

Local School Boards Under Review: Their Role and Effectiveness in Relation to Students' Academic Achievement

Deborah Land

Johns Hopkins University

Local school boards have traditionally governed public education in the United States but have seldom been the focus of empirical research. This article provides a review of literature published in the past two decades on the role and effectiveness of local school boards, specifically with respect to school boards' influence on students' academic achievement. First, a brief history of school boards is presented. Second, their current status is described. Next, school board and educational governance reforms are examined. Then characteristics of effective school boards that experts have identified are delineated. The final section is devoted to discussion of research limitations and future directions.

KEYWORDS: *academic achievement, educational governance, school boards.*

According to the Twentieth Century Fund (1992), local public school boards have been “the distinctive hallmark of American education for more than one hundred and fifty years” (p. 17). In recent decades, however, school boards have been the target of criticism by those who perceive them as outdated and incapable of effectively leading educational reforms to improve students' academic achievement, particularly in urban areas (Carol et al., 1986; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987; Danzberger, Kirst, & Usdan, 1992; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; Finn, 1991; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Kirst, 1994; National School Boards Foundation [NSBF], 1999; Olson, 1992; Streshly & Frase, 1993; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Todras, 1993; Whitson, 1998; Wilson, 1994). Despite the long-standing presence of local school boards in U.S. public education, few empirical studies of their effectiveness exist to inform discussion of what role they should have in the 21st century. Nonetheless, review of opinion-based academic and professional writings on the role and effectiveness of local school boards, in combination with examination of the limited number of data-based studies, can illuminate the role that school boards might play in the future and reveal the traits that may make them effective, particularly in raising student achievement.

This article provides a review of literature published in the past two decades on the role and effectiveness of school boards.¹ Though school boards are but one component of school district leadership—the superintendent and other district administrators and staff constitute the other main components—school boards are

the focus of this review because they have a distinct role and have been understudied. Initially, an ERIC database search was conducted using the term “boards of education” as a keyword. Effort was made to find qualitative and quantitative studies that included students’ academic achievement as an outcome variable, owing to the currently widespread focus on improving student achievement, evidence of which is found in the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, which mandates annual achievement testing of third- through eighth-grade students; NSBF’s (1999) proclamation that school boards’ primary fundamental goal must be to improve students’ academic achievement; and the National School Boards Association’s (NSBA) adoption of the improvement of student achievement as a major objective for school boards (Speer, 1998). Though school boards may be judged effective by measures other than academic achievement, such as their ability to balance budgets, comply with legislation, and respond to local concerns, student achievement is the predominant measure of interest here.

The initial ERIC search produced few empirical studies of school board effectiveness that contained student achievement as an outcome variable, and, thus, a wider net was cast to capture other studies of school boards, writings on the broader issue of educational governance reform, papers on the current and future role of school boards, professional guidebooks for school boards such as those published by the NSBA, and other opinion-based documents identifying characteristics of effective school boards. The purpose of the review shifted from a definitive examination of data-based studies of school board effectiveness in improving student achievement to an examination of the past, present, and future role of school boards and exploration of what characteristics might make them effective, based on an extensive, though not exhaustive, examination of the broader school board literature.

The article is organized into five major sections. First, a brief history of school boards is presented, and then their current status is described. The charge that school boards are outmoded and should be eliminated cannot be addressed adequately without an understanding of how they have evolved and currently function. Next, school board and educational governance reforms are examined in order to describe the larger context in which school boards now operate and to explore how school boards have been reformed and might be reformed in the future. Then characteristics of effective school boards that have been identified by school board experts are described. Because qualitative and quantitative research on school boards is limited, the final section is devoted to discussion of research limitations and future directions.

History of School Boards

Local school boards, composed of lay individuals and vested with authority by their state, traditionally have governed public education in the United States (Johnson, 1988). The roots of this system of school governance reach back more than 200 years to Massachusetts’ representative system of local governance by selectmen (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994). As local governance responsibilities increased in tandem with population growth, selectmen separated educational governance from general local governance and appointed a committee in individual towns to govern education (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994). In 1837, Massachusetts established the first state board of education to give states

a greater role in education, but local school boards retained most of the control over their schools, owing at least in part to public distrust of the ability of a distant political body to satisfy local needs and preferences (Danzberger, 1992, 1994). Separate districts of schools, funded by local taxes, were formed as more schools were built to accommodate continuing population growth (Danzberger, 1992). Massachusetts enacted legislation in 1891 that vested each district with financial and administrative authority over its schools (Danzberger, 1992). The Massachusetts system of separate educational governance spread throughout the colonies and was a prototype for today's governance of public schools by local school boards (Danzberger, 1992; Carol et al., 1986). From the mid-1800s through the early 1900s, the number of local school boards burgeoned, and while there was variation in governance structures, local school boards primarily oversaw and managed public education (Carol et al., 1986; Johnson, 1988).

In the late 1800s, school board members in urban areas typically were elected by local wards (or neighborhoods), which enmeshed the school board members in local ward politics (Danzberger, 1992; Urban & Wagoner, 1996). In response to perceptions that this linkage subjected schools to corruption, as well as the belief that schools were not adequately educating an increasingly diverse student population, elite professional, business, and education reformers strove to improve local educational governance (Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Kirst, 1994; Rothman, 1992; Urban & Wagoner, 1996; Usdan, 1994). During the first two decades of the 20th century, local educational governance became centralized within a smaller city school board composed of lay citizens selected through city-wide elections instead of spread among multiple, larger, ward school boards (Danzberger, 1992; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Kirst, 1994; Rothman, 1992; Urban & Wagoner, 1996). The centralized city school board was modeled on corporate boards and designed to be more policy focused and less involved in daily administration (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; Urban & Wagoner, 1996). The role of superintendent, which in the mid- to late 1800s had been largely instructional and tightly circumscribed by the school board, expanded to encompass a great many more management responsibilities and became professionalized, requiring formal training (Danzberger, 1992; Urban & Wagoner, 1996). Researchers have described the shift to a smaller, centralized, policy-making lay school board with a professional superintendent as its chief executive officer and selection of board members through city-wide (or district-wide as the reform spread from the cities to rural areas) elections as the last major reform of school boards (Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Kirst, 1994).

As of this last major reform, local school boards in the United States have typically evinced the following characteristics: local control in order to meet the specific needs and preferences of the resident population; separation of educational from general governance; large districts with small boards; lay oversight with concentration on policy-making and reliance on a professional superintendent for management, patterned after corporate boards of directors with a chief executive officer; and democratic representation of all citizens through at-large elections rather than subdistrict elections or appointments. School boards have not uniformly or uncontroversially manifested these traditional characteristics, however (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; Urban & Wagoner, 1996). In Virginia, for example, the appointment of school board members was mandatory until the General Assembly

passed legislation in 1992 permitting elections. In Hawaii, the State Board of Education sets and oversees policy for public education; there are no local school boards. Furthermore, by design, school boards historically have had flexibility in governance and have varied in their management, operation, and priorities in response to their local economic, political, social, and religious contexts (Danzberger et al., 1987; Johnson, 1988; Olson & Bradley, 1992; Resnick, 1999). Specific factors such as the resources available and the size and special needs of the student population account for some of the variation among school boards; an urban school board serving a largely minority, low-income population of 100,000 students probably would operate differently and have different priorities than a suburban school board serving a primarily White, middle-class population of 2,500 pupils (Resnick, 1999).

The greatest deviation from traditional characteristics that has taken place in the second half of the 20th century has been the reduction of school boards' local control as federal and state governments have assumed a greater role in the governance of education (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Hadderman, 1988; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Johnson, 1988; Kirst, 1994; Olson & Bradley, 1992; Reid, 2000; Resnick, 1999; Todras, 1993). The 1954 *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* Supreme Court decision necessitated the federal government's involvement in local education to oversee desegregation (Johnson, 1988; Rothman, 1992). In the 1950s and 1960s, the federal government assumed greater local control through special programs and the provision of federal funds in an effort to quell concerns generated by the Soviet Union's launch of Sputnik regarding the inadequacy of students' academic achievement in the United States (Danzberger, 1992; Education Commission of the States [ECS], 1999; Rothman, 1992). In the 1960s and 1970s, federally and state-funded categorical programs, such as special and migrant education, proliferated (ECS, 1999; Kirst, 1994). Over the last two decades, states have sought to improve students' academic achievement by prescribing curricula, teacher certification, competency testing, graduation standards, and data collection (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Johnson, 1988; Kirst, 1994; Nowakowski & First, 1989; Olson & Bradley, 1992; Resnick, 1999; Rothman, 1992). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 greatly expanded the federal role in education. Pressure from the federal and state governments for high academic standards and achievement shows no signs of abating.

Current Status of School Boards

Approximately 95,000 school board members serve on 15,000 local public school boards in the United States (Resnick, 1999). Thus, most school boards are composed of five to seven members, with urban boards more likely to have seven or more members (Robinson & Bickers, 1990). The majority of school board members live in small towns or suburbs, followed by rural, then urban, areas (*American School Board Journal* [ASBJ], 1997, 1998). Although 80% of school districts enroll fewer than 3,000 students, most studies of school boards focus on larger, urban districts, which educate a disproportionate number of children (Danzberger, 1992; Kirst, 1994; Wilson, 1994). Nearly one sixth of public school students reside in the 50 largest school districts, which together comprise less than 1% of all districts (Wilson, 1994). In 1990–1991, only 4% of school districts enrolled more than 10,000 students, but these districts served nearly half of all public students (Olson

& Bradley, 1992). From 1988–1989 to 1997–1998, the number of larger districts gradually rose, while the number of smaller districts declined, thus continuing the trend toward larger districts begun in the early 20th century (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000).

The reform movement of the early 20th century, which transformed school boards into smaller, centralized, city-wide organizations, also brought more educated, higher income, successful professionals and businessmen to school boards, a change that generated concern regarding the ability of such elite members to effectively represent the concerns of local citizens (Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Urban & Wagoner, 1996). According to surveys conducted by ASBJ and Virginia Polytechnic and State University (ASBJ, 1997, 1998), school board members continue to differ demographically from many of the people they serve. In the 1997 survey (ASBJ, 1997), 57% of school board members reported an income at or above \$60,000, with 23% claiming an income of greater than \$100,000. Many members (44%) occupied managerial or professional positions, and 13% owned their own businesses. Nearly half the members (46%) had graduate degrees, and another 29% held a 4-year college degree. The large majority of members (87%) reported they were White; only 5% stated they were Black and 1% stated they were Hispanic. Less than half the members (44%) were female. Many members (43%) reported that they did not have a child currently attending public school.

Although in the 1970s urban school districts began moving toward subdistrict, away from city-wide, elections in an effort to have school board members more closely reflect and represent the racial/ethnic groups within their cities, most elections across the nation still occur at large (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987; Kirst, 1994). The vast majority of school board members, approximately 96%, are elected by local citizens for 3- to 4-year terms (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; Resnick, 1999; Robinson & Bickers, 1990). Although high turnover rates plague some boards (Carol et al., 1986; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000), 61% of the 1997 ASBJ survey respondents had served 4 or more years. It has been reported that board members devote an average of about 20 hours per month to school board work, but this figure is thought to underestimate the true number of hours served (Illinois Association of School Boards, 1996).

Survey and case study data reveal that school boards today face traditional challenges, such as securing and allocating adequate finances and recruiting and maintaining talented staff, as well as new issues such as state- and federal-level interference, greater public apathy toward and lack of confidence in public schools and school boards, a more diverse student population, and more controversial and pervasive social problems, making governance more difficult and complex (Carol et al., 1986; Olson & Bradley, 1992). Yet, school boards continue to be valued and supported, as evidenced by the following comments by school board authorities: School boards “provide the crucial link between public values and professional expertise” (Resnick, 1999, p. 6); they are “the epitome of representative governance in our democracy” (Shannon, 1994, p. 387); and “school board membership is the highest form of public service” (Carol et al., 1986, p. 14). An extensive national study of school boards found that local citizens, parents, community leaders, and educators support the local school board as an institution in close proximity to the citizens it represents (Carol et al., 1986). Thus, while the institution of local school boards has generated much criticism, it still engenders public support.

Current and Future Reforms

According to the Twentieth Century Fund (1992), local school boards are experiencing a crisis of relevance and legitimacy. Many critics perceive school boards, as currently structured and operating, to be incapable of producing sufficient academic achievement to ensure the United States' continued economic preeminence (Carol et al., 1986; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Kirst, 1994; NSBF, 1999; Olson & Bradley, 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Todras, 1993; Wilson, 1994). Indeed, some critics have proposed the elimination of school boards (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Finn, 1991; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Olson, 1992; Streshly & Frase, 1993; Whitson, 1998). Somewhat ironically, state and federal incursion into local school boards' traditional role might have significantly limited school boards' ability to improve education, though some school board critics have claimed that increased state and federal involvement has been necessary because of school boards' ineffectiveness (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987; Kirst, 1994). In this section, the pressures and criticisms supporting calls for reform or elimination of school boards are reviewed; reforms for school boards are presented; and reforms for educational governance, including the school board's role and responsibilities in these reforms, are discussed.

Pressures and Criticisms

Technological advances have transformed the workplace and increased the demand for a highly skilled, intellectually advanced workforce (Danzberger, 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Wilson, 1994). Business leaders claim that insufficient numbers of potential employees are qualified for entry-level positions (Danzberger, 1992; Wilson, 1994). Concurrently, demographic factors, such as poverty and an increasingly diverse student population, and social problems, such as drug use, violence, and homelessness, have challenged the ability of public schools to improve students' academic achievement, particularly in urban areas (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Olson & Bradley, 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). The *Brown v. Board of Education* decision, the civil rights movement, and White flight from public schools, especially in urban areas, have drawn attention to the failure of public education to equitably educate racial/ethnic minority students (Danzberger, 1992). Business leaders, government officials, and education experts have frequently insisted that educational reforms are necessary to meet the needs of today's public school students, particularly racial/ethnic minority students in urban areas, and to guarantee the United States' future economic viability (Carol et al., 1986; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; Kirst, 1994; NSBF, 1999; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Todras, 1993; Wilson, 1994).

In the 1980s, the excellence movement coalesced around the goal of improving students' academic achievement in order to reverse the "rising tide of mediocrity" forecasted by the federally commissioned *A Nation at Risk* report (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). The excellence movement reforms manifested themselves primarily in state legislation prescribing tougher academic requirements for students and teachers and failed to produce the anticipated gains in students' academic achievement (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992). Major reform reports produced in the 1980s show that school boards were expected

to have little role in the reform efforts (Danzberger et al., 1987; Johnson, 1988). Nevertheless, research indicates that school boards did not resist the excellence reforms; some school boards implemented the reforms prior to legislation, and some boards used the reforms to promote local goals, but insufficient funding and the complexity of state mandates and other barriers often constrained their success (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; Firestone, Furhman, & Kirst, 1989; Nowakowski & First, 1989). After the excellence reforms failed to achieve their expected outcomes, the restructuring/system reform emerged, seeking to increase accountability for students' academic achievement, expand access to quality education, increase linkages to social service agencies, and restructure educational governance (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992). This movement has also not incorporated school boards as potential facilitators of reform but has pressured them to react to new initiatives (Danzberger, 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; NSBF, 1999; Reid, 2000).

As previously mentioned, states have greatly increased their involvement in local public education, passing increasingly prescriptive legislation, within the last two decades (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Hadderman, 1988; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Johnson, 1988; Kirst, 1994; Olson & Bradley, 1992; Reid, 2000; Resnick, 1999; Todras, 1993). In the 1980s, 44 states passed large-scale education reform packages and increased funding for education (Danzberger et al., 1992). The states' growing involvement in local educational governance has confused school board members and the public regarding who is in control of education and what the school board's role is (Carol et al., 1986; Kirst, 1994). Greater centralization of control over local education at the state level has led to calls and initiatives for deregulation, but such initiatives frequently have transferred decision-making authority to the school level, bypassing school boards, as occurred in Kentucky (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; ECS, 1999; Harp, 1992; Lindle, 1995/1996; Ziebarth, 1999). Though school boards are uniquely positioned to coordinate reform efforts in accordance with local needs, they have generally acquiesced to state control and have not become full partners in the adoption and implementation of educational governance reforms (Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992).

Other groups in addition to the states have increased their control over local educational governance. Federally funded categorical programs and federal regulations have proliferated (ECS, 1999; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Kirst, 1994). The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 has further expanded the federal government's role in education. Teachers' unions and organizations have assumed greater control (Johnson, 1988). The courts issued judgments on educational matters over which school boards and state legislatures traditionally have ruled, such as the use of standardized testing (Carol et al., 1986; Johnson, 1988; Sewall, 1996). Special interest groups have become more influential (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992; Nowakowski & First, 1989). According to Kirst (1994), school boards will continue to lose ground unless they reevaluate their role within the current educational context and refashion themselves accordingly.

School boards themselves have engendered criticism for a variety of reasons in addition to their failure to assume a proactive, leading role in educational reform. One prominent criticism is that the public is largely uninvolved in school boards. Only a small percentage of the electorate, 10%–15% on average across the nation,

votes in school board elections, and candidates are in short supply in some areas (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987; Danzberger, 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Hickle, 1998; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Rallis & Criscoe, 1993; Resnick, 1999; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Wagner, 1992). Another related criticism is that school boards do not represent the local public's interests and values (Rallis & Criscoe, 1993). A national public opinion survey revealed that urban school board members and members of the urban public differ in their assessment of the performance of their schools, perceptions of the relative potential of specific improvement strategies, and identification of top concerns (NSBF, 1999). School boards also have frequently drawn criticism for micromanagement and encroachment upon the administration's role (Carol et al., 1986; Carver, 1997; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; McAdams, 2000; Thomas, 2001; Todras, 1993; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Wagner, 1992).

Relatedly, many school boards, particularly those in urban areas, have been faulted for their inability to collaborate with superintendents (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). In 1990, 20 of the 25 largest central city school systems experienced superintendent vacancies (Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). The inability of school board members to work together as a cohesive group also has drawn considerable criticism (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; McCloud & McKenzie, 1994; McGonagill, 1987; Rallis & Criscoe, 1993; Schlechty & Cole, 1993; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Wagner, 1992). In addition, the influence of special interest groups has elicited ire (Anderson, 1992; Merz, 1986; Twentieth Century Fund, 1999). School board experts have contended that school boards must change if they are to survive (Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1992; Kirst, 1994; NSBF, 1999; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992).

School Board Reforms

Proposed school board reforms typically have focused on selection procedures for school board members or the role and responsibilities of school boards (Resnick, 1999). Alteration of selection procedures has been a popular target of school board reforms since the mid-1950s, but experts still have not reached consensus regarding which procedure is best (Danzberger, 1992). Within the past two decades, several school board experts have called for states to pass legislation to refocus the role and responsibilities of school boards in policy-making and oversight and limit school boards' management responsibilities. Under this plan, the redefined boards would be labeled local education policy boards. Selection procedures are examined first, followed by a discussion of local education policy boards.

Selection procedures. Nearly all school board members are elected at large (i.e., city/district-wide), elected within subdivisions of the city/district, or appointed. Usually, all members are selected by the same procedure; however, some districts utilize a combination of the three previous options. Reformers and school board experts have advanced various arguments for and against elections and appointments. The focus has been on which procedure is superior for effective educational governance rather than which procedure works best under which circumstances or how the negative aspects of each procedure can be minimized.

One frequently advanced argument for at-large and subdistrict elections is that they give the public a voice in local education, and, in this respect, school boards are regarded as a fundamental democratic institution (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Johnson, 1988; Resnick, 1999; Underwood, 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). However, critics have countered that there are not enough and even fewer good candidates who are willing to run for election in some districts and that voter turnout is very low in most elections (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987; Danzberger, 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Hickle, 1998; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Rallis & Criscoe, 1993; Resnick, 1999; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Thomas, 1993; Wagner, 1992). These critics have interpreted the failure of but a small percentage of the public to vote—5% to 15% of eligible voters is not unusual (Danzberger et al., 1992)—as evidence that the public does not value or need a voice in local education. Yet, there is evidence that when members of the public become dissatisfied, they vote in greater numbers (Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994).

When conducted independently of general political elections (e.g., at a different time of year, unassociated with party tickets), school board elections may insulate board members from undue influence and control by political groups (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992). Separation of education from general government was a main goal in the creation and early reform of school boards. However, given the increasing cost of school board elections, particularly in urban areas, elected members nevertheless may be susceptible to special interest and political groups that are eager to assist them with their election campaigns (Hickle, 1998; Underwood, 1992). Furthermore, some critics charge that it is a myth that elected school boards are apolitical and/or contend that insulation from political groups weakens the status and effectiveness of school boards by isolating them from political power structures and other government offices and resources (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Thomas, 1993; Usdan, 1994; Wirt & Kirst, 1992).

Most of the arguments for and against at-large elections also hold for subdistrict elections. The critical difference between these two selection procedures hinges on who is likely to win. At-large elections, the most common selection procedure, are more likely to retain demographically homogeneous individuals who are members of the professional elite—individuals who are well educated, successful, and tied to local business and community power structures (Boone, 1996; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Robinson, England, & Meier, 1985; Thomas, 1993; Urban & Wagoner, 1996). Subdistrict elections tend to increase the cultural, ethnic, racial, and political diversity of school boards and draw members who are more similar and responsive to subpopulations of constituents (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Kirst, 1994; Robinson et al., 1985; Wagner, 1992). However, critics have contended that subdistrict elections result in more politicized boards whose members are more focused on single issues and special interests and thus less able to work productively as one body (Bradley, 1992; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Kirst, 1994; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). In addition, members elected from subdistricts may have less professional experience and weaker associations with powerful business and government leaders throughout the district than members elected at large (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987).

While many of the problems inherent in the election of board members may be circumvented by appointment procedures, this is highly dependent upon who is appointed and by whom. Culturally, ethnically, racially, and politically diverse individuals with extensive business management and/or educational experience who embrace the trusteeship ideology that the board should work as one body representing the entire community could be appointed, but the individual or individuals appointing members may not value these characteristics (Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Gewertz, 2000; Thomas, 1993; Underwood, 1992). Members of state or local general government, such as mayors, usually appoint school board members. Thus, appointed boards probably are more closely aligned with local government than elected boards, which could have both negative and positive consequences. One of the most frequently advanced arguments against appointed boards is that they are less directly accountable to the public and more directly accountable to whomever appointed them (Danzberger, 1992). Indeed, most appointed school board members of a Virginia county school board reported that they were primarily accountable to the county board of supervisors, not the public (Danzberger, 1992). While those who appoint the school board would, in most cases, be elected by and accountable to the public, they would not be responsible only for or judged solely according to their impact on education. In this respect, the public's voice in education would be muffled. On the other hand, appointment by mayors or other government officials could link school boards more closely to other government agencies and resources (Danzberger, 1994; ECS, 1999; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Olson, 1992; Ziebarth, 1999).

School board experts have recommended numerous other proposals for the selection of school board members, several of which are mentioned briefly here. Some experts have called for elections through political parties in order to give school boards greater political clout (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Danzberger, Kirst, & Usdan, 1993). Iannaccone and Lutz (1994) recommended dividing large urban districts into separate smaller districts (not subdistricts) in order to make school boards more representative of and responsive to their constituencies while avoiding gridlock caused by a diversity of competing interests. Suggested strategies to obtain good board member candidates range from providing members more perquisites to creating selection panels to recruit and screen potential candidates in accordance with state-mandated criteria (Danzberger, 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Schlechty and Cole (1993) proposed one of the most radical reforms: the election of school boards as one body. They recommended that slates of school board members apply and run for election in order to provide incentive for board members to work together, reduce the influence of special interests, and make boards, rather than individual members, accountable to their constituents. Under this plan, states could mandate the ethnic/racial composition of the board.

The arguments for and against at-large and subdistrict elections and appointments, as well as other proposed selection reforms, do not point to a clear solution as to which selection procedures would produce the most effective governance (Danzberger, 1992). For large cities (Danzberger et al., 1992), some experts have recommended a combination of at-large and subdistrict elections, while other experts have advised selection via appointment, with the mayor appointing the majority of members, and a combination of at-large and subdistrict elections only

if necessary, for instance due to public demand (Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Wagner, 1992). Danzberger (1992, p. 47) stated that “one true method” of selection probably does not exist and recommended that states and communities choose their selection procedures based on their perceptions of which will work best for them.

Only limited research has been conducted in recent decades on the selection of school board members and its relation to effective governance and, more specifically, students’ academic achievement. This research indicates that subdistrict elections indeed result in more contentious and fractured school boards rather than more effective governance yet successfully draw a more heterogeneous group of members than at-large elections (Boone, 1996; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Kirst, 1994; Robinson et al., 1985, Thomas, 1993; Urban & Wagoner, 1996). There is not yet convincing evidence that appointment of school board members produces more effective governance or greater academic achievement (Danzberger, 1992, 1994). Jersey City had an appointed board and was the first district in the country to be taken over by the state, and Chicago had an appointed board in the 1980s when the U.S. secretary of education declared Chicago schools the worst in the county (Danzberger, 1992, 1994). These examples provide evidence that appointments do not guarantee success for urban boards. However, Danzberger’s (1992, p. 60) conclusion, based on research and anecdotal evidence, that “how school boards are selected is therefore not the determining variable in governing performance, except perhaps where boards are elected from individual electoral districts [i.e., subdistricts],” may be premature. While there are merits and demerits to each selection procedure, one method or a combination of methods may be more likely to result in effective governance under specific circumstances (Danzberger, 1994; Underwood, 1992). Insufficient research that includes situational variables such as district size and location, student demographics and achievement levels, community concerns, state and local government support, and district resources has been conducted to rule out the impact of selection procedures on educational governance and, more specifically, students’ academic outcomes.

Local education policy boards. Several prominent school board authorities have proposed that local school boards transform into local education policy boards (Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993; Kirst, 1994; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). This proposal has received much attention partly because it is based on findings from the most comprehensive study of school boards of the past several decades, conducted by Carol and colleagues (1986), and other work sponsored by the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL). IEL previously offered training/development programs for school board effectiveness and school leadership, which facilitated refinement of the local education policy boards reform. The West Virginia legislature urged school boards throughout the state to participate in this training and provided funds for it.

The most essential characteristic of the local education policy boards is a focus on policy-making and oversight without involvement in daily administration (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Local education policy boards are foremost responsible for setting an overall vision for education in their districts and, in alignment with this vision, establishing short- and long-term goals, school performance indicators, and assessments of students (Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993). IEL has issued guidelines to assist states in redefining the role of

school boards in a report titled *A Framework for Redefining the Role and Responsibilities of Local School Boards* (Danzberger et al., 1993). Deregulation is a critical component of the proposal; states are advised to repeal legislation requiring school boards to be responsible for virtually every aspect of education, which experts contend compels them to become overly involved in administration (Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1992; Kirst, 1994; Reid, 2000; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Furthermore, state legislation is necessary because school boards are unlikely to reform themselves, according to many critics (Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Refocusing school boards on policy-making and oversight and restraining them from administration also are fundamental elements of reforms proposed by Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) to raise students' achievement, two educational governance models proposed by the ECS (1999), and John Carver's (1997) policy governance model.

Several other critical characteristics of the local education policy boards are delineated in Danzberger and colleagues' (1993) IEL report. Many of these characteristics are described in detail in the Key Characteristics of Effective School Boards section of the report, as numerous school board authorities have identified them as necessary for effective governance. However, as is pointed out in that section, little research exists to substantiate that these characteristics are related to more effective governance that fosters students' academic achievement. The IEL report also recommended that legislators pass legislation that encourages school districts to increase site-based management, authorizes school boards to approve charter schools and/or contract out the management of their schools, and authorizes the establishment of local children's policy councils to oversee coordinated education, health, and social services for all children and families within the district. These recommendations are somewhat controversial; there are limited data to support them (Arnsperger, McElhinney, & Ziebarth, 1999; Ziebarth, 1999).

Educational Governance Reforms

Federal and state governments and local districts have implemented a variety of educational governance reforms, and experimentation is likely to continue as a logical extension of the systemic/restructuring reform movement begun in the 1990s. Educational governance experts vary in how they define and classify these reforms (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; ECS, 1999; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Ziebarth, 1999). The locus of decision-making authority, parental choice of schools, and the influence of the market on the survival and evolution of schools are critical elements of the reforms. Here, two of the most popular reforms, site-based management and charter schools, are described. Then two of the most radical reforms, state and mayoral takeovers and elimination of school boards, are discussed. The school board's role and responsibilities in the educational governance reforms examined are not well established, with the obvious exception of elimination.

Site-based management. Site-based management, which is also referred to as school-based management and involves the decentralization of decision-making authority and control from the school board and central administration to individual schools, has been a popular reform in the past two decades (Drury, 1998; Hofman, 1995; Leithwood & Menzies, 1998; Olson, 1992; Oswald, 1995; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Ziebarth, 1999). Reformers argue that schools and educators

cannot effectively improve students' academic achievement or be held accountable for student outcomes unless they have decision-making authority (Lindle, 1995/1996; Ziebarth, 1999). Advocates have contended that those directly connected to the school are in the best position to make decisions according to students' needs, are invigorated by site-based management and more willing to implement reforms, and benefit from an improved school climate (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998; Oswald, 1995; Peterson, 1991; Ziebarth, 1999). Critics of site-based management have argued that such management usually requires a significant time commitment from school personnel that may detract from students' academic achievement, many teachers do not support site-based management, and there is no solid theoretical argument that site-based management will improve teaching quality and students' academic achievement (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998; Oswald, 1995; Ziebarth, 1999).

Most states have legislated site-based management in the form of pilot programs, recommendations, and, less frequently, mandatory programs (Ziebarth, 1999). Districts and schools adopting site-based management vary in the locus and scope of decision-making authority (Lindle, 1995/1996, Leithwood & Menzies, 1998; Ziebarth, 1999). Indeed definitions of site-based management vary greatly (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998; Oswald, 1995; Peterson, 1991; Ziebarth, 1999). Control under site-based management is typically held by administrators, professionals, community members, or a combination of professionals, community members, and parents (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998). Individual schools often form local councils to make decisions and/or advise the principal (Oswald, 1995). Decision-making authority for personnel, budgets, and curricula are among the most common responsibilities assumed by individual schools and local councils (Oswald, 1995).

Several reviews of studies of site-based management have been conducted, and a compelling link between site-based management and students' academic achievement has not been found (Gleason, Donohue, & Leader, 1995/1996; Leithwood & Menzies, 1998; Murphy & Beck, 1995; Oswald, 1995; Ziebarth, 1999). According to some advocates, variation in site-based management and failure of many schools and local councils to exercise fully decision-making authority account for the absence of compelling positive findings (Oswald, 1995; Peterson, 1991). Some supporters have claimed that 3 to 15 years of site-based management are required before a positive impact on students' academic achievement is evident (Oswald, 1995; Peterson, 1991).

With the devolution of decision-making authority to individual schools, the role and responsibilities of the school board often have been unclear, and the lack of clarity and reluctance of school boards to cede their authority, particularly when the state may still hold them accountable for their schools, has hindered successful reform (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Harp, 1992; Lindle, 1995/1996; Olson, 1992; Oswald, 1995). For example, schools in Kentucky began moving toward site-based management with the passage of the Kentucky Education Reform Act in 1990 (Danzberger et al., 1992; Harp, 1992; Lindle, 1995/1996). The legislation called for the creation of school-based decision-making councils and granted these councils governance authority over 16 areas of school operations and policy, but councils did not always assume authority over all of these areas, and more than one school board went to court in order to maintain or regain control over local schools (Harp, 1992; Lindle, 1995/1996). Some experts have advocated a critical oversight role for school boards in site-based management, but

Land

virtually no research has explicitly evaluated the school boards' role in this form of governance (Drury, 1998; Resnick, 1999). Research also has not evaluated the decision-making ability and governance effectiveness of local councils in comparison to local school boards or examined which division of responsibilities among the school board and local councils and/or principals works best under which circumstances. Furthermore, while advocates may claim that site-based management improves communication between school boards, district personnel, and school decision makers, strong empirical evidence is lacking and contrary examples are available (Lindle, 1995/1996; Oswald, 1995).

Charter schools. Charter schools are an increasingly common educational governance reform (Collins, 1999; Hadderman, 1998; Schwartz, 1996; Ziebarth, 1999). They allow freedom from rules, regulations, and bureaucracy, which are thought to hamper innovation and effectiveness, in exchange for production of specified outcomes within a set time frame; in other words, autonomy is offered in exchange for accountability (Collins, 1999; Danzberger, 1992; ECS, 1999; Hadderman, 1998; Olson, 1992; Schwartz, 1996; Ziebarth, 1999). An outgrowth of the systemic/restructuring reform movement of the 1990s, charter schools also meet some demands for deregulation (i.e., greater flexibility), parental choice, site-based management, and market control over education while remaining under the aegis of public education (Collins, 1999; Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Hadderman, 1998; Schwartz, 1996; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Ziebarth, 1999). Advocates of charter schools have claimed that they challenge traditional educational governance and catalyze improvements throughout the district in which they reside (Collins, 1999; Schwartz, 1996). They also allow for more private involvement in public education; private, for-profit organizations can obtain charters and contribute funding to them (Collins, 1999; Olson, 1992; Schwartz, 1996). Critics have contended that charter schools siphon needed funds from other schools in the district and encourage the privatization of education (Collins, 1999).

In 1991, Minnesota became the first state to pass legislation authorizing charter schools (Collins, 1999; Hadderman, 1998; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). The majority of states have since passed similar legislation (Collins, 1999; ECS, 1999; Hadderman, 1998; Schwartz, 1996; Ziebarth, 1999). Parents, teachers, community groups, and private organizations can seek approval for charter schools from the state or local school district, usually via the school board (ECS, 1999; Schwartz, 1996; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Ziebarth, 1999). In general, charter schools are nonselective, nonsectarian, nondiscriminatory, and tuition free (Hadderman, 1998; Schwartz, 1996; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). They receive public, per-pupil funds (Schwartz, 1996; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). However, states differ in the amount of autonomy they allow charter schools, and, consequently, charter schools across the nation vary widely in philosophy, organization, and operation (Collins, 1999; Hadderman 1998; Schwartz, 1996; Ziebarth, 1999). States that allow greater autonomy tend to have more charter schools (Hadderman, 1998). States and local agencies also vary in the accountability standards to which they hold charter schools (Schwartz, 1996).

Research on charter schools is limited and so far provides mixed evidence of their ability to produce high academic achievement or better outcomes than non-chartered public schools (Collins, 1999; ECS, 1999; Hadderman, 1998; Ziebarth,

1999). Examples of schools that have successfully raised academic achievement appear in the literature, but studies have not isolated the characteristics that contribute to their success (Hadderman, 1998; Ziebarth, 1999). The U.S. Department of Education is currently sponsoring two national studies of charter schools, but academic outcomes are not yet available (Collins, 1999; Hadderman, 1998; Ziebarth, 1999). Preliminary findings show that charter schools tend to attract racial and ethnic minority students in equal or somewhat greater numbers than local public schools but slightly fewer special needs and limited English proficient students (Collins, 1999; Hadderman, 1998). In urban areas, minority students attend, but these students tend not to be the most disadvantaged and vulnerable (Schwartz, 1996).

Although most charter schools remain part of the local district, school boards may be reluctant to govern them because their role and responsibilities with respect to these schools are not well established (Hadderman, 1998; Ziebarth, 1999). Some school board experts have stated that local school boards can maintain a policy-making and oversight role over charter schools and that these schools are an effective mechanism to prevent school boards from involvement in daily management of schools (Danzberger, 1992; Olson, 1992). However, school boards' liability for schools over which they have little control has been questioned (Collins, 1999; NSBF, 1999; Olson, 1992; Ziebarth, 1999). Insufficient attention has been directed toward the school boards' role in promoting charter schools' effectiveness in terms of raising students' academic achievement or in ensuring that charter schools do not drain needed resources from regular public schools. The question of how school boards should handle charter schools that are failing to produce agreed-upon outcomes, including how to assist the students who attend these schools, has received little attention. Revoking or failing to renew a charter likely has negative repercussions.

Contracting out is one variation on the typical charter school arrangement. Instead of individuals applying for charters for individual schools, local or state authorities initiate the process and contract out management of individual schools or districts (Danzberger, 1992; Olson, 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). The school board can, but is not required to, retain policy-making and goal-setting responsibilities and oversee accountability (Danzberger, 1992). The Chelsea, Massachusetts, school board contracted out the management and oversight of its entire school system to Boston University and retained very little control (Danzberger, 1992; Olson, 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Another variation involves school boards overseeing a portfolio of schools through charters with a variety of different organizations (ECS, 1999; Olson, 1992). One of two models of educational governance proposed by ECS (1999) calls for a system of publicly funded, publicly authorized, independently operated schools. Under this plan, school boards would transform into chartering boards that would authorize, monitor, channel funds to, and hold accountable, but not operate, the independent schools within their communities. While state boards of education could serve this function, local school boards are considered more capable of selecting and overseeing schools in keeping with local needs and priorities.

State and mayoral takeovers. State and mayoral takeovers of schools and districts are becoming increasingly common, particularly in urban districts (Danzberger,

1992; ECS, 1999; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Resnick, 1999; Ziebarth, 1999). Takeovers occur as a result of low academic achievement, as measured by achievement test scores, as well as fiscal mismanagement and administrative ineptitude or corruption. In 1989, New Jersey became the first state to take control of a local school district exhibiting chronically low academic performance (Danzberger, 1992; Ziebarth, 1999). As of early 2001, 24 states had passed academic bankruptcy legislation and had authority to assume control over and management of failing schools and districts, and 15 states had authority to take over individual failing schools within districts (ECS, 2001). In state takeovers, usually the state legislature, a federal court, or the state board of education transfers management responsibility for a local district or school to the state department of education for a specified amount of time (Ziebarth, 1999). Although states vary in the balance struck between state and local control in state takeovers, these takeovers represent a fundamental change in local educational governance in that they shift control from representative to executive leadership (ECS, 2001; Cibulka, 2001; Ziebarth, 1999). Indeed, takeovers may violate local voter rights in some states and have prompted the U.S. Department of Justice's involvement (ECS, 2001; Ziebarth, 1999).

The state has granted authority for the school system to the mayor in several urban districts, including Chicago, Boston, Detroit, and Cleveland (Danzberger, 1992; ECS, 1999, 2001; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Resnick, 1999; Ziebarth, 1999). Mayors also may assume control via ballot initiatives, as occurred in Oakland, California (Honig, 2001). In the past, mayors generally eschewed involvement in schools, but failing schools, inefficient school budgets, ineffective management by school boards and district administrators, union strangleholds, flight of the middle class, and other factors have prompted many urban mayors to campaign on school issues and become more directly involved in education (Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Shipps, 2001). Mayors also have come to view quality schools as essential to their cities' economic survival as federal aid to cities has declined and business leaders have become more concerned about the need for quality schools to produce a quality workforce (Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Shipps, 2001). Mayors who assume control of educational governance generally rely upon a corporate model of organization and decision making, and many have the authority to appoint the superintendent (Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Shipps, 2001).

Proponents of state and mayoral takeovers have contended that takeovers refocus control and accountability at a time when numerous groups (e.g., federal, state, and local governments; business leaders; teachers' unions; special interest groups; the courts; district and school administrators; school councils; school boards; voters; and parents) are competing for control of the school system (Danzberger, 1994; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Kirst, 1994; Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Shipps, 2001). In addition, supporters have argued that state takeovers garner more political and financial support for education, encourage greater collaboration between education and general government, provide more widely and better integrated services to students and families, increase collaboration between superintendents and school boards (both are usually appointed in these instances), reduce the influence of special interests, and motivate schools and districts to improve in order to resume or prevent the loss of local control (Danzberger, 1994; ECS, 1999; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Olson, 1992; Shipps, 2001; Ziebarth, 1999). Opponents have countered that state officials and mayors are not necessarily more capa-

ble of overseeing local schools than school boards and district administrators; state officials are less responsive to local issues; state officials and mayors have too many other concerns and responsibilities; education becomes less visible and loses public support; state officials and mayors may grant contracts for education-related services in return for campaign contributions; and, perhaps most fundamentally, local voters and disempowered and unorganized groups have less influence when schools are taken over (Carol et al., 1986; ECS, 1999; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Olson, 1992; Resnick, 1999; Shipps, 2001; Ziebarth, 1999). In takeover situations, those who assume control of a school or school system generally are permitted, and/or have by virtue of their positions, greater flexibility and power in governance, for instance in contract negotiations with teachers' unions, than those previously in charge (Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Shipps, 2001).

Little research has evaluated the success of state and mayoral takeovers, and variations in precipitating factors, organizational structures, personnel changes, redefinition of roles and responsibilities, as well as other factors, complicate comparisons (ECS, 2001; Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Shipps, 2001; Ziebarth, 1999). The limited findings suggest that takeovers improve financial and administrative management and relations with teachers' unions (ECS, 1999; Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Shipps, 2001; Ziebarth, 1999). However, takeovers appear to have mixed effects on students' academic achievement (ECS, 1999, 2001; Ziebarth, 1999). Some researchers have concluded that unless those who assume control focus on curriculum and instruction, academic achievement is unlikely to improve (Kirst & Buckley, 2001). Even in districts where academic achievement test scores rise, some groups may not benefit. An in-depth study of mayoral takeover in Chicago found that poor and African American individuals had less input than others, and poor and minority students suffered academically (Shipps, 2001).

When takeovers occur, the local school board can be eliminated, replaced, or restricted to an advisory role (Bushweller, 1998; NSBF, 1999; Ziebarth, 1999). School board experts have not specified an optimal role for school boards in takeover situations. Clarice L. Chambers, the former president of the National School Boards Association, had been a member of the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, school board for 25 years when the mayor assumed control and changed the locks on the board's conference room (Johnston, 2001a). New laws permitted the school board on which Chambers served to meet only six times per year and reduced its function to budget approval. Yet, the school board may play an important role in ensuring that takeovers result in improved academic outcomes. In Logan County, West Virginia, state takeover preceded improved student attendance, performance, and dropout rates (Bushweller, 1998; Ziebarth, 1999). The state superintendent attributed some of the success to the retention, though in a restricted capacity, of the local school board (Bushweller, 1998; Ziebarth, 1999). Studies of state and mayoral takeovers need to examine more thoroughly the role and effectiveness of school boards in these situations.

Elimination of school boards. Some critics of current educational governance have charged that school boards are anachronistic and/or chronically ineffective and have advocated for their demise (Carol et al., 1986; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Finn, 1991; Olson, 1992; Olson & Bradley, 1992; Streshly & Frase, 1993; Whitson, 1998). One proposal that has received much attention involves eliminating the school board

as a “middleman” between states and individual schools, allowing parents unrestricted choice of which schools their children attend, and funneling money directly to the schools they select (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Olson, 1992; Streshly & Frase, 1993; Wang & Walberg, 1999). According to proponents of this plan, the competitive market would pressure schools to excel in order to survive and weed out weak performers (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Olson, 1992; Streshly & Frase, 1993). The state would have oversight responsibility to ensure equity, minimal quality standards, and the accountability of individual schools (Danzberger, 1992; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Olson, 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). In an extension of this plan, vouchers would be authorized to allow children to attend private schools with public funds and/or states would enter into charter agreements with private schools (Danzberger et al., 1992; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Olson, 1992; Streshly & Frase, 1993).

Some studies, though contested, support a state-monitored system of independent schools (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Ziebarth, 1999). The success of Catholic schools in educating students is prominent in this research (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Ziebarth, 1999). A state-monitored system of independent schools would radically and fundamentally alter traditional educational governance, particularly if public funds were used for private schools. Charter schools and voucher programs have already moved education in this direction (Arnsperger et al., 1999; Danzberger et al., 1992). Although Hawaii has functioned without local school boards and relied upon a state board of education to set policy, research comparing educational governance in Hawaii to educational governance in other states is lacking.

Critics have advanced at least two other proposals that would eliminate local school boards. One proposal involves enfolding local educational governance within local general governance, making it one of several government departments (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Mayoral takeovers are a step in this direction, but, to date, most states and/or mayors have retained a separate local board for educational governance (Danzberger, 1992; Olson, 1992). The other proposal centers on the creation of a local board or group that would oversee integrated, comprehensive education, health, and social services for children and families (Cunningham, 1993; Danzberger, 1992; Olson, 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Proponents of children’s policy boards or well-being commissions, as they have been deemed, have argued that they would ensure a continuum of care without duplication of services for all children and their families (Cunningham, 1993; Danzberger, 1992; Olson, 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). These two proposals have rarely, if ever, been fully implemented, although examples of boards, districts, and individual schools that foster an integration of education, health, and social services can be found.

Some school board authorities have cautioned that the country may be too hastily abandoning traditional educational governance, in which school boards occupy a crucial position, without sufficient public dialogue regarding the possible consequences of such change (Danzberger et al., 1992; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Olson, 1992; Resnick, 1999; Shanker, 1989; Ziebarth, 1999). Most models of educational governance that propose elimination of local school boards retain a governing or oversight board that would function somewhat similarly to how school boards are intended to function, but with less direct opportunity for control by the local community, raising compelling questions about the superiority of these models (Danzberger, 1992; Olson, 1992; Resnick, 1999; Shanker, 1989). According to

Shanker (1989, p. 30), “abolishing school boards because of problems in school governance would be like abolishing Congress or state legislatures in the name of efficiency” (p. 30). Unfortunately, the general public appears to have a limited understanding of the role and responsibilities of school boards, restricting the ability of citizens to understand or contribute to debate about their elimination (Carol et al., 1986).

Conclusions

School boards currently face considerable pressures and criticisms from a variety of sources. Many business and political leaders, educators, school board and educational governance experts, and members of the public advocate school board and educational governance reforms, but there is little consensus regarding which reform is optimal (Arnsperger et al., 1999; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1992; Kirst, 1994; NSBF, 1999; Twentieth Century Fund, 1999; Renchler, 2000; Ziebarth, 1999). Education scholars have proposed reforming the selection procedures for school board members; restricting the school board’s role and responsibilities to focus on policy, not administration; and re-configuring educational governance. A variety of educational governance reforms have been implemented, including site-based management, charter schools, and state and mayoral takeovers, but the school board’s role in these has not been well established.

By design or in effect, many of the recent educational governance reforms constrain, alter, or eliminate school boards. However, little discussion and less research has focused on how school boards can operate most effectively within these new governance structures or what the consequences of school board elimination would be (Danzberger, 1992; Renchler, 2000; Ziebarth, 1999). In addition, little attention has been devoted to the contextual factors that might determine which, if any, reform is likely to be successful in specific situations. The source of much of the dissatisfaction with school boards and impetus for their reform is the poor performance of urban schools. Reforms designed for urban schools might not be appropriate for nonurban schools. Experts have stated that one best governance structure may not exist for public education (Danzberger et al., 1992; IEL, 2001). Researchers need to examine which governance structure is most effective under which circumstances and for whom. All students might not equally benefit, as occurred in Chicago’s mayoral takeover (Shipps, 2001). Furthermore, studies of school board and educational governance reforms should not only investigate how the school boards function under the various reforms but also identify the features that make them effective. In the next section, critical characteristics of effective school boards are discussed.

Key Characteristics of Effective School Boards

The school board literature is populated with a multitude of opinion-based articles and guidebooks that cover a range of topics from how to formulate education policy to the improvement of board meeting minutes (Hange & Leary, 1991; Rallis & Criscoe, 1993). School board organizations, experts, and members have identified characteristics that they consider essential for effective governance; however, little research exists to substantiate that these characteristics are indeed essential for students’ academic achievement. Characteristics that school board experts

frequently have identified as important are organized in this section under the following subheadings: appropriate overarching concerns, which include a focus on students' academic achievement and attention to policy, not administration; good relations with the superintendent, between board members, with other local agencies, and with the public and state; effective performance in the areas of policy-making, leadership, and budgeting; and adequate evaluation and training. Research is presented where possible, but the majority of findings show that many school boards do not embody the characteristics that have been described in the literature as essential for school board effectiveness rather than demonstrate that these characteristics actually are critical for effective governance and, more specifically, students' academic achievement.

Appropriate Overarching Concerns

Students' academic achievement. School boards have traditionally focused on financial, legal, and constituent issues and left responsibility for students' academic achievement to their administrators and educators (Resnick, 1999). Today, however, school boards that do not develop policies and support programs explicitly designed to improve students' academic achievement, oversee and evaluate the implementation and performance of these policies and programs, and demonstrate improved and/or high academic achievement risk being judged ineffective (Carol et al., 1986; NSBF, 1999; Resnick, 1999; Speer, 1998). NSBF (1999) proclaimed that school boards' primary goal must be to improve students' academic achievement and released the report, *Leadership Matters: Transforming Urban School Boards*, to assist school boards in improving students' academic achievement. NSBA has urged local school boards to make improvement of student achievement a major objective (Speer, 1998). NSBA published Bracey and Resnick's (1998) guidebook, *Raising the Bar: A School Board Primer on Student Achievement*; Speer's (1998) report, *Reaching for Excellence: What Local School Districts Are Doing to Raise Student Achievement*; and Amundson and Richardson's (1991) handbook, *Straight A's: Accountability, Assessment, Achievement*. NSBA also has promoted the Key Work of School Boards initiative to improve school boards' leadership for greater student achievement (see <http://www.nsba.org/keywork/>).

In addition to national organizations, other state and local groups have begun working to focus school boards on students' academic achievement. The Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB; 2000) has begun a pilot program, based on its own research (described subsequently), to provide support and training to improve students' academic achievement. The California School Board Association recently shepherded a project titled "Targeting Student Learning: The School Board's Role as Policymaker," one aim of which was to bring policy staff from five state board associations together to identify school board policies critical for improving student learning. The Kansas City Consensus, a group funded through donations from local corporations, foundations, and individuals, convened a school governance task force and released the 2001 report *Steer, Not Row: How to Strengthen Local School Boards and Improve Student Learning*. In the report, the task force stated that it "defined *effectiveness* in terms of student learning, as that is the only indicator that matters" (p. 6). The Educational Research Service and the New England School Development Council released Goodman, Fulbright, and Zimmerman's (1997) guidebook, *Getting There From Here: School Board-Superintendent Collab-*

oration: *Creating a School Governance Team Capable of Raising Student Achievement*, and Goodman and Zimmerman's (2000) report, *Thinking Differently: Recommendations for 21st Century School Board/Superintendent Leadership, Governance, and Teamwork for High Student Achievement*.

School board members and district staff have also expressed a need for school boards to focus on achievement. In a 1997–1998 national survey, school board members identified student achievement as their foremost concern (ASBJ, 1998). School board presidents, superintendents, and high school principals in a survey of 92 Wisconsin school districts frequently recommended concentration on student achievement and school improvement as a change that would improve the effectiveness of their school boards (Anderson, 1992). Unfortunately, a lack of time and established procedures, as well as the demands of numerous crises, may often prevent many school boards from concentrating directly on students' academic achievement (Carol et al., 1986). In a survey of 216 board chairpersons from nine major metropolitan area districts in nine states and several rural districts in three additional states, many board members reported that they need to spend more time on students' learning (Carol et al., 1986). In addition, board members may need specific instruction on the use of educational outcome measures to monitor students' progress and to hold themselves and their schools accountable. In a recent NSBA survey, 36% to 48% of 955 urban, suburban, and rural school board presidents reported that they were not confident that their boards understand what is measured by the state student assessment tests administered in their districts (Speer, 1998). Some educational governance and accountability experts have recommended that school boards use additional measures of achievement such as absences, grades, enrollment in advanced placement classes, honor roll attainment, retentions, promotions, dropout, scholarship awards, and college matriculations (Amundson & Richardson, 1991; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Resnick, 1999).

Although increasing attention is being given to the school board's influence on students' academic achievement, limited research exists to substantiate the importance of this role and provide guidance to school boards regarding how to perform this role effectively (Goodman et al., 1997; NSBF, 1999). Generally, school board experts and guidebooks have advised school boards to focus on academic achievement by establishing a vision for educational excellence, advocating for the vision inside and outside the school system, providing the resources and structure necessary to achieve the vision, and holding programs and people accountable for success (Bracey & Resnick, 1998; Goodman et al., 1997; Speer, 1998). Research is needed to identify and measure, more concretely and specifically than the broad guidelines typically delineated by experts, the key variables through which school boards affect students' academic achievement.

Two studies constitute significant steps in the study of school board effects on students' academic achievement, one by Goodman and colleagues (1997) and one by the IASB (2000). Goodman and colleagues (1997), in a study of 10 districts in five states, found that districts with quality governance tended to have greater student achievement as measured by dropout rates, the percentage of students entering college, and aptitude test scores. However, the researchers did not describe how the quality governance variables were measured, nor did they analyze the degree to which the variables were linked to the achievement outcomes. They only described the characteristics that typified high and low quality governance in their

sample. The characteristics of high quality governance included focus by the board on student achievement and policy, effective management by the board without micromanagement, a trusting and collaborative relationship between the board and superintendent, creation by the board of conditions and structures that allow the superintendent to function as the CEO and instructional leader of the district, evaluation of the superintendent according to mutually agreed upon procedures, effective communication between the board chair and superintendent and among board members, effective board communication with the community, board adoption of a budget that provides needed resources, governance retreats for evaluation and goal-setting purposes, monthly school board meetings for which the superintendent drafts the agenda, and long-term service of board members and superintendents. In contrast, poor governance was characterized by micromanagement by the board, role confusion between the board and superintendent, poor communication by the superintendent to the board, interpersonal conflict and lack of trust and respect between the superintendent and the board, bickering among board members or between board members and the superintendent, and board members' actions reflecting their personal interests, disregard for the agenda process and the chain of command, playing to the news media, and limited commitment to improving governance. Findings from this study form the basis of recommendations by Goodman and colleagues (1997) and Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) that emphasize the importance of teamwork between the school board as a united body and the superintendent and call for ongoing team-building education and development in order for the school board and superintendent to achieve high-quality, collaborative governance that effectively improves students' educational attainment.

The IASB (2000) examined school board and superintendent functioning in Georgia school districts and compared three districts in which students had performed low for 3 consecutive years on standardized achievement tests and a variety of other unspecified indicators with three demographically similar districts in which students had performed high for the same period on similar measures. The districts ranged in size from 1,395 to 5,163 students. The research team, which was not informed in advance of the performance status of the districts, interviewed 159 board members, superintendents, and school personnel regarding seven critical conditions for school renewal selected from the research literature on effective schools and school improvement and change. These conditions were shared leadership, continuous improvement and shared decision making, ability to create and sustain initiatives, supportive workplace for staff, staff development, support for school sites through data and information, and community involvement.

Several major differences were found between high and low performing districts. Board members, superintendents, and school personnel in high achieving districts believed that they could elevate students' academic achievement, while those in low achieving districts believed that significant barriers constrained improvement. School board members in the high achieving districts demonstrated greater understanding of and influence related to the aforementioned seven critical conditions for school improvement and could identify and describe school improvement initiatives and the boards' role in supporting them. In high achieving districts, the school boards' focus on school improvement initiatives was shared by school personnel and linked to building- and classroom-level actions. In contrast to Goodman and colleagues' (1997) study, all of the school boards in the IASB study had

peaceable relationships with their superintendents and were satisfied with them. Similar to Goodman and colleagues' research, the IASB study documented differences between high and low achieving schools but did not analyze whether or how strongly individual variables were related to students' academic achievement.

Additional comparative case studies and quantitative research, both cross sectional and longitudinal, linking specific school board policies and actions to students' academic outcomes are needed in order to demonstrate more concretely the importance of school boards in raising and sustaining students' academic achievement. The key variables that allow school boards to focus effectively on and improve students' academic achievement need further elucidation. Accountability for students' academic achievement presently tends to reside less with the school board than other individuals or groups such as the superintendent, other administrators, and teachers. In a recent NSBA survey, only 21% of superintendents surveyed in consultation with school board presidents reported that they feel it is very important to hold boards accountable for raising student achievement (Speer, 1998). Solid evidence that school boards can have a positive impact on students' academic achievement could guide and improve school board effectiveness; encourage school boards and others to hold school boards accountable, fairly and beneficially, for students' educational progress; and ameliorate the poor reputation of school boards among critics who view them as outdated and deleterious.

Policy, not administration. As a result of the school board reform movement of the early 1900s, school boards retained policy-making as their primary responsibility and appropriated administrative duties to superintendents (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; Urban & Wagoner, 1996). Many educational governance experts continue to promulgate this separation of responsibilities (Campbell & Greene, 1994; Carver, 1997; Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; IASB, 1996; McGonagill, 1987; NSBF, 1999; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). The encroachment of school boards into the daily administration of their districts elicits strong reproach (Carol et al., 1986; Carver, 1997; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; McAdams, 2000; Todras, 1993; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Wagner, 1992). Resnick (1999) wrote that micromanagement is probably the most common and often deserved criticism of school boards. According to the Twentieth Century Fund (1992):

What has made many school boards an obstacle to—rather than a force for—fundamental education reform? Our answer: The tendency for most boards to micromanage, to become immersed in the day-to-day administration of their districts that is properly the realm of the professional administrator. (pp. 2, 5)

Focusing school boards on policy-making and oversight and restricting them from administrative management is a major platform of school board reforms proposed by the Twentieth Century Fund (1992) Task Force, IEL (Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993), and ECS (1999).

A variety of studies have documented that some school boards are involved in the daily administration of their schools and some board members are not clear about the distinction between their and the superintendent's roles and, relatedly, between policy and administration. Goodman and colleagues (1997) found that role confusion between the board and the superintendent and micromanagement

by the board were two elements of low-quality governance that characterized districts with low student achievement. In a 1988 to 1990 study of 266 urban, suburban, and rural/small-town school boards from 16 states, school boards rated themselves as not very effective in avoiding involvement in administrative duties (Danzberger et al., 1992). In a study of 304 superintendents in Nebraska, the second most frequently reported critical conflict between a superintendent and a school board or school board member centered on role confusion (Grady & Bryant, 1991). Wisconsin school board presidents, superintendents, and high school principals from 92 different districts frequently suggested that clarification of policy and administrative responsibilities would improve board effectiveness (Anderson, 1992). Board members in Carol and colleagues' (1986) study reported that an unclearly defined policy-making role and lack of clarity regarding how to distinguish their role from that of administrators hampered board policy-making. In addition, two separate analyses of school board meeting minutes in West Virginia and Utah found that only 3% and 8.3%, respectively, of board decisions focused on policy-making and policy oversight (Hange & Leary, 1991; Van Alfen & Schmidt, 1997). Data such as these, coupled with the conviction that separation of policy and administrative responsibilities is critical for good educational governance, have prompted several reformers to advocate that states codify these role distinctions and explicitly confine school boards to policy-making and policy oversight (Danzberger et al., 1992; 1993; ECS, 1999; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992).

However, the often-stated maxim that school boards should concentrate on policy and leave administration to their superintendents and other district administrators is simplistic, and there is limited research available to substantiate that strict separation of roles is essential for effective governance (Campbell & Greene, 1994; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992). The roles of the school board and superintendent are highly interdependent, making complete separation of policy-making and administration impractical, if not impossible. For instance, the school board typically depends primarily on the superintendent and his or her staff for information on which to base its decisions, thereby allowing the administration to influence policy-making via control of the information it provides (Carol et al., 1986; McGonagill, 1987; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Critics who fault school boards for micromanagement usually do not specify what constitutes micromanagement but sometimes indicate that daily involvement in administration qualifies. However, problems associated with daily involvement by a school board in administration do not necessarily warrant full-scale prohibition of the school board from administration.

The personalities, expertise, experiences, and leadership styles of school board members and the superintendent may necessitate intermixing of policy and administration (McGonagill, 1987). Case studies of nine metropolitan school districts found both negative and positive exceptions to the often advocated separation of roles (Carol et al., 1986). When the board and superintendent have a good working relationship and there are processes for diffusing tensions that arise over the division of responsibilities—characteristics that are more commonly found in more racially, ethnically, and politically homogeneous districts—separation of policy and administration does not appear to be necessary for effective governance (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987). In contrast to the clear division endorsed by many educational governance experts, McGonagill (1987), Carol and

colleagues (1986), and Danzberger and colleagues (1987) recommended that individual boards and their superintendents apportion the policy-making and administrative responsibilities as best suits them and continually evaluate and reassess the arrangement.

Additional research is needed to determine which division of responsibilities under which circumstances leads to more effective governance and improved academic outcomes. At present, there is insufficient evidence that a complete separation of the policy-making and administrative roles between the school board and superintendent, respectively, is essential or feasible for effective governance. Researchers need to develop detailed definitions of the policy-making and administrative roles and valid measures of each role. The percentage of meeting time that school boards spend on policy-related decision making and oversight has been used as a measure of how involved school boards are in policy-making. However, it is not known if school boards that spend a greater portion of their meetings on policy-related decision making and oversight govern more effectively, are less involved in administration, and have improved or better academic achievement in their districts.

Good Relations

Superintendent relations. Some school board experts consider the school board's most important responsibility or task to be hiring a superintendent and holding her or him accountable for managing the district in conformity with the school board's policies and state laws (Carol et al., 1986; Goodman et al., 1997; IASB, 1996). The power to hire and fire the superintendent gives the board indirect control over much of what transpires within the district. Indeed, Robert K. Wimpelberg (personal communication, April 27, 2001) asserted that "it is the board's hiring of, evaluation of, and support for the superintendent that matters the most in its potential to affect student learning." There is widespread agreement within the school board literature that a good working relationship between the school board and superintendent is essential for effective governance (Anderson, 1992; Carol et al., 1986; Goodman et al., 1997; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Grady & Bryant, 1991; IASB, 1996; Thomas, 2001).

Despite the availability of numerous publications and services to assist school boards in their selection of, collaboration with, and evaluation of superintendents, critics have contended that many school boards lack the training or capacity to develop productive, positive, and long-term relationships with superintendents (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). This position is based in part on the high turnover rate of urban superintendents in recent decades. Twenty of the 25 largest central city school districts had superintendent vacancies in 1990 (Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). According to Sharon Lewis of the Council of the Great City Schools, a nonprofit organization representing approximately 50 of the nation's largest public school systems, a 1999 survey of their districts showed the average superintendent tenure to be declining from two and one-third years (personal communication, September 12, 2001).

Case study and survey data indicate that negative board-superintendent working relationships are marked by an overload of information and work for the board, too much board involvement in administrative matters, lack of board independence from the superintendent, and haste on the part of the superintendent to resolve issues (Carol et al., 1986). In contrast, good relationships between school boards

and superintendents are characterized by respect, trust, confidence, support, and open communication (Anderson, 1992; Carol et al., 1986; Goodman et al., 1997). A 1988 to 1990 study of 266 urban, suburban, and rural/small-town school boards from 16 states found that most school boards have weak procedures for management of board-superintendent conflict (Danzberger et al., 1992). A high percentage of school boards formally evaluate their superintendents, but such evaluations can be counterproductive when the board and superintendent have not agreed in advance to clearly defined performance expectations and assessment of results (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992; Goodman et al., 1997; Robinson & Bickers, 1990). For discussion of board involvement in administration and poor differentiation of the board and superintendent roles, see the Policy, Not Administration section.

Only a few studies have examined the relationship between the school board and superintendent with respect to students' academic achievement. Goodman and colleagues (1997) found that districts in which there was role confusion and a lack of trust and collaboration between the superintendent and the board, poor communication by the superintendent, and board micromanagement, among other problems, had lower student achievement than districts without such problems. In contrast, the IASB's (2000) study of three high achieving and three demographically similar low achieving Georgia school districts, found peaceable relationships between the superintendent and school board and board satisfaction with superintendents across all of the districts. Thus, an amicable, productive working relationship might be necessary, but not sufficient, for effective educational governance that has a positive impact on students' academic achievement. Additional research is needed to test this conclusion, as well as to identify which aspects of the board-superintendent relationship are critical for improving or maintaining high academic achievement.

Board member relations. School board members do not have authority to govern local education as individuals; states authorize school boards to govern as a singular body (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; IASB, 1996). Thus, the ability of board members to work together and reach consensus is essential for boards to exercise their authority. Traditionally, board members have conceptualized their role as trustees and functioned as a single body representing the collective values and interests of the community (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; McGonagill, 1987; Merz, 1986). Critics have charged that since the 1960s, board members increasingly have viewed their role as representatives, rather than trustees, and operated as individuals representing specific groups of constituents, special interests, and/or single issues (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; McCloud & McKenzie, 1994; McGonagill, 1987; Rallis & Criscoe, 1993; Schlechty & Cole, 1993; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Wagner, 1992). Critics also have censured some school board members for concentrating on individual relationships with constituents to further their individual political careers (Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Wagner, 1992; Wilson, 1994). The representative role appears to impede the ability of board members to function as one body (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Danzberger & Usdan, 1994; McCloud & McKenzie, 1994; McGonagill, 1987; Rallis & Criscoe, 1993; Schlechty & Cole, 1993).

Danzberger and colleagues (1992) wrote, "There is no question that the school boards most visibly troubled and which are condemned for the most dysfunctional behaviors are those whose members' [sic] practice the mirror theory of representative government" (p. 94). A lack of consensus among board members regarding their appropriate role (i.e., representative vs. trustee) also may cause frustration and conflict (Danzberger et al., 1992; Merz, 1986; McGonagill, 1987).

Research confirms that many school boards have difficulty working as one body. In one study, urban, suburban, and rural/small-town school boards generally rated themselves low on board member relations (Danzberger et al., 1992). More specifically, boards rated themselves low on interpersonal conflict resolution skills, respect and trust for the collective board, and communication among members. Urban boards rated themselves the lowest on average. According to Rallis and Criscoe (1993), a state government evaluation of Seattle schools (Washington State House of Representatives, 1990, as cite in Rallis & Criscoe) found that individuality hampered many boards. Case study research in nine metropolitan area districts revealed that school board members, educators, and the public perceived that the inability of the school board to work as a team and undue influence by special interest groups hindered the boards' ability to govern effectively and created a poor image of board performance (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1994). School board members in the case study and board chairpersons in survey research expressed dissatisfaction that many board members did not understand their trusteeship role and were focused on single issues (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987). School board presidents, superintendents, and high school principals have recommended decreasing the influence of special interests in order to improve board effectiveness (Anderson, 1992). Hill, Wise, and Shapiro (1989) observed that in each of six urban school districts nominated and selected for their implementation of improvement plans, though not necessarily for improvement in students' academic achievement, the school board exhibited the ability to reach consensus and was not fractured by conflict.

The shift away from the trusteeship role appears to be related to changes in election procedures and greater diversity among board members, particularly in urban districts (Bradley, 1992; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; McCloud & McKenzie, 1994; McGonagill, 1987; Schlechty & Cole, 1993; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). As previously mentioned, in the 1970s, urban school boards began shifting from at-large to subdistrict elections in an effort to diversify their membership (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987; Kirst, 1994). Boards whose members are drawn from subdistricts have been observed to be the most politicized (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987). Racial and ethnic minority board members may feel torn between serving their respective constituency and working more generally to improve education for all students in the district (Carol et al., 1986; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). However, because the representation of diverse constituencies satisfies an important democratic principal, it may no longer be politically feasible for school boards to function solely as trustees (McGonagill, 1987). Thus, the challenge is to transcend individual interests enough to reach consensus yet still respect and address these interests (Carol et al., 1986; McCloud & McKenzie, 1994; McGonagill, 1987). Investigation of how the trustee and representative roles can be blended for effective governance is needed.

Interagency collaboration. Numerous educational governance experts have emphasized the importance of interagency collaboration between schools and other local organizations, most notably health and social service agencies (Boyd, 1996; Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993; Goodman et al., 1997; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Resnick, 1999; Shannon, 1994; Usdan, 1994; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Wagner, 1992). A major goal of the restructuring/systemic reform movement has been the provision of integrated, comprehensive social and educational services to children and families based on the conviction that unless children's needs outside school are adequately met, their academic achievement cannot improve (Boyd, 1996; Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Resnick, 1999; Shannon, 1994; Usdan, 1994; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Demographic factors, such as child poverty, growing racial and ethnic minority populations, and more working mothers, and social problems, such as drug use and homelessness, underlie the demand for collaboration (Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Resnick, 1999; Shannon, 1994; Usdan, 1994; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992).

Some experts have advocated for school boards to lead and oversee interagency collaboration. The NSBA made advocacy for social, health, and education services on behalf of children one of its four major leadership prongs (Campbell & Greene, 1994; Shannon, 1994). Shannon (1994), as executive director of the NSBA, wrote that "if the comprehensive needs of all children are to be met, the schools are a natural place in which to deliver the services, and educators are natural partners for those responsible for providing the services. The NSBA unambiguously endorses this approach to serving all the needs of children" (p. 389). Alternatively, the Twentieth Century Fund (1992) called for the establishment of state-mandated children and youth coordinating boards to link local social, health, and education services.

Although the literature contains numerous and widely varied descriptions of collaboration between schools and health and social service agencies, research has not identified the best models for such collaboration or persuasively demonstrated that such collaboration improves students' academic achievement. Research suggests that while interagency linkages between social, health, and education services have benefited some at-risk children, schools have been somewhat uncooperative partners in these collaborative efforts (Boyd, 1996). In a 1988 to 1990 survey of urban, suburban, and rural/small-town school boards, boards rated themselves low on coordination and policy formation with human service agencies (Danzberger et al., 1992). School boards may lack the capacity to collaborate with social and health service agencies, given their already expansive responsibilities (Danzberger, 1994; Kirst, 1994). Furthermore, school boards' advocacy on behalf of children and families' health and social needs could raise contentious debate over the appropriate services to provide to children and families, given the range of values and beliefs regarding parental, personal, and government responsibilities and rights (Boyd, 1996). Little research has examined the costs versus benefits of such collaboration to school boards and districts.

Local and state government. In contrast to the reformers of the early 1900s, many school board experts now advise boards to increase their linkages to local government (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Usdan, 1994). Many experts now believe that the potential benefits of closer affiliation with local

government outweigh the possible dangers (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Usdan, 1994; Wirt & Kirst, 1992). Local support for education has declined, particularly in urban areas, as poverty has increased and the elderly population has grown (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992). Establishment of linkages with local government could give boards more political clout and community support, as well as facilitate the coordination of education, health, and social services for children and families (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1992; Usdan, 1994).

Research indicates that school boards do not routinely interact with local government unless they are fiscally dependent on it (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992). In Danzberger et al.'s (1992) study, school boards reported that they typically do not actively influence the local government's education-related policy-making. Scant research has examined the impact of closer alliances between school boards and local government on students' academic achievement. Mayoral takeovers offer examples of greater affiliation with local government. As detailed earlier, they have had mixed effects on students' academic achievement (ECS, 1999, 2001; Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Shipps, 2001; Ziebarth, 1999). Carol and colleagues (1986) observed that boards that were fiscally dependent upon local government, and therefore in close contact, often were mired in conflict. Research-based guidelines are needed to assist school boards to establish optimal arrangements with local government that will positively affect academic achievement.

In addition to closer linkages to local government, some experts claim that school boards would benefit from greater collaboration with state government. Tension between school boards and states has escalated as states have exercised greater control over local educational governance (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Johnson, 1988; Kirst, 1994). Although school boards are state-authorized government bodies, school boards and states have not collaborated in the development of educational reforms and legislation, and school boards have largely acquiesced to the states' involvement and not actively sought to resume the control they have lost (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987; Resnick, 1999). School boards, through state and national school board associations, could seek to become active partners in educational reform (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987; Resnick, 1999). Research should examine further how the tension between states and local school boards has affected educational governance, identify barriers to and facilitators of school boards' collaboration with states, and assess the effect of collaboration on school boards' effectiveness (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987).

Public relations. The school board, as a democratic institution, ideally represents and is responsive to the public through its membership and governance. Critics have contended that lack of school board member candidates, low voter turnout, limited public involvement, and poor understanding of the school board's role are primary evidence that the school board is a failing institution (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1987; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Rallis & Criscoe, 1993; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Data confirm that some members of the public are dissatisfied with and/or misunderstand the role of school boards (Carol et al., 1986; NSBF, 1999). In a national opinion survey of urban residents and school board members, only 37% of the urban public reported that their local school board was doing a good to excellent

job, whereas 70% of school board members rated their performance as good to excellent (NSBF, 1999). Only 39% of the public stated that the school board should be one of the groups or individuals creating most of the policies related to the operation of local schools (NSBF, 1999). Improved public relations may be critical for school board survival (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992).

School board authorities urge boards to increase their communication with and inclusion of the public and to establish specific policies for public relations (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993; IASB, 1996; Nelson & Crum, 1983; NSBF, 1999; Resnick, 1999). However, greater inclusion is a simplistic recommendation. Ogawa (1996) writes that effective organizations construct both bridges and buffers to external groups. Greater inclusion of the public in all aspects of governance probably would not be beneficial (Boyd, 1996; Ogawa, 1996). Yet, opportunities for public involvement in addition to voting or attendance at school board meetings are needed (Carol et al., 1986; NSBF, 1999). Experts have also recommended that boards implement specific public relations policies, including policies for communicating with the media. Danzberger and colleagues (1992) found that many school boards lack comprehensive written media policies. Criticism of the board in the media, particularly by board members, can have a negative impact on the public's perception of the board's effectiveness (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992).

Studies should examine the variety of policies and procedures that boards use to involve and communicate with the public. The association of these policies and procedures to public perceptions and support of the school board, as well as to the quality of educational governance and students' academic achievement, should be assessed. A study of six urban school districts, nominated and selected based on their successful implementation of improvement reforms, found that these districts were characterized by communication with and involvement of the community in educational issues and reform goals, providing some evidence of the importance of good public relations (Hill et al., 1989).

Effective Performance

Policy-making. Policy-making is widely described as being the school board's principal function (Carver, 1997; Clemmer, 1991; Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993; Nelson & Crum, 1983; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Guidelines for the formulation and oversight of policy are readily available. In addition, state boards of education and school boards associations offer a variety of materials, training opportunities, and services to assist school board members with policy-making (Nelson & Crum, 1983). According to experts, good policies generally contain the following elements: reflection of the board's vision for the school system, coherence with other policies, specification of goals and objectives, definition of roles and responsibilities, flexibility for the operation of the policy, specification of outcomes to measure success, and compliance with state and federal mandates (Danzberger et al., 1992; Resnick, 1999). It is recommended that school boards have written guidelines about making policy, including specification of the processes, procedures, and resources for information gathering, development, oversight, and evaluation (Carol et al., 1986).

Many school boards appear to have room for improvement in their policy-making. Approximately half of 216 board chairpersons in one survey reported that

more policy study and review sessions would improve policy-making, and nearly a third of the respondents stated that their board did not hold periodic goal-setting and planning meetings (Carol et al., 1986). Many of the boards in Carol and colleagues' (1986) case study of nine metropolitan districts lacked procedures for policy oversight and evaluation. A national review of policy manuals in 130 school districts revealed wide variation in the inclusion of policy items deemed essential by study directors of the regional offices of the U.S. Department of Education (Nelson & Crum, 1983). Many school boards in the national review recorded their policies in multiple locations without a central policy manual that consolidated all policies or documented their whereabouts. As mentioned previously, two studies of school board meeting minutes indicated that school boards spend only a small percentage of their meetings making policy-related decisions (Hange & Leary, 1991; Van Alfen & Schmidt, 1997).

Although the literature abounds with recommendations and guidelines for good policy-making, there are few studies that link school boards' policy-making to students' academic outcomes, and most of these are difficult to find in the research literature because they focus on a specific policy, such as the prohibition of social promotion, and include limited details about the school board's role in the formulation, oversight, evaluation, and success or failure of the policy. Nevertheless, school board associations now urge school boards to focus on policies aimed directly at improving students' academic achievement. Thus, achievement-targeted policy-making is a ripe topic for research, which is needed not only to substantiate the relation between policy-making and students' academic achievement but also to identify the crucial elements of this policy-making.

Leadership. Each of the other key characteristics delineated here can be incorporated into a definition of effective leadership. Yet, some educational governance experts would consider this definition incomplete. According to many experts, the creation of a vision, or mission, for education and empowerment of the administration, educators, and community to carry out the vision also are critical elements of effective leadership (Campbell & Greene, 1994; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993; Griswold, 1997; Johnson, 1988; Rallis & Criscoe, 1993; Resnick, 1999; Schlechty, 1992; Van Alfen, 1992). Establishing a vision for education is the first of four leadership thrusts advocated by the NSBA (Campbell & Greene, 1994; Resnick, 1999; Shannon, 1994). Ideally, the school board exercises its core democratic function by assessing community values and interests and translating these into a vision that falls within the parameters set by the state and federal governments (Campbell & Greene, 1994; Carol et al., 1986; Griswold, 1997; Resnick, 1999; Schlechty, 1992). Mobilization of the community, including school personnel, political and business leaders, and the general public, may be facilitated by giving the community a voice in the formulation of the vision and a role in its attainment (Danzberger et al., 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Resnick, 1999; Van Alfen, 1992).

Although the school board literature contains anecdotal examples of boards that have successfully established a vision and empowered their communities, these functions and the steps required to accomplish them have not been well explicated. According to Van Alfen (1992), for example, leadership is more an outlook or viewpoint than a group of specific techniques. As part of a 2-year project headed by the

California School Boards Association (CSBA), a committee of school board experts described the vision as follows:

The vision statement reflects the consensus of the governance team (the entire board and superintendent) on what children need in order to achieve their highest potential and which educational programs will be offered to reach that ideal. The vision reflects the shared values of the community and the governance team and as such should drive virtually every aspect of the district's program. (Campbell & Greene, 1994, p. 393)

The committee also defined the creation of a climate for excellence as a component of the leadership role as follows:

Providing direction for the district also includes a more subtle, but nonetheless real, board function—creating a climate that makes possible the achievement of excellence in the system. Much of what the board does to establish a climate for excellence emanates from the tone it sets individually and collectively. By setting fair but rigorous standards of performance, establishing well-considered policies, and treating its own members and others with dignity and respect, the board communicates a professionalism at the top that becomes a model for the entire school system. (Campbell & Greene, 1994, p. 393)

In contrast to the CSBA's recommendation of mobilization via example, Resnick (1999) recommended the empowerment of administrators and educators through transference of decision-making responsibilities but warned that this potentially would confuse the lines of authority, responsibility, and accountability.

The increase in state involvement in local educational governance in the 1980s strongly suggests that the states perceived school boards as ineffective in setting the vision for and moving districts toward educational reform (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Johnson, 1988; Kirst, 1994). School boards also have been criticized for rubber-stamping policy initiatives presented to them by the administration, following rather than leading (Feistritz, 1989; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). To date, there is mixed research evidence that school boards have the ability to and can effectively lead major reform efforts (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger & Clark, 1993, as cited in Danzberger 1994; Danzberger et al., 1992; Firestone et al., 1989; Keedy & Freeman, 1997; McAdams, 2000; Westat, 2001). Additional research is needed not only to substantiate the importance of vision and empowerment for effective governance and improvement of students' academic achievement but also to identify the critical components of vision and empowerment to enable school boards to lead more effectively.

Budgeting. School boards have traditionally focused on financial oversight (Resnick, 1999). In addition to planning and approval of district budgets, the school boards' financial responsibilities often entail negotiations with labor unions; oversight of service contracts for transportation, food, technology, and facilities maintenance; and revenue generation via capital campaigns, bonds, and tax levies. Strong, yet disputed, data demonstrate that school funding is inversely related to students' academic achievement (Burtless, 1996; Greenwald, Hedges, & Laine, 1996; Payne & Biddle, 1999; Versteegen & King, 1998). However, money does not guarantee academic success, as studies finding little or no relation between funding and student achievement attest. According to Picus (2000), school boards need to identify and fund effective

policies and programs and cull those that are ineffective from their budgets, instead of continually adding new policies and programs and seeking increasingly greater amounts of funding. In order to make informed financial decisions, school board members must collaborate with school financial officers and develop sufficient knowledge of and facility with budget figures (Williams, 1998). An examination of three school districts that experienced bankruptcy revealed previous years of over-spending, overestimation of resources, failure to plan ahead, failure to heed audits, insufficient cost control procedures, inability to track spending, and failure to keep hiring and raises within budget (Noonan, Manca, & Matranga, 1999).

A critical task for school boards is the allocation of financial resources to bolster students' academic achievement, a task that has garnered attention as the demand for high standards and accountability has swept the nation. In a 1997–1998 national survey, student achievement supplanted finance and budget issues, which slipped to second, as school board members' top ranked concern (ASBJ, 1998). Odden and Archibald's (2000) review of research and examination of two districts and an additional 12 schools that reapportioned resources and demonstrated improvement in students' academic achievement revealed that successful schools directed funds toward costly strategies such as smaller class size, professional development and more planning time for teachers, and one-to-one tutoring for struggling students. These schools each selected an overall curriculum strategy, such as a national school reform design. Data-rich needs assessments dictated strategy selection, and schools had flexibility to reapportion their funding to finance the strategy. One of the major shifts that schools made was from financial support of categorical programs to the support of the whole school educational strategy selected. Many schools also reassigned or eliminated instructional support aides. Recently, Standard and Poor's developed and released an independent evaluation system, School Evaluation Services, that assesses, based on a combination of financial and academic indicators, district performance and produces data that school boards can use to guide the reallocation of funds to improve achievement (Cox & Stewart, 2000).

Adequate Evaluation and Preparation

Evaluation. School board authorities have recommended that school boards engage in evaluations for three primary reasons: to promote development and, thereby, improve performance; to hold staff, individual schools, and the district accountable; and to hold themselves accountable for their own and the districts' performance (Amundson & Richardson, 1991; Boone, 1991; Capital Area School Development Association, 1990; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Resnick, 1999; Robinson & Bickers, 1990). The first reason is the one most often advanced (Boone, 1991; Carol et al., 1986). In this regard, evaluation serves an oversight function and is part of a cyclical process in which goals are set, policies are implemented, structures and resources are provided, and then evaluation is conducted to determine success and direct the resetting of goals. Thus, evaluation can serve as a control mechanism and be used to optimize the school board's and the district's performance (Boone, 1991; Capital Area School Development Association, 1990; Carol et al., 1986; Robinson & Bickers, 1990).

The other two reasons supporting school board evaluation have gained prominence as the demand for accountability has increased. The NSBA lists accountability as one

of its four leadership prongs, but school boards may be more likely to interpret this to mean that they should hold others accountable rather than themselves (Campbell & Greene, 1994; Resnick, 1999; Shannon, 1994). Because school board members are elected or appointed, they may feel that evaluation of their own effectiveness via the election and/or appointment process is sufficient (Boone, 1991; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987; Robinson & Bickers, 1990; Sewall, 1996). However, as the need for and role of school boards are increasingly questioned, it may be critical for boards to evaluate themselves with regard to their district's performance and prove their effectiveness (Amundson & Richardson, 1991; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987; Sewall, 1996). In addition, communication of self-evaluation findings could help boards build trust with administrators, teachers, other staff, and the public and make these groups more receptive to working toward common goals (Carol et al., 1986; Gates & Wall, 1986; McGonagill, 1987; Resnick, 1999).

Studies show that many boards do not evaluate themselves regularly. In a survey of 216 school board chairpersons, only a third reported that their boards regularly conduct evaluations (Carol et al., 1986). In a national survey of more than 700 randomly sampled school district superintendents, only 26% reported that their school boards routinely evaluate themselves, and slightly more than half reported that their boards never do so (Robinson & Bickers, 1990). Of those school boards engaging in evaluation, 59% used criteria established by both the board and the superintendent, 24% used criteria set only by the board, and the remainder used standards set by the state or other agencies. Several additional findings related to school boards' self-evaluation suggest that current recommendations and practices may be inadequate. Robinson and Bickers (1990) assessed the criteria most commonly identified in the literature as important for school board evaluation. These criteria included a wide range of school board responsibilities, from conducting meetings as scheduled at a time and place convenient for the public to providing orientation and continued development for board members. Only two criteria were specifically related to students' academic achievement: setting short- and long-term goals for and staying informed of students' scholastic progress. Greater attention to the evaluation of policies and actions directly related to students' academic achievement may be critical for their success.

Most experts have recommended evaluation of the board as a whole, which is most common, but some advocate evaluation of individual members, and some support the evaluation of meetings (Boone, 1991; Robinson & Bickers, 1990). Many experts also have recommended that administrators, educators, and the public within the district have a voice in the board's evaluation (Capital Area School Development Association, 1990; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992; McGonagill, 1987; Robinson & Bickers, 1990). However, research indicates that few boards have an established method for such input (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992; Robinson & Bickers, 1990). Many experts have recommended use of an outside auditor for evaluation, usually in concert with or in addition to evaluation by the board itself, but this appears to be an infrequent practice (Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Robinson & Bickers, 1990; Streshly & Frase, 1993; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). Furthermore, some experts have argued that school boards would more candidly evaluate themselves and concentrate on development if evaluations were exempt from sunshine laws (Goodman et al., 1997; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000).

The literature currently contains limited evidence that school board evaluations improve governance effectiveness and student outcomes (Robinson & Bickers, 1990). Goodman and colleagues (1997) found that evaluation was one of several characteristics comprising good governance that appeared related to greater academic achievement. Carol and colleagues (1986) found that evaluation, together with several other traits, characterized school boards that seemed to have a greater sense of effectiveness. Additional research is needed to examine the relation of board self-evaluation to effective governance and academic achievement.

Training/development. There is widespread consensus among school board experts that school board members should obtain training/development in order to improve board effectiveness (Capital Area School Development Association, 1990; Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; IASB, 1996; Kansas City Consensus, 2001; Schmidt, 1992). Calls for training/development for virtually every aspect of the school board role. Many school board members concur that training/development is needed (Anderson, 1992; Carol et al., 1986; Tallerico, 1991), and some states and school board associations have mandated that school board members obtain training/development (Capital Area School Development Association, 1990; Danzberger et al., 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Resnick, 1999; Schmidt, 1992; Tallerico, 1991). However, there is some disagreement over the form, content, and length of training/development that board members should receive, who should provide it, and whether it should be required (Schmidt, 1992).

Abundant training/development opportunities and materials are available. Prospective board member candidates can receive preliminary training/development, new members can participate in orientations, and experienced members may engage in ongoing training/development (Capital Area School Development Association, 1990). The Capital Area School Development Association (1990) listed the following resources for training/development: students; parents and community members; fellow board members; self-assessment reports; policy manuals; educational reports and position papers; legislators and school law; local, state, and national training programs; and district staff. Independent groups, such as IEL and the Danforth Program for School Board Members, also provide training/development. Superintendents frequently take responsibility for providing orientations to new school board members (Carol et al., 1986) and may tend to view themselves as the primary source for ongoing training/development (Tallerico, 1991). While some research supports a primary role for superintendents in ongoing training/development, other research shows that school board members prefer and rely more upon self-initiated and self-directed learning in the form of on-the-job training, reflection, learning from mistakes, information gathering, and independent reading (Tallerico, 1991; Thomas, 1993). When training/development is mandated, state departments of education and state boards associations usually are the providers (Schmidt, 1992).

Critics of formal training/development programs have charged that they are often too superficial, too concerned with dispensing information rather than building skills, and too focused on individual members rather than the board as one body or the board and superintendent as a team (Carol et al., 1986; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Schmidt, 1992). However, school board members may prioritize the accumulation of information above skill and team development (Carol et al.,

1986; Thomas, 1993). After becoming members, many are surprised by the complexity of the job and thus may feel their most pressing need is for information (Anderson, 1992; Carol et al., 1986). Thomas (1993), for instance, found a need for greater knowledge of the intent of and factors precipitating states' reform legislation among school board members in the central region states. However, given that frequent criticisms of school boards center on the inability of members to function collectively as one group and in collaboration with their superintendent, team training/development may warrant a higher priority than school board members usually give it (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1987; Goodman et al., 1997; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Schmidt, 1992).

Experts disagree over whether training should be required (Capital Area School Development Association, 1990; Danzberger et al., 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Resnick, 1999; Schmidt, 1992; Tallerico, 1991). According to Tallerico (1991), "Such approaches can be criticized for giving less attention to shaping the content and processes of learning to be consistent with trustees' needs/perspectives, than to devising accountability systems for measuring and recording hours of formal instruction" (p. 104). School board members have cited lack of time as a reason why they have not sought training/development on their own (Carol et al., 1986; Resnick, 1999). While mandating training/development may surmount this barrier, it also may discourage qualified candidates who view the requirement as excessive from seeking election or accepting appointment to the school board (Capital Area School Development Association, 1990). Nevertheless, Goodman and Zimmerman (2000) reported that several states have mandated yearly instruction to school board–superintendent teams, and that mandated instruction for school board members has yielded "enormously positive" (p. 14) results, but they did not provide data to support this claim.

Despite the frequent and urgent calls and requirements for training/development, there is little evidence to prove the effectiveness of the various training/development materials and activities (Schmidt, 1992). Research is needed to help school boards and school board members discern which of the plethora of training/development materials and opportunities are likely to be most useful to them, particularly given time and financial constraints (Tallerico, 1991). In addition, the components of effective training/development materials and activities should be identified. For instance, while one-shot formal training/development activities appear more common than multiple-dose activities delivered over time, multiple-dose activities may prove superior (Carol et al., 1986). Also, effectiveness data could help school boards justify the costs of training/development to their communities and themselves.

Conclusions

School board experts have identified an assortment of characteristics that they consider critical for effective school board governance. Among the most frequently identified of these characteristics are appropriate overarching concerns, namely students' academic achievement and policy, not administration; good relations with the superintendent, other agencies, local and state governments, and the public, as well as between board members; effective performance in the areas of policy-making, leadership, and budgeting; and adequate evaluation and training/development. However, solid research linking these characteristics to more effective governance and, more specifically, positive academic outcomes is notably absent in the literature.

In 1986, Carol and colleagues wrote, “Some descriptive accounts of the work of boards and superintendents can be found in the literature, but there is no recent solid data base upon which to generate recommendations for change in either this relationship or the role, functions and operating structures of boards themselves” (p. 2). To rectify this situation, these researchers conducted case study and survey research on school boards. Findings from their research are frequently cited within this article and throughout the school board literature. Unfortunately, school board research did not proliferate after the publication of their work, and there are virtually no studies in which governance variables are clearly defined, measured, and their impact on governance effectiveness and, more specifically, students’ academic performance quantitatively assessed. Two qualitatively oriented studies, namely Goodman and Zimmerman (1997) and IASB (2000), have established a clearer link between school boards and students’ academic achievement, but these are not sufficient for a solid contemporary research base. In an attempt to advance the study of local school board effectiveness, problems and directions for future research are discussed next.

Research Limitations and Future Directions

The future control of school boards over local education could depend on research that identifies key characteristics of effective school board governance and clearly links these characteristics to students’ academic achievement. In this section, limitations in school board research conducted in the past two decades are examined. These limitations include the lack of rigorous data and the failure to operationalize variables and examine school boards as a discrete unit of analysis. Then future directions for research on school board effectiveness are discussed. Models for the study of school board effectiveness are proposed, and studies are recommended.

Limitations

Currently, the school board literature is rife with conclusions and recommendations based on personal experience, observations, and opinions. School board experts frequently rely on anecdotal evidence, rather than data from carefully designed research studies, to support their conclusions. An exception to this practice is Carol and colleagues’ (1986) case study and survey research, which is well cited in the school board literature and this article. Danzberger and colleagues (1992), Goodman and colleagues (1997), the IASB (2000), and several other researchers have provided additional, much needed data on school board effectiveness. Yet, these studies do not constitute a strong research base. More studies are needed, including research conducted by individuals who are not affiliated with organizations that offer training/development programs for school boards. While integration of research and practice has advantages—for instance, it provides opportunities to refine research-based recommendations through attempts to implement them—practice can bias research.

Another problem with the school board literature is that authors sometimes report that their conclusions are based on a combination of sources without clarifying the specific source of each conclusion or fully describing their research methods. For example, Rallis and Criscoe (1993) reported that they derived their data from personal experience, a literature review, a case study of a rural county board,

and a questionnaire of individual board members, but they did not link all conclusions to the specific data source and did not detail their research methods. Given the paucity of rigorous data on school board effectiveness, it is critical that those reporting data-based findings on school boards distinguish among their different sources of information and clarify the basis of their conclusions.

The failure to operationalize variables poses another methodological problem that must be overcome in order for research to advance. Surprisingly, the school board literature contains few examples of operational definitions of school board effectiveness. Instead, the characteristics of effective school boards usually are described in general terms, and often these descriptions focus more on what school boards should *not* do, rather than what they should do, thereby providing incomplete information regarding optimal activities (Campbell & Greene, 1994). Danzberger and colleagues (1992) made the following attempt to operationalize effectiveness: "The measure of effective governance is the collective ability of board members to fulfill their obligations and responsibilities across the spectrum of responsible governing behaviors" (p. 82). However, school board experts have not reached consensus regarding the spectrum of responsible governing behaviors or the obligations and responsibilities required and their relative importance for effective governance. Furthermore, the obligations and responsibilities themselves need to be operationalized. Reliable and valid measures of specific characteristics need to be developed in order for researchers to make accurate conclusions and comparisons across studies.

Operationalization of students' academic achievement is more straightforward. Standardized achievement test scores are readily available and comparable across locales. However, researchers should not rely exclusively on standardized test scores, because these do not provide a full picture of students' academic performance. For instance, the school board's adoption of stricter promotion standards could result in a higher dropout rate for low achieving students and spuriously elevate achievement test scores by removing many of the lowest scoring students from the equation. Other potentially useful measures of students' academic performance include the following: absence, retention, dropout, promotion, graduation, and college matriculation rates, as well as student grades, enrollment in advanced placement courses, honor roll attainment, and scholarship awards (Amundson & Richardson, 1991; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Resnick, 1999). Student outcomes such as delinquency, civic involvement, and employment also be included.

Another hindrance to the development of a solid research base on school board effectiveness is the failure of studies of educational governance to treat school boards as a discrete unit of analysis. Often, researchers and educational governance experts lump school boards into analysis and discussion of district leadership and do not consider school boards in their own right, or they address school boards only in terms of the board's relationship with the superintendent and other district personnel. McAdams's (2000) case study of school board and district leadership in Houston, where standardized achievement test scores have notably improved, is somewhat of an exception in that it details the activities of the school board and board members, the superintendent, district personnel, community groups, and others during the period in which test scores rose. However, while it is apparent that the school board played a critical role in the turnaround, it is difficult to isolate the key activities and effects of the school board from those of other parties. Future direc-

tions for research in which the school board is a discrete unit of analysis are addressed in the next section.

Future Directions

The construction of models could augment understanding of school board effectiveness and guide future research by facilitating the creation and testing of general propositions. Figure 1 presents an example of a simple model of the school board within the educational governance system. The model depicts the influence of the federal government, state and local government, and the court system on the school board. It shows that selection procedures may affect school boards. It also illustrates how the school board—through an appropriate focus on students' academic achievement and policy; good relations with the superintendent, community agencies, state and local government, and the public, as well as among board members; effective performance in the areas of policy-making, leadership, and budgeting; and adequate evaluation and training/development—could affect the district, which in turn could have an impact on schools, which could then influence students' achievement. For instance, the federal government could require annual testing of students' academic achievement, and states could mandate which tests will be administered. School boards, in turn, could establish standards for student achievement, require that curricula are aligned with these standards, and allocate resources to ensure that administrators, teachers, and students are well prepared for the annual tests. The superintendent might coordinate efforts to revamp curricula to bolster students' academic achievement in accordance with the new standards and provide training to teachers on the annual tests. Teachers could deliver the new curricula to students and prepare them for the tests, which might elevate their test scores.

However, the direct and indirect effects on and by the school board within the educational governance system are much more complex than depicted in Figure 1. Figure 2 better reflects the numerous bidirectional relations among elements of the system. For example, low test scores could influence the state government to alter its guidelines for educational standards as well as cause the school board to approve new whole school reforms designed to raise standardized test scores. Schools whose students fail to demonstrate acceptable levels of academic achievement may be taken over by the state, eliminating or greatly reducing the school board's and district's control of the schools. State legislation giving schools site-based control over personnel, budgeting, and other responsibilities would circumscribe the amount of control possessed by the school board and district. Fullan (1999) argues that the school system is complex and resistant to change, and thus multiple influences from the top down and the bottom up must be in operation for change to occur.

Although the models presented in Figures 1 and 2 are based on review of the school board literature, they represent only a preliminary step in model development and are offered as examples of what models supported by future data might entail. The purpose of the models is to propose relationships that can be tested. A "single, one-size-fits-all arrangement" for educational governance is not likely to be found, given the diversity among districts across the nation (IEL, 2001, p. iv). Researchers must examine what works under which circumstances and for whom. For this reason, contextual variables are listed with the models. Locality is




FIGURE 1. Simple model to guide school board research.




FIGURE 2. Complex and probably more realistic model to guide school board research.

a leading candidate for a critical contextual variable. Although urban school boards are less prevalent than suburban and rural boards, much of the school board literature is devoted to urban boards, perhaps because they have more severe problems (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger et al., 1992; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Kirst, 1994). Indeed, some school board authorities have cautioned that traditional school board and educational governance is being abandoned owing primarily to problems in urban areas (Danzberger, 1992; Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994; Shanker, 1989). Research suggests that traditional school board and educational governance continues to function well in communities with a homogeneous population, few financial difficulties, and agreement regarding educational goals (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992). School board and educational governance authorities also have emphasized that stability in leadership (i.e., low turnover) is necessary for effective governance and that reform piled on reform can be detrimental (Cuban, 1990; Danzberger, 1994; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Kansas City Consensus, 2001; Littleford, 1999; Shanker, 1989). The contextual variables listed in Figures 1 and 2 are not exhaustive, and their relative importance has not been determined. Researchers need to begin routinely incorporating contextual variables, such as those listed in the models, into their studies of school board effectiveness.

The sheer complexity of influences on and effects of school boards, an indication of which is provided in Figure 2, probably accounts in large part for the absence of quantitative studies of school board effectiveness. However, with the development and evolution of credible measures of students' academic achievement (e.g., norm-referenced tests [NRTs] and criterion-referenced tests) and methods to analyze multilevel data (e.g., computers that can quickly process large data sets and statistical techniques such as analysis of covariance [ANCOVA] and hierarchical linear modeling), such analyses are possible. Just as NRTs and ANCOVA significantly advanced the study of teacher effectiveness, today's technology can be used to further the study of school board effectiveness (S. Stringfield, personal communication, August 27, 2001).

Hofman's (1995) study of school boards in the Netherlands provides an example of the type of quantitative research that is needed in the United States. Hofman surveyed a random sample of 133 Dutch school boards and collected students' test scores at one primary school within each school board's jurisdiction. After accounting for a variety of student and school characteristics, Hofman found that increases in arithmetic and language achievement were positively associated with the school boards' inclusion of school personnel and parents in their decision-making process. Hofman interpreted this as support for greater site-based management of schools. Unfortunately, Hofman did not provide detailed information on the variables she measured, so it is not clear what involvement of school personnel and parents in the school board's decision-making process entailed. Furthermore, the system of educational governance in the Netherlands differs from that in the United States, and the findings may not replicate in this country. Nevertheless, the strengths of the study, which include random selection of school boards and analysis of quantitative data, justify its identification as a model study for school board research in the United States.

Another benefit of models such as those depicted in Figures 1 and 2 is that they encourage researchers to select subsets of variables for careful examination while

remaining mindful of the greater context in which their work fits. Despite advances in technology, few researchers have access to the full range of data necessary to conduct studies that include the large number of variables that have been identified in the school board literature as likely to influence or be influenced by school boards. Furthermore, large-scale quantitative studies would not suffice; the complexity of school board and educational governance precludes the ability of a single methodology to capture all relevant information. Future studies of school board governance should employ a variety of research methodologies. Danzberger and colleagues (1987) recommended use of in-depth interviews and observations and less reliance on survey measures. Similarly, Tallerico (1991) stated that surveys of school board members provide only limited information. However, surveys currently may yield inadequate data because reliable and valid survey measures have not yet been developed. Comparative case studies seem well suited for school board and educational governance research. The American Educational Research Association's 2001 symposium on mayoral takeovers (Cibulka, 2001; Honig, 2001; Kirst & Buckley, 2001; Shipps, 2001) provides an example of the utility of comparative case studies. Just as there may be no one best form of educational governance (Danzberger et al., 1992; IEL, 2001), there likely is no one best methodology for research on school board effectiveness, particularly at this point when there is still much to learn.

Conclusions

The current research literature on school boards has significant limitations. The foremost problem is that few data-based studies exist. In addition, some researchers fail to operationalize variables, and reliable and valid measures to assess school boards have not been developed. Without a rigorous body of qualitative and quantitative research that identifies the characteristics that are necessary for effective school board governance and substantiates that school boards affect students' academic achievement, school boards will remain in jeopardy of losing further control over local education and face possible elimination. Future research must examine what form of school board and educational governance works under which circumstances and for whom. Changes in school board and educational governance are likely to be attempted with increasing frequency in communities across the nation, particularly in urban areas where students' academic achievement is low. Data to guide these changes are urgently needed.

Summary

In the past two decades, many school board and educational governance reforms have been proposed and implemented. This trend shows no signs of abating. Many school board critics perceive school boards to be obstacles to and incapable of leading educational reforms designed to improve students' performance, and some critics have advocated that school boards be eliminated (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1987; Finn, 1991; Harp, 1992; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Johnson, 1988; Kirst, 1994; Olson, 1992; Streshly & Frase, 1993; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992; Whitson, 1998). In addition, the federal and state governments have expanded their involvement in local public education, passing increasingly prescriptive legislation (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992; Danzberger et al., 1987, 1992; Goodman & Zimmerman, 2000; Hadderman, 1988; Iannaccone &

Lutz, 1994; Johnson, 1988; Kirst, 1994; Olson & Bradley, 1992; Reid, 2000; Resnick, 1999; Todras, 1993). Danzberger and colleagues (1992, p. 27) stated that "school boards have been the biggest loser in the power shifts of the past 30 years." This is especially true in urban areas, where state and mayoral takeovers have been more likely to occur.

Some school board experts support experimentation with school board and educational governance reforms while others decry it, and some call for thoughtful consideration of and dialogue regarding reform options, but few have demanded additional research on school board effectiveness (Carol et al., 1986; Danzberger, 1992, 1994; Danzberger et al., 1992, 1993; Harrington-Lueker, 1996; Resnick, 1999; Shanker, 1989; Twentieth Century Fund, 1992). School board experts have advised that effective school boards focus on students' academic achievement and policy rather than administration; have good relations with the superintendent, other community agencies, state and local government, and the public, as well as among the board members themselves; effectively practice policy-making, leadership, and budgeting; engage in evaluation; and undertake training and development. However, research substantiating the link between school boards' manifestation of these characteristics and students' academic achievement is extremely limited. Yet, the idea that school boards may be critical, not only indirectly, for ensuring students' academic success has begun gaining momentum, evidence of which can be seen in the efforts of school boards and educational governance organizations to focus school boards directly on students' academic achievement. Researchers have begun to present evidence of an association between school boards and students' academic achievement (Goodman & Zimmerman, 1997; IASB, 2000; McAdams, 2000). A solid, rigorous, multimethod body of research that clearly identifies key characteristics of effective school board governance and links these characteristics to students' academic achievement may be essential for school boards' survival. Furthermore, it may slow or reverse the erosion of school boards' control over local educational governance.

Notes

This research was supported by funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education (Grant R-117D-40005). However, the opinions expressed are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the positions or policies of the U.S. Department of Education. The author is grateful to Sam Stringfield, Ken Leithwood, and Robert K. Wimpelberg for their thoughtful reviews of earlier versions of this article.

¹The term school boards is used throughout the article to refer to *local* school boards of *public* education in the United States. State, private, and foreign school boards are not discussed, except where specifically noted.

References

- American School Board Journal. (1997). Education vital signs 1997: Leadership. *American School Board Journal*, 184(12), A15.
- American School Board Journal. (1998). Education vital signs 1998: Leadership. *American School Board Journal*, 185(12), A13-A15.
- Amundson, K. J., & Richardson, C. (1991). *Straight A's: Accountability, assessment, achievement: A handbook for school board members*. Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association.

- Anderson, C. G. (1992). Behaviors of the most effective and least effective school board members. *ERS Spectrum*, 10, 15–18.
- Arnsperger, A., McElhinney, C., & Ziebarth, T. (1999). *Governing America's schools: A primer for reporters*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Boone, M. (1991, September). *School board self-evaluation: Charting a path to the future*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Texas Association of School Boards and the Texas Association of School Administrators, Houston, TX.
- Boone, M. (1996, October). *Impact of cumulative voting on four small rural school districts*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Rural Education Association, San Antonio, TX.
- Boyd, W. L. (1996). *Competing models of schools and communities: The struggle to reframe and reinvent their relationships* (Publication Series No. 8). Philadelphia: National Research Center on Education in the Inner Cities.
- Bracey, G. W., & Resnick, M. A. (1998). *Raising the bar: A school board primer on student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association.
- Bradley, A. (1992). Boards of contention: Under state order, Dallas tries to clean up its act. *Education Week*, 11(32), 11–15.
- Burtless, G. (Ed.). (1996). *Does money matter? The effect of school resources on student achievement and adult success*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Bushweller, K. (1998). Under the shadow of the state. *American School Board Journal*, 185(8), 16–19.
- Campbell, D. W., & Greene, D. (1994). Defining the leadership role of school boards in the 21st century. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 391–395.
- Capital Area School Development Association. (1990). *A view from inside: The roles and responsibilities of school board members*. Albany, NY: Author.
- Carol, L. N., Cunningham, L. L., Danzberger, J. P., Kirst, M. W., McCloud, B. A., & Usdan, M. D. (1986). *School boards: Strengthening grass roots leadership*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Carver, J. (1997). *Boards that make a difference: A new design for leadership in non-profit and public organizations* (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Chubb, J. E., & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.
- Cibulka, J. (2001, April). *The mayoral role in school reform in two predominantly African-American cities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Clemmer, E. (1991). *The school policy handbook: A primer for administrators and school board members*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Collins, T. (1999). *Charter schools: An approach for rural education?* Charleston, WV: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 425 896)
- Cox, W., & Stewart, M. (2000). Signs of fiscal health: A new evaluation system links school finance and academic results. In *School spending 2000—Investing in learning* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.asbj.com/schoolspending/cox.html>
- Cuban, L. (1990). Reforming again, again, and again. *Educational Researcher*, 19(1), 3–13.
- Cunningham, L. L. (1993). Putting the pieces together: Toward a comprehensive program of social reform (Reformulating our approaches to school governance). *Planning and Changing*, 22, 240–247.
- Danzberger, J. P. (1992). School boards: A troubled American institution. In *Facing the challenge: The Report of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on School Governance* (pp. 19–124). New York: Twentieth Century Fund.
- Danzberger, J. P. (1994). Governing the nation's schools: The case for restructuring local school boards. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 367–373.

- Danzberger, J. P., Carol, L. N., Cunningham, L. L., Kirst, M. W., McCloud, B. A., & Usdan, M. D. (1987). School boards: The forgotten players on the education team. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, 53–59.
- Danzberger, J. P., Kirst, M. W., & Usdan, M. D. (1992). *Governing public schools: New times, new requirements*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Danzberger, J. P., Kirst, M. W., & Usdan, M. D. (1993). *A framework for redefining the role and responsibilities of local school boards*. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.
- Danzberger, J. P., & Usdan, M. D. (1994). Local education governance: Perspectives on problems and strategies for change. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 366.
- Drury, D. W. (1998). *Reinventing school-based management: A school board guide to school-based improvement*. Arlington, VA: National School Boards Association.
- Education Commission of the States. (1999). *Governing America's schools: Changing the rules*. Denver, CO: Author.
- Education Commission of the States. (2001). *State takeovers and reconstitutions*. Denver, CO: Author.
- Feistritz, C. E. (1989). My study reveals board presidents are rubber stamps for superintendents. *American School Board Journal*, 176(6), 19–20.
- Finn, C. E. (1991, January 23). Reinventing local control. *Education Week*, pp. 32, 40.
- Firestone, W. A., Fuhrman, S. H., & Kirst, M. W. (1989). *The progress of reform: An appraisal of state education initiatives* (CPRE Rep. Series No. RR-014). New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, Center for Policy Research in Education.
- Fullan, M. (1999). *Change forces: The sequel*. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.
- Gates, P. E., & Wall, C. (1986). Community involvement pays off. *Updating School Board Policies*, 17(9), 1–3.
- Gewertz, C. (2000). Detroit school board splits over superintendent choice. *Education Week*, 19(20), 5.
- Gleason, S. C., Donohue, N., & Leader, G. C. (1995/1996). Boston revisits school-based management. *Educational Leadership*, 53(4), 24–27.
- Goodman, R. H., Fulbright, L., & Zimmerman, W. G. (1997). *Getting there from here: School board-superintendent collaboration: Creating a school governance team capable of raising student achievement*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service & New England School Development Council.
- Goodman, R. H., & Zimmerman, W. G. (2000). *Thinking differently: Recommendations for 21st century school board/superintendent leadership, governance, and teamwork for high student achievement*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Grady, M. L., & Bryant, M. T. (1991). School board turmoil and superintendent turnover: What pushes them to the brink? *School Administrator*, 48, 19–26.
- Greenwald, R., Hedges, L. V., & Laine, R. D. (1996). The effect of school resources on student achievement. *Review of Educational Research*, 66, 361–396.
- Griswold, C. A. (1997). Mission: The primary board responsibility. *Momentum*, 28(2), 66–68.
- Hadderman, M. L. (1988). *State vs. local control of schools* (ERIC Digest Series No. 24). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 291 164)
- Hadderman, M. (1998). *Charter schools* (ERIC Digest No. 118). Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 422 600)
- Hange, J. E., & Leary, P. A. (1991, November). *The leadership function of school boards: West Virginia data*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Southern Regional Council for Educational Administration, Auburn, AL.

- Harp, L. (1992). Boards of contention: Kentucky lawmakers redefine power of school boards. *Education Week*, 11(32), 26–27.
- Harrington-Lueker, D. (1996). School boards at bay. *American School Board Journal*, 183(5), 18–22.
- Hickle, J. (1998). The changing face of school board elections. *Updating School Board Policies*, 29(1), 1–5.
- Hill, P. T., Wise, A. E., & Shapiro, L. (1989). *Educational progress: Cities mobilize to improve their schools*. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation.
- Hofman, R. H. (1995). Contextual influences on school effectiveness: The role of school boards. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 6, 308–331.
- Honig, M. I. (2001, April). *Bottom-up support for top-down change: Expanding mayoral control over Oakland public schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Education Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Iannaccone, L., & Lutz, F. W. (1994). The crucible of democracy: The local arena. *Politics of Education Association Yearbook*, 9, 39–52.
- Illinois Association of School Boards. (1996). *Your school board + you*. Springfield, IL: Author.
- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2001). *Leadership for student learning: Restructuring school district leadership*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Iowa Association of School Boards. (2000). IASB's Lighthouse Study: School boards and student achievement. *Iowa School Board Compass*, 5(2), 1–12.
- Johnson, B. L. (1988). *Sacrificing liberty for equality: The erosion of local control in American education* (Occasional paper for the Louisiana LEAD Project). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 356 531)
- Johnston, R. C. (2001a). Leadership. *Education Week*, 20(20), 5.
- Johnston, R. C. (2001b). Boston group: Council should run schools. *Education Week*, 20(24), 12.
- Kansas City Consensus. (2001). *Steer, not row: How to strengthen local school boards and improve student learning*. Kansas City, MO: Author.
- Keedy, J. L., & Freeman, E. (1997, March). *School board chair understandings about school restructuring in North Carolina: Implications for policy*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Kirst, M. W. (1994). A changing context means school board reform. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 378–381.
- Kirst, M. W., & Buckley, K. E. (2001, April). *Mayoral takeover: The different directions taken in different cities*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Leithwood, K., & Menzies, T. (1998). Forms and effects of school-based management: A review. *Educational Policy*, 12, 325–346.
- Lindle, J. C. (1995/1996). Lessons from Kentucky about school-based decision making. *Educational Leadership*, 53(4), 20–23.
- Littleford, J. (1999). Leadership of schools and the longevity of school heads. *International Schools Journal*, 19(1), 23–34.
- McAdams, D. R. (2000). *Fighting to save our urban schools . . . and winning: Lessons from Houston*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- McCloud, B., & McKenzie, F. D. (1994). School boards and superintendents in urban districts. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 384–385.
- McGonagill, G. (1987). Board/staff partnership: The key to the effectiveness of state and local boards. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 69, 65–68.
- Merz, C. S. (1986). Conflict and frustration for school board members. *Urban Education*, 20, 397–418.

- Murphy, J., & Beck, L. G. (1995). *School-based management as school reform: Taking stock*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2000). *Digest of education statistics 1999* (NCES Publication No. 2000-031). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National School Boards Foundation. (1999). *Leadership matters: Transforming urban school boards*. Alexandria, VA: Author.
- Nelson, J. L., & Crum, L. R. (1983). The power and challenges of local school boards. *American Education*, 19, 10–16.
- Noonan, D., Manca, D., & Matranga, M. (1999). Staying out of the red. *American School Board Journal*, 186(5), 40–42.
- Nowakowski, J., & First, P. F. (1989). A study of school board minutes: Records of reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 11, 389–404.
- Odden, A. R., & Archibald, S. (2000). Investing in learning: How schools can reallocate resources to support student achievement. In *School spending 2000—Investing in learning* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.asbj.com/schoolspending/odden.html>
- Olson, L. (1992). Boards of contention: Up for discussion. *Education Week*, 11(32), 23–25, 27–28.
- Olson, L., & Bradley, A. (1992). Boards of contention: Introduction. *Education Week*, 11(32), 2–3, 5, 7, 9–10.
- Oswald, L. J. (1995). *School-based management*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 384 950)
- Payne, K. J., & Biddle, B. J. (1999). Poor school funding, child poverty, and mathematics achievement. *Educational Researcher*, 28(6), 4–13.
- Peterson, D. (1991). *School-based management and student performance*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 336 845)
- Picus, L. O. (2000). Setting budget priorities. In *School spending 2000—Investing in learning* [On-line]. Available: <http://www.asbj.com/schoolspending/resourcespicus.html>
- Rallis, S. F., & Criscoe, J. (1993, April). *School boards and school restructuring: A contradiction in terms?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta, GA.
- Reid, K. S. (2000). Governance report calls for overhaul. *Education Week*, 20(3), 1, 20.
- Renchler, R. (2000). *New patterns of school governance*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 446 346)
- Resnick, M. A. (1999). *Effective school governance: A look at today's practice and tomorrow's promise*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Robinson, G. E., & Bickers, P. M. (1990). *Evaluation of superintendents and school boards*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Robinson, T. P., England, R. E., & Meier, K. J. (1985). Black resources and Black school board representation: Does political structure matter? *Social Science Quarterly*, 66, 976–982.
- Rothman, R. (1992). Boards of contention: Historians cite “steady erosion” in local control. *Education Week*, 11(32), 4–5.
- Schlechty, P. C. (1992). Deciding the fate of local control. *American School Board Journal*, 178(11), 27–29.
- Schlechty, P. C., & Cole, R. W. (1993). Why not charter school boards? *American School Board Journal*, 180(11), 30–33.
- Schmidt, P. (1992). Boards of contention: “Minimal” training may not fit boards’ needs. *Education Week*, 11(32), 19.

- Schwartz, W. (1996). *How well are charter schools serving urban and minority students?* New York: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 410 322)
- Sewall, A. M. (1996, November). *New school governance: The school board and its future*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association, Tuscaloosa, AL.
- Shanker, A. (1989). Al Shanker (of all people) wants a hard look at what's befallen school boards. *American School Board Journal*, 176(3), 29–30.
- Shannon, T. A. (1994). The changing local community school board. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 387–390.
- Shippy, D. (2001, April). *Regime change: Mayoral takeover of the Chicago public schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle, WA.
- Speer, T. L. (1998). *Reaching for excellence: What local school districts are doing to raise student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association.
- Streshly, W. A., & Frase, L. F. (1993). School boards: The missing piece of the reform pie. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 2(2), 140–143.
- Tallerico, M. (1991). School board member development: Implications for policy and practice. *Planning and Changing*, 22(2), 94–107.
- Thomas, J. Y. (2001). *The public school superintendency in the twenty-first century: The quest to define effective leadership* (CRESPAR Tech. Rep. No. 55). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.
- Thomas, R. G. (1993). *Learning needs of school board presidents in the central region*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 362 481)
- Todras, E. (1993). *The changing role of school boards*. Eugene, OR: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 357 434)
- Twentieth Century Fund/Danforth Foundation. (1992). *Facing the challenge: The report of the Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on School Governance*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund Press.
- Underwood, K. (1992). Power to the people. *American School Board Journal*, 179(6), 42–43.
- Urban, W., & Wagoner, J. (1996). *American education: A history*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Usdan, M. D. (1994). The relationship between school boards and general purpose government. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 374–377.
- Van Alfen, C. (1992). *A challenge for school boards' leadership in rural America*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 354 134)
- Van Alfen, C., & Schmidt, S. M. (1997). Leadership and rural school boards: Utah data. *Rural Educator*, 18(2), 1–4.
- Verstegen, D. A., & King, R. A. (1998). The relationship between school spending and student achievement: A review and analysis of 35 years of production function research. *Journal of Education Finance*, 24, 243–262.
- Wagner, R. F. (1992). The case for local education policy boards. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 74, 228–229.
- Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1999). Decentralize or “disintermediate”? *Education Week*, 19(14), 36, 52.
- Westat. (2001). *Report on the final evaluation of the city-state partnership*. Rockville, MD: Author.
- Whitson, A. (1998). Are local school boards obsolete? *Childhood Education*, 74, 172–173.
- Williams, R. M. (1998). One on two: An interview with NSBA leaders. *School Business Affairs*, 64(5), 12, 14–16.

Land

- Wilson, J. C. (1994). Urban education: A board member's perspective. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75, 382-386.
- Wirt, F. M., & Kirst, M. W. (1992). *Schools in conflict* (3rd ed.). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Ziebarth, T. (1999). *The changing landscape of education governance*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Author

DEBORAH LAND is a Spencer Postdoctoral Fellow at the Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, 3003 N. Charles St., Suite 200, Baltimore, MD 21218; e-mail dland@csos.jhu.edu. She is interested in the context of education and adolescent social development.