your assistance would be an important part of my dissertation for the PhD degree at Iowa State University.

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this research study. Expected benefits of this research study include a greater understanding of the relationship between a superintendent and the school board, which may include professional training activities that develop from this study.

General Instructions:

- Mark all responses on the NCS-Answer Sheet.
- Use a No. 2 lead pencil for marking; do not use ink or ballpoint pens.
- Make heavy black marks that fill the circle completely.
- Erase cleanly any answer you wish to change.
- Make no stray marks on the answer sheet.
- Please select only one response for each question.
- The choices immediately follow the question.
- Please do not leave any item blank.

At any time you may withdraw from this study and discontinue participation in the project without prejudice to the subject (45 CFR 46.116). All data that is provided will be kept confidential in regard to specific individuals. Project completion time for this research study is 15 minutes. Do not sign your name, to ensure anonymity, numbers are included on the research study to determine non-respondents.

Enclosed are the following items: (1) one copy of the Superintendent Form and NCS answer sheet (red), (2) five copies of the School Board Member Form and NCS answer sheets (blue), and a self addressed stamped enveloped. Please complete the superintendent form and have your school board members each complete a form. **Please collect all forms and return in the enclosed self-addressed stamped enveloped.** Please do not bend the answer sheets.

If you have any questions or concerns about this procedure or study please contact:
Steve Oberg at (712) 882-2687 or e-mail address: soberg@maple-valley.k12.ia.us Thank you for assisting me in the pilot testing of my Governance Relationships Assessment Instrument.

Energetically,

Steve Oberg
PhD Candidate, Educational Administration

Appendix E: Shared District Superintendent Pilot Letter.

Iowa State University
March 12, 2001

Dear Mr. ,

Your help is needed in the pilot testing of my Governance Relationships Assessment Instrument. Your assistance would be an important part of my dissertation for the PhD degree at Iowa State University.

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this research study. Expected benefits of this research study include a greater understanding of the relationship between a superintendent and the school board, which may include professional training activities that develop from this study.

General Instructions:

- Mark all responses on the NCS-Answer Sheet.
- Use a No. 2 lead pencil for marking; do not use ink or ballpoint pens.
- Make heavy black marks that fill the circle completely.
- Erase cleanly any answer you wish to change.
- Make no stray marks on the answer sheet.
- Please select only one response for each question.
- The choices immediately follow the question.
- Please do not leave any item blank.

At any time you may withdraw from this study and discontinue participation in the project without prejudice to the subject (45 CFR 46.116). All data that is provided will be kept confidential in regard to specific individuals. Project completion time for this research study is 15 minutes. Do not sign your name, to ensure anonymity, numbers are included on the research study to determine non-respondents.

Enclosed are the following items: (1) two copies of the Superintendent Form and NCS answer sheet (red), (2) fourteen copies of the School Board Member Form and NCS answer sheets (blue), and a self addressed stamped enveloped. Please complete the two superintendent forms (one for each district) and have your school board members each complete a form. **Please collect all forms and return in the enclosed self-addressed stamped enveloped.** Please do not bend the answer sheets.

If you have any questions or concerns about this procedure or study please contact: Steve Oberg at (712) 882-2687 or e-mail address: soberg@maple-valley.k12.ia.us Thank you for assisting me in the pilot testing of my Governance Relationships Assessment Instrument.

Energetically,

Steve Oberg
PhD Candidate, Educational Administration

Appendix F: Single District Superintendent Research Study Letter.

Iowa State University

April 24, 2001

Dear Ms. ,

Your help is needed to obtain responses to measure the perceptions Iowa superintendents and school board members regarding working relationships and governance. Your assistance would be an important part of my dissertation for the PhD degree at Iowa State University.

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this research study. Expected benefits of this research study include a greater understanding of the relationship between a superintendent and the school board, which may include professional training activities that develop from this study.

General Instructions:

Mark all responses on the NCS-Answer Sheet.

Use a No. 2 lead pencil for marking; do not use ink or ballpoint pens.

Make heavy black marks that fill the circle completely.

Erase cleanly any answer you wish to change.

Make no stray marks on the answer sheet.

Please select only one response for each question.

The choices immediately follow the question.

Please do not leave any item blank.

At any time you may withdraw from this study and discontinue participation in the project without prejudice to the subject (45 CFR 46.116). All data that is provided will be kept confidential in regard to specific individuals. Project completion time for this research study is 15 minutes. Do not sign your name, to ensure anonymity, numbers are included on the research study to determine non-respondents.

Enclosed are the following items: (1) one superintendent envelope containing a copy of the Superintendent Form and NCS answer sheet (red), (2) five labeled envelopes containing copies of the School Board Member Form and an NCS answer sheets (blue), (3) a large self addressed stamped enveloped. Please complete the superintendent form and have each of your school board members complete a form and seal their answer sheet in the provided envelope. **Please collect all forms/envelopes and return in the self-addressed stamped enveloped.** Please do not bend the answer sheets.

If you have any questions or concerns about this procedure or study please contact: Steve Oberg at (712) 882-2687 or e-mail address: soberg@maple-valley.k12.ia.us Thank you for assisting me in my data collection of my Governance Relationships Assessment.

Energetically,

Steve Oberg
PhD Candidate, Educational Administration
Iowa State University

Appendix G: Shared District Superintendent Research Study Letter.

April 24, 2001

Dear Mr. ,

Your help is needed to obtain responses to measure the perceptions Iowa superintendents and school board members regarding working relationships and governance. Your assistance would be an important part of my dissertation for the PhD degree at Iowa State University.

There are no foreseeable risks associated with this research study. Expected benefits of this research study include a greater understanding of the relationship between a superintendent and the school board, which may include professional training activities that develop from this study.

General Instructions:

- Mark all responses on the NCS-Answer Sheet.
- Use a No. 2 lead pencil for marking; do not use ink or ballpoint pens.
- Make heavy black marks that fill the circle completely.
- Erase cleanly any answer you wish to change.
- Make no stray marks on the answer sheet.
- Please select only one response for each question.
- The choices immediately follow the question.
- Please do not leave any item blank.

At any time you may withdraw from this study and discontinue participation in the project without prejudice to the subject (45 CFR 46.116). All data that is provided will be kept confidential in regard to specific individuals. Project completion time for this research study is 15 minutes. Do not sign your name, to ensure anonymity, numbers are included on the research study to determine non-respondents.

Enclosed are the following items: (1) one superintendent envelope containing a copy of the Superintendent Form and two NCS answer sheets (red), (2) fourteen labeled envelopes containing copies of the School Board Member Form and an NCS answer sheets (blue), (3) a large self addressed stamped enveloped. Please complete the two superintendent forms (one for each district) and have each of your school board members complete a form and seal their answer sheet in the provided envelope. **Please collect all forms/envelopes and return in the self-addressed stamped enveloped.** Please do not bend the answer sheets.

If you have any questions or concerns about this procedure or study please contact: Steve Oberg at (712) 882-2687 or e-mail address: soberg@maple-valley.k12.ia.us Thank you for assisting me in my data collection of my Governance Relationships Assessment.

Energetically,

Steve Oberg
PhD Candidate, Educational Administration
Iowa State University

Appendix H: Superintendent Reminder Letter.

Iowa State University

May 25, 2001

Dear Superintendents,

The school year is fast approaching the end for some of us and for others it may already be over. This is a quick reminder to have your school boards complete the research study that was sent out about a month ago.

This research study will be used to analyze the working relationships between a single district superintendent and that of a shared superintendent. Please take time to complete the superintendent's research study and have your board members do the same.

If you have already mailed the research study and I have not received it yet – I thank you. If you have questions please feel free to e-mail or call me.

Energetically,

Steve Oberg
PhD Candidate, Educational Administration
Iowa State University

Appendix I: Superintendent Research Study Form.

**Perceptions of Iowa Superintendents and School Board Members
Regarding Their Working Relationships and Educational Governance**

Superintendent Form

General Instructions:

- Mark all responses on the NCS-Answer Sheet.
- Use a No. 2 lead pencil for marking, do not use ink or ballpoint pens.
- Make heavy black marks that fill the circle completely.
- Erase cleanly any answer you wish to change.
- Make no stray marks on the answer sheet.
- Please select only one response for each question.
- The choices immediately follow the question.
- Please do not leave any item blank.
- Please do not bend the NCS answer sheet

If you have any questions or concerns about this procedure or study please contact:
Steve Oberg at (712) 882-2687 or e-mail address: soberg@maple-valley.k12.ia.us

Part I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. How many years have you served as a superintendent as of October 1, 2000, including this current year?
 1. 1-2 Years
 2. 3-5 Years
 3. 6-8 Years
 4. 9-11 Years
 5. Over 11 Years

2. How many years have you served as a superintendent in your current district as of October 1, 2000, including this current year?
 1. 1-2 Years
 2. 3-5 Years
 3. 6-8 Years
 4. 9-11 Years
 5. Over 11 Years

3. What is your highest level of attained formal education?
 1. Master's degree from an accredited college or university including valid superintendent certificate.
 2. Master's degree plus additional graduate hours
 3. Doctoral degree from an accredited college or university

4. Gender
 1. Female
 2. Male

**Part II. PERCEPTION OF THE DEGREE OF INVOLVMENT BY THE SCHOOL BOARD
IN PERFORMING EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE TASKS**

Task Instructions: The following questions deal with tasks performed by the superintendent with no input from the school board. Please circle the response that best describes your school district.

1 = Never 2 = Infrequently 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Almost Always

5. Issues regulations and directives necessary to carry out board policy. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Ensures the development of an adequate district-wide personnel evaluation system. 1 2 3 4 5
7. Directs the school district's day-to-day operations. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Initiates appropriate programs for management training and staff development. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Maintains final legal control over the budget. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Determines what items will be included on the school board meeting agenda. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Appoints people to serve on various citizen advisory committees. 1 2 3 4 5
12. Hires school professional staff and teachers. 1 2 3 4 5
13. Decides which educational programs to approve, eliminate, or modify. ... 1 2 3 4 5
14. Maintains adequate safeguards against the misuse of funds. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Establishes an annual district budget in tune with district mission. 1 2 3 4 5
16. Evaluates the educational programs in the district. 1 2 3 4 5

Part III. PERCEPTION OF THE WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THE SUPERINTENDENT

Task Instructions: The following questions deal with developing a relationship with the superintendent. Please circle the response that best describes your school district.

1 = Never 2 = Infrequently 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Almost Always

17. It is easy to give advice to the school board. 1 2 3 4 5
18. I believe that I can trust the school board. 1 2 3 4 5
19. The information I receive from the school board is accurate. 1 2 3 4 5
20. The board and superintendent jointly develop district objectives. 1 2 3 4 5
21. Time lines are set for planning. 1 2 3 4 5
22. Goals and objectives are clearly set for the superintendent by the school board. 1 2 3 4 5
23. The board clearly defines the roles and expectations that they have for the superintendent. 1 2 3 4 5
24. The board evaluates the superintendent on the defined roles and expectations. 1 2 3 4 5
25. I believe that board members understand the information they receive from the superintendent. 1 2 3 4 5
26. It is easy for school board members to talk openly in the school board meeting. 1 2 3 4 5
27. Communication between the school board and the superintendent is open. 1 2 3 4 5
28. I am comfortable discussing issues with the school board members. 1 2 3 4 5
29. Educational programs to improve the school district include planning. 1 2 3 4 5
30. Improvement programs include a careful assessment of results. 1 2 3 4 5
31. Sufficient information is provided to the school board to make good decisions. 1 2 3 4 5
32. Communication between the superintendent and the community is open. 1 2 3 4 5

- 33. The general public feels at ease talking to the superintendent..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 34. The general public trusts the superintendent..... 1 2 3 4 5

Task Instructions: Please indicate what "grade" your current school board and superintendent would receive as described in the following statements. The grades correspond to the following system:

1 = Failing 2 = Poor 3 = Average or Fair 4 = Very Good 5 = Excellent

- 35. The ability of the school board to develop trust with the superintendent... 1 2 3 4 5
- 36. The ability of the superintendent to develop trust with the school board... 1 2 3 4 5
- 37. The ability of the school board to develop a shared vision with the superintendent..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 38. The ability of the superintendent to develop a shared vision with the school board..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 39. Ability of the school board to develop clearly established roles and expectations for the superintendent. 1 2 3 4 5
- 40. The ability of the superintendent to accomplish the clearly established roles and expectations set forth by the school board. 1 2 3 4 5
- 41. Ability of the school board to communicate with the superintendent to establish an effective working relationship. 1 2 3 4 5
- 42. Ability of the superintendent to communicate with the school board to establish an effective working relationship..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 43. The ability of the school board to demonstrate leadership in governing the school district..... 1 2 3 4 5
- 44. The ability of the superintendent to demonstrate leadership in governing the school district. 1 2 3 4 5
- 45. The ability of the school board to demonstrate leadership in developing community links. 1 2 3 4 5
- 46. The ability of the superintendent to demonstrate leadership in developing community links. 1 2 3 4 5
- 46. In your opinion, what is the current working relationship between the superintendent and the school board in your district? 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Appendix J: School Board Member Research Study Form.

**Perceptions of Iowa Superintendents and School Board Members
Regarding Their Working Relationships and Educational Governance**

School Board Member Form

General Instructions:

- Mark all responses on the NCS-Answer Sheet.
- Use a No. 2 lead pencil for marking, do not use ink or ballpoint pens.
- Make heavy black marks that fill the circle completely.
- Erase cleanly any answer you wish to change.
- Make no stray marks on the answer sheet.
- Please select only one response for each question.
- The choices immediately follow the question.
- Please do not leave any item blank.
- Please do not bend the NCS answer sheet.

If you have any questions or concerns about this procedure or study please contact:
Steve Oberg at (712) 882-2687 or e-mail address: soberg@maple-valley.k12.ia.us

Part I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. How many years have you served as a public school board member as of October 1, 2000, including the current school year?
 1. 1-2 Years
 2. 3-5 Years
 3. 6-8 Years
 4. 9-11 Years
 5. Over 11 Years

2. What is your highest level of attained formal education?
 1. High school diploma or GED
 2. Associate's degree or vocational-technical school degree
 3. Bachelor's degree
 4. Master's degree
 5. Doctoral degree

3. Gender
 1. Female
 2. Male

Part II. PERCEPTIONS OF THE DEGREE OF INVOLVEMENT BY THE SCHOOL BOARD IN PERFORMING EDUCATIONAL GOVERNANCE TASKS

Task Instructions: The following questions deal with a task performed by the superintendent with no input from the school board. Please circle the response that best describes your school district.

1 = Never 2 = Infrequently 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Almost Always

4. Issues regulations and directives necessary to carry out board policy 1 2 3 4 5
5. Ensures the development of an adequate district-wide personnel evaluation system. 1 2 3 4 5
6. Directs the school district's day-to-day operations..... 1 2 3 4 5
7. Initiates appropriate programs for management training and staff development. 1 2 3 4 5
8. Maintains final legal control over the budget. 1 2 3 4 5
9. Determines what items will be included on the school board meeting agenda. 1 2 3 4 5
10. Appoints people to serve on various citizen advisory committees. 1 2 3 4 5
11. Hires school professional staff and teachers. 1 2 3 4 5
12. Decides which educational programs to approve, eliminate, or modify. ... 1 2 3 4 5
13. Maintains adequate safeguards against the misuse of funds..... 1 2 3 4 5
14. Establishes an annual district budget in tune with district mission. 1 2 3 4 5
15. Evaluates the educational programs in the district..... 1 2 3 4 5

Part III. PERCEPTIONS OF THE WORKING RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS AND THE SUPERINTENDENT

Task Instructions: The following questions deal with developing a relationship with the superintendent. Please circle the response that best describes your school district.

1 = Never 2 = Infrequently 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Almost Always

16. It is easy to take advice from the superintendent 1 2 3 4 5
17. I believe that I can trust the superintendent. 1 2 3 4 5
18. The information I receive from the superintendent is accurate..... 1 2 3 4 5
19. The board and superintendent jointly develop district objectives..... 1 2 3 4 5
20. Time lines are set for planning..... 1 2 3 4 5
21. Goals and objectives are clearly understood by all board members. 1 2 3 4 5
22. The board clearly defines the roles and expectations that they have
for the superintendent..... 1 2 3 4 5
23. The board evaluates the superintendent on the defined roles and
expectations. 1 2 3 4 5
24. I believe that board members understand the information they receive from
the superintendent. 1 2 3 4 5
25. As a board member, it is easy to talk openly in the school board
meeting..... 1 2 3 4 5
26. Communication between the school board and the superintendent is
open. 1 2 3 4 5
27. I am comfortable discussing issues with the superintendent. 1 2 3 4 5
28. Educational programs to improve the school district include planning. 1 2 3 4 5
29. Improvement programs include a careful assessment of results. 1 2 3 4 5
30. Sufficient information is provided by the superintendent to make
good decisions. 1 2 3 4 5
31. Communication between the superintendent and the community is
open. 1 2 3 4 5

32. The general public feels at ease talking to the superintendent..... 1 2 3 4 5

33. The general public trusts the superintendent..... 1 2 3 4 5

Task Instructions: Please indicate what "grade" your current school board and superintendent would receive as described in the following statements. The grades correspond to the following system:

1 = Failing 2 = Poor 3 = Average or Fair 4 = Very Good 5 = Excellent

34. The ability of the school board to develop trust with the superintendent... 1 2 3 4 5

35. The ability of the superintendent to develop trust with the school board... 1 2 3 4 5

36. The ability of the school board to develop a shared vision with the superintendent..... 1 2 3 4 5

37. The ability of the superintendent to develop a shared vision with the school board..... 1 2 3 4 5

38. The ability of the school board to develop clearly established roles and expectations for the superintendent. 1 2 3 4 5

39. The ability of the superintendent to accomplish the clearly established roles and expectations set forth by the school board. 1 2 3 4 5

40. The ability of the school board to communicate with the superintendent to establish an effective working relationship. 1 2 3 4 5

41. The ability of the superintendent to communicate with the school board to establish an effective working relationship. 1 2 3 4 5

42. The ability of the school board to demonstrate leadership in governing the school district..... 1 2 3 4 5

43. The ability of the superintendent to demonstrate leadership in governing the school district. 1 2 3 4 5

44. The ability of the school board to demonstrate leadership in developing community links. 1 2 3 4 5

45. The ability of the superintendent to demonstrate leadership in developing community links. 1 2 3 4 5

47. In your opinion, what is the current working relationship between the superintendent and the school board in your district?..... 1 2 3 4 5

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Appendix K: Human Subjects Form.

IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY¹¹⁸
OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Human Subjects Research Office
221 Beardshear Hall
Ames, IA 50011
515/294-4566
FAX: 515/294-8000

DATE: March 15, 2001

TO: Steve Oberg

FROM: Janell Meldrem, IRB Administrator

RE: "Perceptions of Iowa superintendents and school board members regarding their working relationships and educational governance" IRB ID 01-435

TYPE OF APPLICATION: New Project Continuing Review Modification

The project, "Perceptions of Iowa superintendents and school board members regarding their working relationships and educational governance" has been approved for one year from its IRB approval date 3/13/01. University policy and Federal regulations (45 CFR 46) require that all research involving human subjects be reviewed by the Institutional Review Board (IRB) on a continuing basis at intervals appropriate to the degree of risk, but at least once per year.

Any modification of this research project must be submitted to the IRB for prior review and approval. Modifications include but are not limited to: changing the protocol or study procedures, changing investigators or sponsors (funding sources), changing the Informed Consent Document, an increase in the total number of subjects anticipated, or adding new materials (e.g., letters, advertisements, questionnaires).

You must promptly report any of the following to the IRB: (1) all serious and/or unexpected adverse experiences involving risks to subjects or others; and (2) any other unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others.

You are expected to make sure that all key personnel who are involved in human subjects research complete training prior to their interactions with human subjects. Web based training is available from our web site.

Ten months from the IRB approval, you will receive a letter notifying you that the expiration date is approaching. At that time, you will need to fill out a Continuing Review Form and return it to the Human Subjects Research Office. If the project is, or will be finished in one year, you will need to fill out a Project Closure Form to officially end the project.

Both of these forms are on the Human Subjects Research Office web site at:
<http://grants-svr.admin.iastate.edu/VPR/humansubjects.html>.

Iowa State University Human Subjects Review Form

OFFICE USE ONLY
EXPEDITED FULL COMMITTEE ID#

PI Name Oberg Title Perceptions of Iowa Superintendents and School Board Members Regarding Their Working Relationships and Educational Governance.

Checklist for Attachments

The following are attached (please check):

- 13. [X] Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:
a) the purpose of the research
b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #'s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see item 18)
c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research
d) if applicable, the location of the research activity
e) how you will ensure confidentiality
f) in a longitudinal study, when and how you will contact subjects later
g) that participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject
14. [] A copy of the consent form (if applicable)
15. [] Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)
16. [X] Data-gathering instruments

17. Anticipated dates for contact with subjects:

First contact
March 1, 2001
Month/Day/Year

Last contact
June 15, 2001
Month/Day/Year

18. If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased:

January 1, 2002
Month/Day/Year

19. Signature of Departmental Executive Officer

Date

Department or Administrative Unit

[Handwritten signature]

3/1/01

EC PS

20. Initial action by the Institutional Review Board (IRB):

[] Project approved

[] Pending Further Review

[] Project not approved

[] No action required

Date

Date

Date

21. Follow-up action by the IRB:

Project approved []

Project not approved

Project not resubmitted

Date

Date

Patricia M. Keith
Name of IRB Chairperson

3-13-01
Approval Date

[Handwritten signature]
Signature of IRB Chairperson

REFERENCES CITED

- Alexander, K., & Alexander, M. D. (1985). American public school law (2nd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing.
- Anstey, M. (1993). Information: The key to better relationships. (Monograph Series No. 4). Cumberland, IA: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.
- Barney, R. (1993). Board decision-making processes are enhanced and empowered by using a district-wide vertical team. (Monograph Series No. 4). Monticello, Iowa: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.
- Benzinger, T. L. (1987). The relationship of school board members' common perception of ideal superintendent leadership behavior to their present superintendent's work motivation. Doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Besculides, G. (1999). Caring for ourselves. School Administrator, 56 (2), 34-36.
- Bordwell, R. (1993). Ensuring long-term communication and information flow within and between the board of education and superintendent of schools. (Monograph Series No. 4). Washington, Iowa: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.
- Bratlie, R. (1992, March). Shared superintendent: A good idea? Paper presented at the International Rural and Small Schools Conference, Grand Forks, ND.
- Brubaker, D. (1995). The disposable superintendent. Executive Educator, 17 (2), 16-18.
- Callahan, R. E. (1962). The American board of education, 1789-1960. In P. J. Cistone (Ed.), Understanding school boards. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
- Cochren, J. (1994). Selecting a superintendent: A leader or an implementor? Unpublished manuscript.
- Council, B. (1994). Steer a steady course. American School Board Journal, 181 (1), 25-27.
- Crawford, G. J. (1972). Conflict in the board member – superintendent relationship: A case study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Daeschner, S. (1993). The key to board of education and superintendent communication. (Monograph Series No. 4). Cedar Rapids, IA: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.

Danzberger, J. P. (1992). Background paper on school boards: A troubled American institution. In The Twentieth Century Fund, Facing the challenge: The report of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on School Governance. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund Press.

Davis, T. (1993). Service-oriented, student-centered approach will help schools gain community credibility. (Monograph Series No. 4). Urbandale, IA: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.

Decker, Robert H., McCumsey, & Norman L. (1990, October). The Iowa shared superintendency: The school board president's perspective. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the national Rural Education Association, Colorado Springs, CO.

Else, D. (1993). Strengthening board of education/superintendent relationships in American's schools. (Monograph Series No. 4 (1), 1-7). IA: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.

Fisher, S. (1993). Building mutual trust and understanding within and between the board of education and superintendent of schools. (Monograph Series No. 4). Mason City, IA: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.

Flinchbaugh, R. (1993). The 21st century board of education. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Flynn, P. (1993). Board/superintendent relations: Roles, expectations, and communications. (Monograph Series No. 4). Davenport, IA: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.

Fower, C. (1975). How to let and help your superintendent be a superintendent. American School Board Journal, 162 (9), 19-22.

Geitzenauer, J. (1993). Ideas for creating cohesiveness and cooperation between administration and board. (Monograph Series No. 4). Gilmore City, IA: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.

Giles, D., & Giles, S. (1990). Where do all the superintendents go? Unpublished manuscript.

Good, H. (1998). Then and now. American School Board Journal, 185, (5) 50-51.

Grabinski, D. (1993). Customer service orientation provides opportunities for all learners. (Monograph Series No. 4). West Des Moines, IA: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.

- Grieder, C. (1969). Public school administration. New York: The Ronald Press.
- Griffiths, D. (1966). The school superintendent. New York: Center for Applied Research in Education.
- Gunderson, D., & Cooper, E. (1993). Issues. (Monograph Series No. 4). Dike, IA: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.
- Hale, L. (1988). A comparison of the congruency of perceptions of school board/superintendent's working relationship to the perception of their exchange of information, collaborative planning, definition of roles, and length of time in office. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.
- Hanuske, S. (1983). Shared services for rural and small schools. (Report No. 400-83-0023). Washington, DC: National Inst. of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259 874)
- Haugland, M. (1987, February). A comparative analysis of the professional competencies needed by superintendents of public schools perceived to be most desirable for successful employment by school board members and superintendents in South Dakota. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA.
- Heath, J. (1980). With a shared superintendent, neither system gets a fair shake. American School Board Journal, 167 (5), 35.
- Hoffmann, G. (1993). Changing a vision into an education reality. (Monograph Series No. 4). Des Moines, IA: University of Northern Iowa, Department of Education.
- Houston, P. (1996). From Horace Mann to the contrarians. The School Administrator, 5 (53), 10-13.
- Howe II, H. (1996). The continuing question: Will public schools make it in America? The School Administrator, 5 (53), 14-17.
- Iannaccone, L. (1981). Superintendents make a difference. School Administrator, 38 (8), 16-17.
- Iowa Association of School Boards. (2002). Attracting, recruiting and retaining quality administrators. Retrieved March 13, 2002, from World Wide Web: <http://www.ia-sb.org/humanresources/hr.asp>.
- Iowa Association of School Boards. (2002). Attracting, recruiting and retaining quality administrators. Retrieved March 13, 2002, from World Wide Web: <http://www.ia-sb.org/boardbasics/PrinciplesforPositiveRelations.asp>.

Iowa Association of School Boards. (2000). IASB school board member handbook. Des Moines, IA: Author.

Jess, J. (1991, October). Shared superintendency and educational reform. Paper presented at the Annual Rural and Small Schools Conference, Manhattan, KS.

Johnson, C. (1994). No standards can measure "heart and soul" requirements. School Administrator, 51 (7), 29.

Jones, J., & Dunbar, D. (1993). Building a shared vision that is oriented to and focuses on student needs for the future. (University of Northern Iowa, Monograph Series No. IV). Iowa Association of School Boards, IA.

Jury, F. (1993). Building a shared vision to meet the future needs of students. (University of Northern Iowa, Monograph Series No. IV). Marshalltown, IA.

Katz, M. (1993). Matching school board and superintendent styles. School Administrator, 50 (2), 16-17.

Kelly, D. (1997). Turnover at the top. The American School Board Journal, 184 (4), 46-48.

Kimmelman, P. (1998). Looking for the lone ranger. The American School Board Journal, 185 (11), 52-53.

Kinn, C. K. (1980). Superintendent and board member role perceptions in selected Minnesota school districts. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Northern Colorado, Greeley, CO.

Kirst, M. (1991). School board: Evolution of an American institution. The American School Board Journal, 178 (11), A11-A14.

Knezevich, S. J. (1975). Administration of public education (4th ed.). New York: Harper and Row.

Konnert, M. W., & Augenstein, J. J. (1990). The superintendency of the nineties. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.

Lutz, G., & Dietzenbach, J. (1998). The Iowa superintendent shortage research study. Unpublished manuscript, University of Northern Iowa at Cedar Rapids.

MacNaughton, R. (1987). Pain and pride mingle in school board memories. American School Board Journal, 174 (4), 32, 44.

McAdams, R. (1996). ISO: The ideal superintendent. The American School Board Journal, 183 (11), 56-58.

McAdams, R. (1998). Who'll run the schools? The American School Board Journal, 185 (8), 37-39.

Mukensnabl, A. E. (1981). The relationship between school board members and superintendents expectations for decision making behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

National School Boards Association. (1992). NSBA sets vision for redefining school boards. Education Week, 4, C-1.

National School Boards Association. (1982). Becoming a better board member: A guide to effective school board service. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Nikolai, P. C. (1998). School governance: Impact of boardmanship training on board member perceptions of effectiveness. Doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University, Ames.

Pardini, P. (2001). Four profiles of resilient leadership. The School Administrator, 6 (58), 22-24.

Phillips, W. (1984, November) Advantages and disadvantages of a "joint administrative agreement". Paper presented at the Joint Annual Conference of the Illinois Association of School Boards, the Illinois Association of School Administrators, and the Illinois Association of School Business Officials, Chicago, IL.

Rincones, R. (1988). Exploring alternatives to consolidation. (Report No. EDO-RC-88-05). San Cruces, NM: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 296 817)

Rogers, J. (1992). Good-bye, honeymoon. American School Board Journal, 179 (9), 30-32.

School Administrators of Iowa. (2002). Administrators as instructional leaders: an Iowa perspective. Retrieved March 13, 2002, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.sai-iowa.org/adminasinstruct.html>.

School Administrators of Iowa. (2002). Policy statement on the school administrators shortage. Retrieved March 13, 2002, from the World Wide Web: <http://www.sai-iowa.org/shortDE.html>.

Sergiovanni, T. J., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F. D. & Thurston, P. W. (1992). Educational governance and administration (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Shannon, T. (1996). Lessons for leaders. The American School Board Journal, 183 (6), 19-22.

Smith, R. (1986). Don't be snookered into handing your board's authority to the superintendent. American School Board Journal, 173 (3), 23-24.

Stapley, M. (1957). School board studies. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.

Todras, E. (1993). The changing role of school boards. (Report No. EDO-EA-93-6). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 357 434)

Twentieth Century Fund & Dansforth Foundation. (1992). Facing the challenge: The report of The Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on school governance. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund Press.

Twiford, T. & Harrison, F. (1986, November). Establishing and maintaining an effective board/superintendent relationship. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the North Carolina State School Boards Association, Winston-Salem, NC.

Zachary, F. M. (1988). A study or the role of the superintendent as viewed by superintendents in Texas. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, Commerce, TX.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are several individuals I wish to acknowledge for their contributions to the successful completion of my graduate program and dissertation. I thank them for their unwavering support, avid encouragement, profound wisdom, and loyal mentorship throughout this dissertation project.

I wish to thank my major professor and advisor, Dr. William Poston, for the encouragement and guidance he as offered me throughout my program. To my dissertation committee, who worked so collaboratively and provided excellent individual and collective critiques. I wish to extend sincere gratitude to: Dr. Don Hackmann, Dr. David Williams, Dr. Mack Shelley, and Dr. Robert Martin. They provided valuable time and expertise to this project.

I would like to thank the Iowa Scottish Rite Masonic Foundation for their financial support. It is a great honor to be listed as a 2001 Educational Administration Ph.D. Fellow and I will continue to strive to improve the educational opportunities available to all learners.

I wish to extend special thanks to my family. My wife Sue, and my two children, Jaime and Chris. They have offered enthusiastic encouragement and support through out this entire project. Their support has given me the strength to continue to strive for success. Special gratitude goes to my parents, Gloria and Robert Oberg who have offered unwavering faith and confidence in any endeavor that I choose to pursue.

I would also like to express my sincere appreciation to Linda Steele, who so willingly gave up her valuable time to encourage my efforts in finishing this research.

Lastly, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Mike Kissinger, my cooperating teacher when I began my education career. Without Mike's wisdom and guidance I would have pursued a field completely outside of education.