

University of Mississippi

eGrove

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Graduate School

2015

Leadership Orientation Frame Preferences Of School Boards In Mississippi

Patrick Laquincy Washington
University of Mississippi

Follow this and additional works at: <https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd>



Part of the [Elementary Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Washington, Patrick Laquincy, "Leadership Orientation Frame Preferences Of School Boards In Mississippi" (2015). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 489.
<https://egrove.olemiss.edu/etd/489>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at eGrove. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of eGrove. For more information, please contact egrove@olemiss.edu.

ORGANIZATIONAL FRAME PREFERENCES OF SCHOOL BOARDS IN MISSISSIPPI

A Dissertation
presented in partial fulfillment of requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Education
in the School of Education
University of Mississippi

by

PATRICK L. WASHINGTON

April 24, 2015

Copyright Patrick L. Washington 2015
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to examine how school boards in Mississippi approached their work through the four organizational lenses or frames developed by Dr. Terrence Deal and Dr. Lee Bolman (2013). Using the four frame model (structural, human resource, political, and symbolic), this study examined the self-perceived leadership orientations of school board members from forty-one school boards using the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey (LO(S)S). The data was analyzed to determine if there are significant differences between multi-frame preferences by school boards by their selection status. The study also examined leadership style effectiveness and if any differences exist between frame use and leadership style. The relationship between demographic data and Quality Distribution Index or QDI was also examined.

The Leadership Orientations Self-Survey or LO(S)S was made available to board members during the December, 2014 Mississippi School Boards Association Winter conference. Board members were also given the option to have surveys emailed for completion via SurveyMonkey. A total of 188 surveys were completed, 87 by appointed board members and 101 by elected board members. The study found that both appointed and elected board members preferred the human resource frame and the structural frame. The symbolic frame use was reported to be the third preferred and political was the least preferred. The study also found that a majority of respondents, 79, rated themselves equally effective as managers and leaders. Analysis of variance tests were used with the frame score as the dependent variable to determine

if significance existed between variables. A Pearson r was used to test for the relationship between frame preference and QDI scores.

The findings in this study were the following:

1. No significant difference existed between frame mean score preferences and selection status of school board members.
2. No significant difference existed between frame mean score preferences by selection and leadership style effectiveness.
3. Gender, education level, ethnicity, and years of experience did not have any interaction with frame preferences.
4. No significant relationship existed between QDI and frame preferences.

Because significance was found to exist between leadership effectiveness and frame score, additional analyses were conducted to determine the significance of this relationship. Four groups were categorized based on their effectiveness self-ratings: (1) managers, (2) leaders, (3) equal middle and bottom 20% for management and leadership; adaptive, (4) and equal top 20% for management and leadership; super adaptive. One-way ANOVA tests were used to test for significance and Tukey HSD post-hocs were performed. Human resource and structural frames were most used for all four groups followed by symbolic, then political. Significant mean differences were found to exist between the two dominant frames: human resource and structural, and the two least preferred frames for all four groups. This finding suggests that while no significance exists when considering selection status, frame preferences, and effectiveness as manager or leader, leadership effectiveness ratings had some effect on frame preferences.

The study also found that females and males also reported more frequent use of the human resource and structural frames followed by symbolic and structural. The study concluded that the two most widely used frames are human resource and structural. The results of the

research were provided to the Mississippi School Boards Association and the National School Boards Association with the intent to inform training modules and policy development.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents Walter and Zalie Washington for blessing me with life's most precious gifts, faith and love.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

LO(S)S	Leadership Orientations Self-Survey
MSBA	Mississippi School Boards Association
NSBA	National School Boards Association
PELP	Public Education Leadership Project
QDI	Quality Distribution Index

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The process of completing this degree was a journey that began in 2006. During this time I have been subject to the various vicissitudes of life including the loss of my parents and best friends, Walter and Zalie Washington and the loss of my youngest sister Sharon. Although painful, these experiences have made positive contributions to my character that made finishing this degree possible. This task would not have been accomplished if it were not for my lovely and supportive Vicki and our two beautiful daughters, Olivia and Emily. I sincerely want to thank my committee, Dr. Douglas Davis, Dr. Susan McClelland, and Dr. Jerilou Moore for their advice and feedback. Finally, a huge thanks to my dissertation chairperson Dr. William (Joe) Sumrall who has supported me since my years as an undergraduate student. I hope each of you will embrace this research as a testament of your support, guidance, and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER II: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	12
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY.....	47
CHAPTER IV: RESULTS.....	58
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION.....	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	91
APPENDIX.....	100
VITA.....	150

LIST OF TABLES

1. LO(S)S item numbers	49
2. Descriptions of Dimensions of Leadership on the LO(S).....	51
3. Reliability Coefficients for the LO(S)S.....	53
4. Demographic Data (age, gender, ethnicity).....	62
5. Demographic Data (education, selection, years served).....	63
6. Four Frame Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges.....	65
7. Frame Preference Scores by Selection.....	65
8. ANOVA Results for Frames.....	66
9. Leadership Effectiveness Mean Scores.....	68
10. ANOVA Results for Leadership Effectiveness.....	68
11. Means and Standard Deviations for Frames by Gender.....	70
12. ANOVA for Demographic Variables.....	71
13. QDI and Letter Grades for Population Sample.....	73
14. Pearson Correlation for QDI.....	74

15. QDI Means and Standard Deviations.....	74
16. Means and Standard Deviations for Managers.....	76
17. ANOVA Results for Managers.....	77
18. Means and Standard Deviations for Leaders.....	77
19. ANOVA Results for Leaders.....	78
20. Means and Standard Deviations for Adaptive Group.....	79
21. ANOVA Results for Adaptive Group.....	79
22. Means and Standard Deviations for Super Adaptive Group.....	80
23. ANOVA Results for Super Adaptive Group.....	81
24. MSBA School Board Job Description.....	89

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The work of schools is becoming more complex and demanding. Administrators, teachers and parents are often at the core of the educational debate about what is needed to improve schools. The demand for better results in America's schools has led to many efforts to improve the quality of teaching and learning that rested on the shoulders of teachers and school leaders. Some researchers state that, "The challenges come at us from all sides: politicians, the media, and the public. And that's why school board members, on the front lines of public education, need to be better trained, more prepared, and deeply engaged in the work being done" (Gemberling, Smith, & Villani, 2009, p. v). What is educational reform? Why is educational reform necessary? Who is held accountable if reform does not happen? Some researchers such as Weiss suggests that, "reformers claims about success don't exactly match reality" (Weiss, 2013, p.1). These are extraordinary times in public education. The idea of change is fueled by new policies and the wealth of philanthropists promising to support thoughtful proposals that will positively impact student achievement (Rose, 2010). We have learned from previous reform efforts that if lasting change will occur, local community members must learn and take ownership of their own improvement strategies (O'Neil, 2004). The idea that America's public education system is in a constant state of being *reformed* is an indication that something is not right with America's

public schools. In fact, research by Rose and Gallup (2005) revealed that while most American's gave their local schools high approval ratings, national and international academic data show the nation's public schools are falling behind. The history of our public educational system has not accomplished significant results in an era that would qualify it as an educational golden age (Eadie, 2005). Given this, who is responsible for ensuring the changes that are needed in our public schools will occur? The responsibility for school reform to become realized rests with the entire community beginning with the school board (Stover, 2008). Although very few public schools are in the horrific state the media portrays, we must recognize the data does not suggest we are the Super Power in the classroom as we are on the battleground. The passage of legislation such as No Child Left Behind was drafted and voted into law as a means to improve the status of America's public school system (Editorial Projects in Education Research Center, 2011). The attempt to hold individuals accountable when schools do not improve has solidified the federal government's role in public education; although, the Constitution allows states the right to govern their own schools (Smith, 2004). The task at hand is monumental. There are over ninety-three thousand public schools in almost fifteen thousand school districts in the United States serving over forty-seven million students, and the responsibility to properly educate them is spread across various levels of government (Corcoran & Goertz, 2005). In essence, the responsibility to educate America's children is every citizen's civic responsibility. According to some researchers such as Stone, many communities agree that, "Education is not so much a service delivered to the public but as an aim that is served by the combined efforts of educators and members of the community" (Stone, 2005, p 209). In this view of democracy, citizens are not a passive audience, but instead active participants that are contributors to the community's efforts to improve its public school system (Stone, 2005).

School districts are the cornerstone of our American democracy. They hold together communities and translate policy into effective practice. According to Hanushek (2012) most Americans agree that our public school system needs reform; however, issues such as poverty, slow economic growth, growing budget deficits, and lagging international competitiveness are each linked to perceived shortcomings in the education and skills of American workers. It is through this lens that Hanushek further suggests,

An economy's ability to grow over time its ability to innovate and raise both productivity and real incomes is strongly tied to the quality of education provided to the vast majority of workers. Skills and intellectual capital are increasingly important in a modern economy, and schools play a central role in the development of valuable skills. (2012, p. 227).

The fundamental value of public education and the very strength of our nation are not mutually exclusive. The birth of public education was founded on the principle that this nation would ensure an educated citizenry that would be capable of sustaining a productive and prosperous democracy that protects individual rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness (Glickman, 1998). That very citizenry is now calling for schools to improve. If America's schools will be transformed and if reform will manifest itself in improved student performance results, then it must begin with the reformation and development of the school board (McAdams, 2002). Many policymakers and politicians agree that if reform will happen, profound changes have to come at the level of state legislatures and state departments of education, which have the state constitutional authority and responsibility to provide for the education of their citizens. The state empowers local districts to organize and operate schools; therefore, any significant reform initiatives for schools must redirect state policy. Hanushek, Link, and Woessmann (2013) found

that governments that gave more local control in developed countries such as the United States had a positive impact on student achievement. Greater latitude from the federal and state level government must then hold local level school boards responsible for improving their ability to lead and improve their schools.

Local school districts are governed by a local school board that consists of elected or appointed members from within the community charged with ensuring that every child has access to a quality public school. For the majority of the over fourteen thousand school board members in the United States, the job of the school board member is extremely demanding and pays very little, if anything at all (Eadie, 2005). The role of the school board has changed dramatically over the past two decades making the school board one of the most difficult, taxing jobs in America. It requires the courage and heart to make difficult decisions and is reserved for those who desire to make a real difference in the true fabric of America by ensuring children are adequately and sufficiently educated (Burgett, 2013). In the past, school boards were generally overseers of school systems, but now are on the frontlines of accountability and are charged with creating conditions within their school districts that enable students and staff to meet rigorous accountability and performance standards (Gemberling, Smith, & Villani, 2009). Most, if not all, accountability measures and initiatives begin in the classroom, as they should. Beyond the classroom is the principal who is accountable to the superintendent. The superintendent answers to the local community directly through a locally elected or appointed school board. In some instances, states take over school districts with low performance, but all too often many students have been allowed to attend subpar schools. The attempt to shift the focus on local improvements by focusing on a locality's capacity to change represents a deliberate attempt to move beyond business as usual which is why educational reform is needed (Stone, 2005). Reform is no quick

fix. There is no program capable of building the capacity to move schools in the direction needed. After years of failed attempts to transform schools, there is an immediate need for effective school board leadership as the nation continues to reform public schools (Stover, 2010). Consequently, more focus on school boards' potential to make vital and essential decisions is no longer an option, but a must.

Statement of the Problem

Although leadership orientations of instructional leaders have been studied at all levels, there are a limited number of studies of leadership orientations of school boards, in general, or of specific studies about how school board members perceive themselves as managers or as leaders. School Boards have a monumental task that cannot be accomplished without the necessary skills required to seek the most qualified individual to lead their district. Performing their duties effectively requires a fundamental knowledge base of instructional best practices and an understanding of the organization and of organizational change. With these duties in mind, it is imperative to understand the leadership styles of board members as they relate to decision-making and effectiveness.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership orientation preferences (as developed by Bolman & Deal 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013) of both elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi. The Leadership Orientation Self-Survey (LO(S)S); and sub-scale preferences (Bolman & Deal, 1990) was employed to determine leadership orientation frame preferences of the school board members included in this study. The study also investigated the effects of demographic characteristics (age, gender, highest academic degree

earned, and years of experience on the school board) on board members' leadership orientation frame preferences.

Significance of Research Topic

School board leadership would not be as complex if boards were only facing problems for which they are equipped to solve. But because of the rapid pace of change, boards are not equipped to lead as effectively as we need (Heifetz & Linsky, 2002). The role of the school board has become increasingly complicated. In the past, school boards paid little or no attention to student performance only because they were not expected. These areas of accountability were the sole responsibility of the superintendent, principals, and teachers (Gemberling, Smith, & Villani, 2009). The twenty-first century school is a diverse, multi-faceted organism that requires competent leadership on all levels. In order to change schools to be more effective at educating children, leaders also must change. There must be an "inner departure" in the way leaders think, what leaders say and do (Sparks, 2007). Additionally, there has to be an agreement to be collectively responsible for student learning. Because school boards are responsible for holding the superintendent responsible, it only makes sense that school boards are aware of what quality school leadership looks like, and most importantly, what quality instruction looks like.

Frames are mental models that enable leaders to comprehend and maneuver through a particular territory. Bolman and Deal's (2008) research on framing found that having an understanding of framing makes it easier to know what you are up against and ultimately what you can do about it. The demands and expectations are too great to continue to lead through the narrow lens of merely being transactional. Transformational leaders must approach the work through the lens of transformation which requires a multi-faceted perspective to the work (Sparks, 2007). Frames are mental maps that serve as a global positioning system that leaders

carry in their heads to enable them to navigate through the treacherous and often unpredictable waters of change (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Their research on framing further emphasizes the importance of learning multiple perspectives or frames as “a defense against thrashing around without a clue about what you are doing and why” (Bolman & Deal, 2008, p. 21). School boards are confronted with a plethora of issues that often hinder school reform from occurring, or at least at a faster rate. These barriers often include, but are not limited to, ingrained policies, budgeting issues, practices, and politics (Senge, 2012). Unless board members and other school administrators are able to think flexibly and see organizations from multiple angles, they will be unable to properly solve and deal with the full range of inevitable issues they are likely to encounter (Bolman & Deal, 2008). Research studies on frames suggest that an understanding of the leadership orientations will have a direct, positive impact on the school districts where they serve. The origination of policies, the implementation of new programs and the selection of superintendents all fall beneath the jurisdiction of the school board. Therefore, an examination of the leadership orientations of school board members would shed some necessary light on the process by which decisions are made that directly impact student achievement in the state of Mississippi.

Research Questions

1. Is there a difference in preference score means for elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi?
2. Is there a difference in leadership style preference for elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi?
3. Is there a difference in frame preferences when gender, educational attainment, and years of experience are considered?
4. Does a relationship exist between frame preferences and QDI?

Null Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between frame preference score means of elected and appointed board members who completed the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S.
2. There is no significant difference between the frame preference of elected and appointed board members who rate themselves as managers or leaders using the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S.
3. There is no significant difference between frame preferences and gender, highest academic degree earned, and years of experience on the school board.
4. There is no significant relationship between frame preferences of school board members in Mississippi using the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S and the Quality Distribution Index (QDI) for the school districts represented in this study.

Delimitations of the Research Study

- The study is delimited to data gathered only from selected school districts in Mississippi.
- The study is delimited to properly completed responses to the Leadership Orientation Self Survey LO(S)S.
- The study is delimited to responses obtained during the 2014-2015 school year.

Limitations of the Research Study

- The study assumes that school board members have a comprehension of the terminology in Bolman and Deal's LO(S)S.
- The study assumes that school board members will respond accurately to questions about their use of leadership orientation frames on the LO(S)S.

Definition of Terms

1. **Frame** is a tool, lens, or perspective that brings a situation into focus providing individuals with a particular perspective through which to view a situation. These frames are mental models that help leaders navigate a particular terrain. The Bolman & Deal (1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013) frames are structural, human resource, political and symbolic.

2. **Multi-frame thinking** is the ability to view situations within an organization through various perspectives that identify with combinations of three or four of (Bolman & Deal's 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013) leadership orientation frames.
3. **Frame breaking** refers to a leader's ability to be able to shift perspectives or frames in order to produce desired results (Bolman & Deal, 2013).
4. The **human resource frame** emphasizes the needs of individuals within an organization and adapts the needs of the organization to fit the people so that they might experience improved self-esteem when performing their responsibilities (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013).
5. The **political** frame views organizations as groups of different interests vying for power and scant resources; conflict is the central theme of this perspective (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013).
6. The **structural frame** is based on a division of labor and the creation of policies, rules and procedures. It is a more traditional approach rooted in the factory metaphor (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013).
7. The **symbolic frame** emphasizes the culture of organizations and is concerned with rebuilding the expressive or spiritual aspects of the organization through the use of stories, myths, metaphors, heroes, ceremonies, and rituals (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013).
8. **Leadership styles** are behaviors that are representative of managers and leaders of organizations and that have a powerful effect on morale and productivity (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

9. **Leadership behaviors** refer to specific characteristics demonstrated by managers and leaders of organizations (Bolman & Deal, 1997).

Justification for the Study

Leadership matters. Successful organizations are led by competent, effective leaders. The work that is needed to reform our public schools requires significant changes in the way school systems do business. The change must begin with significant changes in what leaders think, say and do (Sparks, 2007). We are living in a time in which public education is under continuous scrutiny by the public because of the number of poor performing schools. This scrutiny, much of which is valid, demands the need for school board members to be better trained, better prepared, and more deeply engaged in the work that is required of them (Gemberling, Smith, & Villani, 2009). According to Reimer (2008), Americans want amazing and outstanding school systems, regardless, of whichever corner of the country they live in, and it is the obligation of school board members to provide them. The magnitude of the work is further complicated by technology that has created a digital divide in our society. Boards have to consider this divide as a challenge in addition to our nation's commitment to educational reform and increased expectations for improving academic achievement (Houston, 2001). As school districts experience these changes in both rural and urban districts and as baby boomers retire, effective school board members will be needed. Learning multiple perspectives or frames help "leaders and managers find clarity and meaning amid the confusion of organizational life" (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 40). Anna-Marie Cote (1999) revealed the importance of multi-frame thinking in school principals for enhancing problem-solving skills and the ability to develop creative solutions. Bolman and Deal (2008) found the following:

Leaders fail when they take too narrow a view. Unless school board members are capable of thinking flexibly and seeing the organization from multiple angles, they will be unable to deal with the full range of issues they inevitably encounter. (p. 437)

It is necessary for us to know and understand the decision-making processes that school board members employ. This study provides the Mississippi School Board Association valuable information that can be used to design professional development modules for existing and incoming school board members.

Organization of the Study

Chapter one provides background information, a statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions and hypotheses, delimitations and limitations, definition of terms and justification for the study. Chapter two contains a review of related literature and research. Chapter three presents the population, the data collection method, and the methodology used to respond to the research questions and hypotheses. Chapter four contains a presentation and analysis of data collected. Chapter five provides a summary and discusses the findings of the study in relation to the research questions. It also includes implications for current practice and recommendations for future research. Following chapter five are appendices. The appendices include the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S, cover letter sent to participants, requests for permission to use materials, state mandated training modules for Mississippi School Board Members, state requirements for local school board service, the selection process for school boards in the United States, and selection process for Mississippi School Boards by district.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History and the Evolution of the School Board

School boards have evolved a great deal over the past century. Acker-Hocevar and Ivory (2007) made the following statement:

School board members commit to leadership in one of the most important functions of our society, educating the young, and they commit to doing so in a world of unrelenting tensions. Serving the multiple and competing interests of constituents, staying abreast of the many changes in education, and simultaneously ensuring that schools improve are formidable tasks under the best of circumstances. (p. vii)

Public education has a long history of local control. Since the early years of America's formal organization, the benefits of locally operated schools were realized. The first local management of schools was organized in the late seventeen hundreds in Massachusetts by establishing elected school boards. In 1837, Massachusetts established the first state board of education to give states a greater role in education, however, most of the responsibilities of school governance remained with local boards because the public did not believe that distant political bodies could satisfy local needs (Jacobsen, Rothstein & Wilder, 2009). In 1891, Massachusetts enacted legislation that vested each district with financial and administrative authority over its schools (Land, 2002). The model set in place by Massachusetts was more or

less followed by many states as public schools continued to be established throughout the country. Eventually, all states adopted a similar pattern of school governance with the exception of Hawaii, where only one state-run school district exists (Sell, 2006).

The first significant change initiated by a local school board that significantly influenced local school governance occurred in the 1830s when the first office of Superintendent of Schools was created in Boston (Land, 2002). Growing school populations made it nearly impossible for volunteer, unpaid, part-time board members to manage schools so they began to delegate some of the school board administrative functions to the hired superintendent (Usdan, 2001).

The second period of significant change peaked in the 1890s and addressed the issue of whether public schools should be controlled by locally elected officials or by professional experts in the offices of the superintendents (Thomas, 2002). In 1885, John Philbrick, U.S. Commissioner of Education, issued a report on school boards calling them “corrupt” and lacking in “expertise, virtue, professionalism, intelligence, and dedication” (Emery, 2007, p.31). School board members in urban areas were elected by local wards (or neighborhoods), which trapped the school board members in local ward politics. This resulted in a perception of local boards as a source of corruption and the thought that the position was only sought by individual members who hoped to advance their own parochial and special interests at the expense of the school district as a whole (Kirst, 2010). Furthermore, the start of the industrial era and the rapid expansion of big businesses brought out the belief that schools were not adequately educating the increasingly diverse student population, which led the elite professional, business, and education reformers to strive to reform local educational governance. Additional research by Kirst (2010) suggests that this shift was an effort to cause school boards to operate with efficiency, expertise, professionalism, centralization, and nonpolitical control. According to the author of *Perceptions*

Regarding Leadership Orientations of Local School Board, “the local superintendents argued for giving them the power, prestige, salary, and security needed to run efficient schools.” (Thomas, 2002, p. 5). Between 1900 and 1920, the local governance of school evolved to a compromised system consisting of a smaller city school board, selected through city-wide and more focused on policy making, and a professional superintendent acting as chief manager with more managerial and operating responsibilities and authority (Danzberger & Usdan, 1994). Researchers consider this reform as the last major reform of school boards (Iannaccone & Lutz, 1994).

According to the Mississippi Department of Archives and History or MDAH, the Legislature authorized the leasing of sixteenth – section land for the use of public education. “Prior to 1870 there was no statewide public education system in Mississippi. However, there were a number of places in the state where black children were taught in one-room schoolhouses. Many of these children were educated by white missionaries or teachers from the North, because few freedmen were qualified to teach and even fewer whites from the South were willing to teach freedmen” (“Mississippi History Timeline”, 2014, p.1). According the MDAH, Mississippi established its first system of public education in 1870.

The Mississippi Department of Education’s website indicates that there are over one hundred fifty-five school districts in the state of Mississippi (“Mississippi District”, 2013, p.1). The National Center for Education Statistics reports that there are close to five hundred thousand students in Mississippi schools. A recent study conducted by researchers for Education Week, called the Quality Counts report, scored Mississippi with an F (fail) rating when it comes to quality of the state’s public schools (“Quality Counts”, 2014). Mississippi code 37-6-7 defines a School board as a governing body. And further states that each school district shall be governed by a school board consisting of five (5) members, selected in the manner provided by law.

Therefore, the state of Mississippi has approximately seven hundred seventy five board members of which most will participate in trainings by the Mississippi School Boards Association (MSBA) and other partner organizations with the intent to build board capacity to perform in four areas: (1) advocacy, (2) leadership training, (3) technical assistance, and (4) information dissemination (“Mississippi School Boards Association”, 2014). The achievement data suggests an obvious need for improvement in capacity of school boards to serve as instructional leaders. As Mississippi school boards attempt to make the necessary shift from managers to instructional leaders, it will require board members to understand their role and responsibility as *change agents* at a much greater depth (Marzano, McNulty, & Waters, 2005).

The Role of the School Board

As we approach the midpoint of the second decade of the twenty-first century, school boards are facing new challenges with significant and long-term historical consequences. The role of the school board will need to shift to deal with and lead through turbulent economic times, a myriad of educational reform initiatives and an unstable political environment (Reeves, 2011). School boards are entrusted with one of the most important responsibilities that can be assigned to any group of citizens, that of helping to shape the education of the community’s young people. Yet, the public remains unclear about the role of the school board and its value to their school district. School boards are “that dark island of American governance, the institution that everyone knows of but few understand” (Danzberger & Usdan, 2006, p. 9). Historically, most school boards operated primarily through the lens of policy making; however, developing and revising policies does not merit the majority of time that school board members are asked to invest and neither has this use of time proven to be impactful on the overall success of the school districts they lead (Eadie, 2005). Many researchers and publications describe the school boards’ functions, roles, and responsibilities from the different perspectives of management, leadership,

and policy making. What is lacking is a clear delineated listing of duties for the school board on which all agree. Burgett (2013) suggests that the role of the school board is to mold, shape, direct and outline the educational opportunities for children and adults in the district. Embedded within this broad job description are more distinct actions that define the role of the school board including: (a) governing the system, (b) serving as a liaison between the system and the community, (c) developing and adopting policies, (e) considering the superintendent's employment and assignment recommendations, and (f) preparing an annual budget (Lister, 2006). Mizell (2010) adds that school boards are responsible for several key functions such as setting academic goals at each level, developing policies and providing resources that enable educators to meet their individual and collective goals. In the *Key Work of School Boards Guidebook*, The National School Boards Association or NSBA (2009) suggests eight key areas for which boards should operate. The key areas are: (a) vision, (b) standards, (c) assessment, (d) accountability, (e) alignment, (f) climate and culture, (g) collaborative relationships/community engagement, and (h) continuous improvement (Gemberling, Smith, and Villani, 2009). Thomas (2002) claimed that state codes and statutes outline general guidelines of school board functions that often lack specificity that may lead to the detriment of the effectiveness of some local school boards.

According to Reimer (2008), the lack of clarity about the role of the school board and its responsibilities often results in board members spending less time on the essential drivers of their work. Reimer also established a core listing of the school board's role, (a) guides change in goals, structure and programs, (b) screens and supports key projects identified to improve programs and operations, (c) chooses, directs and evaluates the superintendent of the district, (d) oversees the planning and deployment of resources, (e) serves as a bridge between the district

and the community, (f) and ensures fiscal, legal, staff and programmatic accountability. Smoley (1999), in his list, included what he believes is the most essential aspect of the school board, which is serving as the educational voice of the community at the local level. In spite of the great involvement of the states and federal government in the public education system, public schools remain local enterprises that reflect the culture and the values of their communities. In fact, according to Richard Meyer (2011), board members represent everyone in their community including those who do not directly support them. The importance of school boards often lies in their major role of acting as the connection ring between federal and state levels and local communities. From one side, they ensure that the requirements of the states and government are met; while from the other side they translate the local values and priorities into policies and strategies to meet the goals and inspiration of the communities (i.e., parents, taxpayers and local business), as well as to make the most of the local community's resources and culture (Bryant & Resnick, 2010).

In their article, *School Boards: Why American Education Needs Them*, Bryant and Resnick (2010) said, "If school boards didn't exist, someone would invent them to create a link between the community and its schools, to ensure oversight of education, and, increasingly, to translate state and federal government mandates for local use"(Bryant & Resnick, 2010, p. 14). In his article, *Running An Effective School District*, the author mentioned other school based roles such as issuing teacher contracts, approving and disapproving staff employment, managing buildings and transportation, developing curricula, representing the district to the media, and evaluating schools. (Sell, 2006).

Critics argue that the role of the school board can be achieved by mayors and county officials ignoring the fact that this organizational structure often requires an Office of Education

as a department among others under the mayor's control. Thus, mayors have several priorities to fulfill including those of the majority of voters who believe that schools and education may not be one. Therefore, the value of the singularity of purpose and accountability of the elected school board becomes apparent (Bryant & Resnick, 2010). The experience of New York City's public schools that put the school governance under mayoral control did not achieve any outcomes. The output was less accountability, loss of a forum for parents, fewer checks and balances, and the end of budget transparency (Maeroff, 2010).

Qualifications of School Board Members

The ability of school board members to serve as joint partners to help transform public schools in America has been called into question. Many are skeptical that school boards can hold educators responsible for raising performance (Jacobsen, Rothstein, and Wilder, 2009). There is little doubt that the role of the school boards does have a direct impact on student achievement. The local school board has ultimate responsibility for the curriculum and board; therefore, should have firsthand knowledge of and provide oversight to the total instructional program of its schools (Webb, 1977). An effective school board leader must show organizational competence (Ford & Uebbing, 2011). Therefore, having the right members on the team, with the right skill set and knowledge is essential to moving any school district forward. Qualifications to serve as a school board member vary from state to state. In some states such as Mississippi, New Jersey and Tennessee a high school diploma or its equivalency is required while in at least thirty-two others including Arkansas, Louisiana and Ohio no high school diploma or Graduate Equivalency Diploma is required. At least thirty states have a minimum age requirement. Some states such as Montana and Nebraska require no formal training for board members upon being elected while Mississippi requires twelve hours of basic education for newly elected or appointed board

members and six hours of continuing education for veteran board members ("Mandated Training," 2012). This wide range of expectations propel the need for sincere dialogue and policy changes in order to accelerate the nation's reform efforts.

Mississippi School Board members are required to attend six hours of training each year ("Mandated Training," 2012). One might ask if the minimal state requirements for training can develop school board leaders who can effectively lead an organization of licensed teachers, principals and superintendents (Quinby, 2012). This question and continued debate have led to some local municipalities giving school board control to the mayor. "Typically, mayoral control consists of giving mayors power to appoint some or all of the school board members who were previously elected, but in its more extreme versions, it involves broadly incorporating separate school districts into general purpose municipal governments" (Gold, Henig & Simon, 2011, p. 34). Student achievement data continues to remain dire under this organizational structure. School districts such as the District of Columbia Public Schools and Newark, New Jersey schools moved to this model but continue to have high dropout rates, low achievement scores and minimum student achievement gains across the board (Nations Report Card, 2013).

Over the past two decades, billions of dollars have been spent on research in order to improve public education only to result in minimal improvements. Knowing what needs to be done in order to improve public education, and actually doing it are two different things (Stover, 2011). Leadership is difficult and complex work, especially, within the context of public education; therefore, the importance of ensuring school board members are competent, skillful leaders is essential to the success of the school district (Reimer, 2008). Skillful school leadership is essential if all students are to experience quality teaching and learning every day. School boards can impact student achievement in either positive or negative ways. Just as teachers and

administrators are called to implement research – based methods, school boards must learn and practice research effective leadership practices in order to obtain maximum student achievement results (Marino, 2011).

Characteristics of Effective School Boards

What is the definition of an effective school board? In all literature, including academic research, advocacy statements by leading national organizations, and public policy papers, an effective school board is defined as a board whose primary agenda is developing and upholding policy that is aligned to helping schools to achieve their mission of raising students' achievement and involving the community to achieve this goal (Gemberling, Smith, & Villani, 2009). What characterizes an effective school board? It is a complex question that involves evaluating all functions (e.g., internal governance, policy formulation, building administrators, and collaboration with the community) of the board (Stover, 2013).

“Excellence in the classroom begins with excellence in the boardroom” (Dervarics & O'Brien, 2011, p.23). Several researchers showed that school boards in high-achieving districts exhibit certain prevailing attitudes, characteristics and approaches that separate them from their counterparts in lower-achieving districts. Dailey et al., (2005) at the Center for Public Education in a collaborative with the Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB) grouped the results of numerous studies and research that focused on the evolving role of school boards and the comparison of school board practices in districts with substantially different student outcomes. Although the researchers were not entirely congruent in their findings about the characteristics of effective school boards, the results revealed a high degree of consensus and almost no contradictions were found in terms of indicators for effective boards versus ineffective boards.

A review of over thirty research papers, journal articles, dissertations and public policies revealed ten distinct characteristics of an effective school board that the majority of the researchers agreed upon. The review of literature suggests that effective school boards share eight distinct characteristics:

Visionaries and strategic planners

Marzano, McNulty & Waters (2005) stated, “A vision without a plan is just a dream. A plan without a vision is just drudgery. But a vision with a plan can change the world” (p. 25).

Effective school boards visualize the future of education with a commitment to a vision of high expectations for student achievement and quality instruction, formulates clear goals, defines outcomes and sets strategies direction and theory of action. Gemberling, Smith, & Villani (2009) stated, “The board must set expectations for student achievement in the years ahead. Vision is not about what we are, but about what we want to be” (p. 3). Set objectives, such as deciding whether to make a priority out of boosting student literacy or introducing twenty-first century skills to the curriculum” (Stover, 2011, p. 18). Effective boards work relentlessly to ensure that the set goals remain the district’s top priority and do not allow bureaucratic functions that have normally been the chief concerns of district operations to distract them from their goals (Dailey et al., 2005).

Reeves (2011) found that successful school board members are visionaries who are capable of inspiring and motivating change. However, creating an inspiring vision that is not effectively implemented does not inspire change, but rather only breeds cynicism and complacency. As visionaries, effective school board members cannot afford to wait for the illusion of buy in from the community but should inspire the community to accept the challenge of making the necessary and maybe even painful changes. A critical step in establishing a vision for the district

is being clear about the role of the board and the superintendent and also recognizing that it is both the board's and superintendent's responsibility to develop a vision with the school community (Larson & Rader, 2006).

Good governance combined with high expectations is not enough to create great schools. School boards have to have a plan that will lead to their desired outcomes (McAdams, 2002). McClelland & McQueen (2010) describe strategic planning as a sure way to invest in the future of improving the district. Strategic plans are significantly shorter today than they were in the past. District level strategic plans should only be a few pages and school level plans should be limited to one page. The power is not in creating grandiose plans, but short plans that actually come to life (Reeves, 2011). To be more effective, governance experts agree that school leaders need to focus on "how" they do their job; the practices, procedures, and processes they follow in details as opposed to ambiguous, often ambitious plans that are written with good intentions but are too far removed from the reality of what can actually happen (Stover, 2011).

Focused on student achievement

A few decades ago, school boards rarely focused on student achievement, but today's school boards are held accountable for how students perform on various state assessments (Gemberling, Smith, & Villani, 2009). Effective boards establish a climate of success by having an elevated view of students, as well as of the system and its ability to teach all children at high levels releasing each student's greatest potential (Dailey et al., 2005). Effective twenty-first century school boards demonstrate a relentless commitment to student achievement which requires a commitment to its staff and a systemic, methodical approach to governing and executing in order to have an impact where it matters most which is inside the classroom (Stover, 2008).

Governing is a priority

Studies by Eadie (2005) found that highly impactful school boards make governing their priority. These school districts also were more likely to have high student achievement results, positive parental involvement, operating efficiently and have an overall positive image within the community.

In order to achieve the boards vision, effective boards create an organizational framework that supports a process for strategic planning, policy development, budget approval, and setting high academic standards that target student achievement (Dailey et al., 2005). Several studies note that effective districts enact comprehensive, coherent reform policies and take an approach to reform in which administrative structures are aligned with district goals; the system as a whole should be viewed as a unit of change. Effective school boards recognize their responsibility as policy-makers and not as administrators (Thomas, 2002). According to a report by the Center for Public Education, effective boards should spend less time on operational issues and more time focusing on policies to improve student achievement (Dervarics & O'Brien, 2011).

Promotes open communication and community engagement

Thomas (2002) found that effective school board members recognize that open and honest communication is essential to school district success. These boards should have adequate communication processes in place to inform and engage both internal and external stakeholders. These processes often result in the board's goals being met, while lack of communication lead to mistrust, suspicion, and unmet goals.

Epstein (2009) suggests that the way in which schools care about children is reflected by the way in which they engage their parents and families. Community engagement is a central and vital component of an effective school board because it sits in between the community and the

district (Gemberling, Smith & Villani, 2009). Although the preeminent responsibility of the board is to govern, there is a critical symbolic and political role that includes keeping the desired image of the school district in high regards, attending district functions, speaking at community forums and school functions and serving as the liaison between the community and the schools (Eadie, 2005). They tell the district the community's story, and the community the district's story (Cassel & Holt, 2008). As the voice of the community, most local school boards make community engagement a priority (Campbell, 2010). Familiarity with community members and with key educational issues is high leverage areas that lend themselves to an increased likelihood of positive board and community relations. Districts with a positive image often also have a communication system in place in which stakeholders are able to provide ongoing feedback to school leaders (Thomas & Wahlstetter, 2010). By engaging key stakeholders and growing support for their schools, as well as by engaging parents in decisions, the school board can lead the community to work actively with the schools in order to provide each student with an education of the highest quality (Bryant & Resnick, 2010). "What community members need are leaders and policymakers who will listen and also challenge us. Do not ask us to buy in to your ideas for change; challenge us to envision a future that is better than today" (Reeves, 2012, p. 42). Successful school boards such as in Hillsborough County, Florida have systems in place to keep the public abreast of school matters and also provide a means for stakeholders to have their voices heard (Eadie, 2013). Additionally, these successful school boards have also been found to employ communication processes throughout the district such that everyone within the district and community has access to the same information (Thomas & Wahlstetter, 2010). Given the board's proximity to the community, school boards can create a positive community climate that will foster student achievement (Resnick, 2000). Ward (2007) found that boards that have a

traditional upward trajectory in terms of positive community image as well as positive student achievement results will also have a well-documented plan that engages leaders and the community at all levels. Wadsworth (2003) concludes in an article on community engagement and education that our system of public education will not change for the better until parents, teachers, and students are engaged and heard as equal partners.

Fiscally responsible

School boards play a significant part in ensuring that their district is financially and fiscally sound (Burgett, 2013). School finance and budgeting is a complex component of public schools that often become even more difficult to understand because of the myriad of state and federal laws that regulate the use of these funds. However, it is imperative for school boards to have a reasonable understanding of these laws in order to ensure proper use of funds and to protect themselves and the district from potential legal ramifications (Glass, 2005). School boards with high professional leadership engage in important financial practices such as forecasting budget projections around long-term and short term goals and projects (Manley, 2005). According to Weber (2007), the priority for spending district funds should be to improve student achievement. If schools are going to accomplish improved student achievement results, then it will need to allocate funds to ensure that the resources are available in order to accomplish this goal.

Although the influence of the federal government's role in local public education has increased, federal funding has not (Campbell, 2010).

Data Driven

Data driven instruction is one of the most current concepts in education that is being used to help schools and entire districts accomplish significant results (Santoyo, 2010). School boards should monitor data, even when the data does not suggest that the systems in place are working,

and use it to drive continuous improvement and not for the means of terminating staff for poor performance. Data should not be used to validate district actions, but to challenge assumptions and provide a tool for reflection. Data should also be collected from multiple sectors, both internal and external to the organization, and the term “data” should not refer solely to test data, but to qualitative and quantitative data from students’ achievement, successful practices, school systems, and board systems and operations (Dailey et al., 2005). The use of data to determine what shifts should be made in order to improve is a means by which school boards remain in a state of continuous improvement (Gemberling, Smith, & Villani, 2009).

Seeks to establish and maintain a positive relationship with the superintendent

At the heart of every effective board is a positive working relationship amongst board members and with the superintendent (Eadie, 2005). “It goes without saying that a good working relationship between the school board and the superintendent is key to a school district’s success” (Larson & Rader, 2006, p. 30). Assessing the board and superintendent relationship is complex and often flawed with a lack of clarity and accuracy because of the difficulty to assess such as trust, compassion, and credibility (Goens, 2009). Additional research found that effective school boards typically have a positive relationship with the superintendent that is grounded on a foundation of mutual respect, collaboration, and trust. Eadie (2008) claimed that this relationship is a critical factor in the effectiveness of the board as a whole. Eadie further suggests, “school boards around the country have taken very practical steps to ensure that the very precious, high stakes—but oh, so fragile—working relationship with the superintendent remains close, positive, productive, and enduring” (Eadie, 2008, p. 44). In successful districts, board members define an initial vision for the district and then seek to hire a superintendent who shares this vision. Once hired, the board and the superintendent work to develop a trusting relationship in which the

superintendent is empowered and entrusted to execute a plan that is aligned with the board's vision. In addition, boards and superintendents in high-achieving districts jointly refined their visions over time, assessed district strengths and weaknesses and demonstrate reliability and trust in their working relationship. This joint collaboration between the board and the superintendent begins and ends with creating a culture and environment that authentically embraces the idea of teamwork so that all schools can generate results for students (Dervarics & O'Brien, 2011). One of the major contributing factors for the leadership turnover for superintendents has been directly attributed to poor school board superintendent relations (Sheehan, 2013).

Committed to professional development

Elmore (2004) stated, "The lack of capacity is the Achilles hill of accountability" (p. 12). Research suggests that highly impactful school boards promote the belief that as all children can learn, adults working in the system can also learn and improve their practice. In fact, according to research by Fullan and Hargreaves (2012) communities that are thriving with high quality schools recognize the importance of investing in their own learning or professional capital as a long term investment with incalculable returns. School boards that often exist in these communities believe that they should support extensive professional development programs for themselves, administrators and teachers, even during times of [fiscal] restraint. One source noted that districts should invest at least 5% of their resources in adult learning and leadership development (Dailey et al., 2005). Another source, notes the importance of the organization itself maintaining an inquiry approach to instructional improvement that is grounded on continuous improvement processes through continuous adult learning. (Dervarics & O'Brien, 2011). Eadie (2005) noted that highly effective school boards are composed of individuals who are driven to improve the quality of their work and take ownership in improving their individual and collective

capacity to execute as a school board member which, subsequently, has a positive impact on the overall improvement of the entire board's ability to govern at a high level (Eadie, 2005).

McClelland & McQueen (2010) suggest that school boards include their plan to improve the capacity of staff in the district's strategic plan, suggesting that districts will have little or no results if it attempts to develop leadership capacity without a plan.

Additional studies found that high-achieving districts have formal, deliberate training for new board members in order to help board members understand their role in school renewal and student achievement. For example, the National School Board Association or NSBA, has developed a school board training program for data-driven decision making; likewise, state school board associations have developed hands-on programs to help boards meet a wide range of challenges through effective governance (Resnick & Bryant, 2010). Coleman and LaRocque (2012) illustrated the value of both formal and informal learning activities for board members; effective school districts offer a mixture of learning activities for their board members, including retreats, special meetings, work sessions, school visits and even social events.

Regularly and routinely monitors progress

Eadie (2005) suggests, "High-impact school boards make a real difference in the affairs of their school districts: setting clear strategic directions; playing a proactive role in leading strategic change aimed at dealing with the truly critical issues facing the district; and rigorously monitoring district performance" (p. 26). Effective boards believe that strategic planning is not enough; districts should assist schools with the implementation of plans and monitor their progress. Districts should seek continuous improvement by monitoring the school progress towards their vision and goals and adjusting or intervening when necessary in order to support the superintendent and the school (Dailey et al., 2005). Eadie (2009) found that many school

boards continue to attempt to execute with antiquated governance systems and structures and are in dire need of modernizing their governance model. Success in reform requires strategic planning that is focused and is scaled such that the board and school leadership can conduct ongoing assessments of what is and is not working in order to continue an upward trajectory (Thomas & Wohlstetter, 2010). Sell (2006) recommends that school boards create a systematic approach to allow them to continuously and regularly assess all organizational components of their governance structures and policies affecting student achievement. This level of monitoring allows the board to keep a laser like focus on its goals and reprioritize if needed in order to ensure success (Stover, 2011). Weber (2007) concludes in one study that meaningful change takes time; therefore school boards must plan realistic short term and long term goals and be able to articulate their successes to its constituents who are often looking for change “now”.

Promotes teamwork

It takes a team to improve school districts (Black, 2007). There are many common characteristics shared by effective school boards; however, there is not one that is proven to have the greatest sustainable impact as the commitment to teamwork (Pickett, 2012). Effective school boards leverage the collective intellectual capital on the board and places a high emphasis on leading instead of simply exercising power and authority (Good, 2007). It is well documented that successful school boards recognize the complexity of the work is far too reaching to go at it alone. Although there is an obvious need to continue to improve our public educational system in America, it is also undeniable that the progress that has been made is due to collaboration amongst school boards, superintendents, teacher unions and the community at large working as a cohesive team (Eadie, 2013). Research by Usdan (2005) found that school districts that are led by boards that exercise top-down non-democratic approaches to board leadership often leads to

the exacerbation of political clashes that stalls progress and often leads to a more negative image of the district.

Actual State and Reform

In spite of the well-defined characteristics of an effective school board, school boards in many districts are far from these role models. In fact, Reimer (2008) suggests that in spite of school boards' intent most do not reflect good leadership. Many school boards oversee too many complex activities. Activities that are often operational and administrative rather than educational. Their governance extends to personnel, transportation, food services, and facilities, buying school sites, approving insurance policies, addressing new state or federal regulations, or voting on employee compensation alternatives (Rothstein, Jacobsen, & Wilder, 2009).

Since the second half of the twentieth century, many local boards have reverted back into politicized boards, with an increased involvement in the operations and administration of their school districts (Danzberger & Usdan, 1994). Their policy-making and governance function has been overshadowed by the increasing interference of federal and state governments. Enacting several legislations that took power away from school boards such as for curricula, teacher certification, competency testing, graduation standards, and data collection have occurred. This incursion into local school boards' traditional roles has significantly limited the ability of boards to improve education (Sell, 2006). Furthermore, the lack of initiative in addressing issues such as equity and achievement have led to several state and federal laws and regulations that put constraints on local education governance (Mizell, 2010). Teachers, especially in connection with collective bargaining, have assumed many of the prerogatives that school boards once reserved for themselves. Hence, new governance models threaten to make school boards in some locales as obsolete (Maeroff, 2010). In addition, the financial pressures that hinder school board

decisions and the fact that school boards often focus more on operations than on academics are factors that have negatively impacted the perception of the school board (Reimer, 2008).

Additionally, the blurring of the roles of the superintendent and the board makes it difficult to define the locus of accountability for policy and administration (Hamilton, 2008).

Some critics claim that school boards are outdated and incapable of effectively leading educational reforms to improve students' academic achievement (Land, 2002). They consider the failings of public schools as an excuse to shove the school board aside and give mayor's control of the system. Some researchers suggest that these critics of school boards often lack knowledge of the successful leadership that today's school boards may provide through their changed focus and governing method (Bartusek, 2000). Fortunately, school boards still have their supporters. These supporters know that there is room for improvement and recognize that although some school boards are becoming increasingly mired in politics and micromanagement, many are relentlessly focusing on the strategic direction of the school. Many boards are concerning themselves with education and educational outcomes rather than managerial responsibilities (Thompson, 1994).

The Effect of School Boards on Student Achievement

Until the past decade, the effect of school boards on student achievement is rarely considered in educational research. Only a few studies have tackled this subject. In 2000, the Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB) conducted a study to determine a school boards impact on student achievement. The research team interviewed and surveyed one hundred and fifty – nine employees, board members and administrators in six districts. Three of the districts were identified as high achieving according to Iowa Department of Education state standards and the other three were identified as low achieving by the same state standards. The goal of the study was to compare the board/superintendent teams' ability to encourage positive change. The

districts involved were comparable in terms of enrollment, percent of children living in poverty, per student expenditure, household income and other factors to ensure that student achievement is not a product of socioeconomic factors. The study found that board members in the high achieving districts were constantly seeking ways to improve the district and viewed social or economic problems as challenges; they always held elevating views of students and staff. In the low-achieving districts, board members and superintendents were more likely to simply accept shortcomings in the students or in the district. Their emphasis was on managing the district rather than changing or improving the district. One of the study's key findings was that, in the high-achieving districts, the board/superintendent team knew more about school reform initiatives and the board's role in supporting them than their peers in the low-achieving districts. The findings of the study were as follows: (1) board members had vast knowledge about goals and improvement plans and how to implement them, (2) board members were able to articulate links between the goals and their individual and collective actions as board members, and (3) board members were proficient at using data to inform their decision making. On the contrary, their peers in the low achieving districts rarely used data to inform their decisions. Board members in low achieving districts simply perceived data as a report and instead of seeking an understanding of the data to inform their decisions, board members simply relied on the interpretation made by the superintendent (Hess & Meeks, 2010).

The research also confirms that in a high achieving district, in spite of the fact that board members are not professional educators, they have important responsibilities related to teaching and learning, curriculum and instruction, and the learning environment. In other words, these board members are instructional leaders who have the knowledge and background necessary to

make instructional decisions. They have an understanding of how to organize the people and the school environment to start and sustain an improvement effort.

A follow up study by The Education Writer Association (EWA) further validated the results of the IASB study (Farmer, 2003). Researchers examined ten school districts in five states and found that well run districts had lower dropout rates, a higher percentage of students enrolling in college, and higher aptitude test scores than in poorly run districts. Well run districts were characterized by “quality governance” that included a focus by the board on student achievement, a positive relationship between the board and superintendent; poorly run districts were characterized by “poor governance” described by micro-management by board members, conflict and poor communication between board members and the superintendent, and confusion over their respective roles. The EWA report also showed similar results from the work of the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation or MDRC, released in 2002 and commissioned by the Council of the Great City Schools: a shared vision was key for the more successful urban districts among the case studies as well as focusing on student achievement goals as higher priority. In comparison, the typical districts lacked consensus among their leaders, lacked concrete goals and took little responsibility for improving instruction.

The study concludes that school board members and school superintendents measure their own effectiveness by one and only one measure, i.e., according to how well their students achieve. Yet, this will happen only by leaders who are collaborative rather than confrontational and know how to use politics to bring about change. They must have the political will and personal commitment to stay the course rather than succumb to the trap of a quick fix. Those leaders should have a vision and plans to achieve that vision. They should base their decisions on hard data rather than assumption (Farmer, 2003). Recent studies indicate a direct relationship

between the quality of school board leadership and student achievement which justifies the need for continual research on this topic (Poniatowski, 2006).

School Boards as Reformers

Student achievement is the key work of the school board. Closing the achievement gap has been at the forefront of educational reform ever since achievement data revealed the disparities between white and minority students. Progress towards closing this gap has been slow most of which is due to the lack of recognition of the role the school board plays (Dillon & Vail, 2005). Educational reform efforts will not become a reality without competent and skilled school board leadership (Thomas & Wahlstetter, 2010). Effective school boards realize and understand the connection between district level leadership and student achievement (Black, 2007). Studies show that highly effective school boards are proven to have a significant effect on student achievement (Eadie, 2005). Additionally, effective school boards work with an intentional focus to ensure alignment of their policies, structures, and systems in order for the district to accomplish positive student achievement results (Palandra, 2010). What we have not learned to do at scale is to create consistent high performing school districts because research on good governance and management by school boards is sparse (McAdams, 2002). “Research shows that raising achievement and turning around low-performing schools requires a long-range plan, stable leadership to move things along, community and staff buy-in, adequate resources, and a sustained focus that lasts year after year” (Stover, 2008, p. 15).

Accountability is education’s watchword (Goens, 2009). Assign responsibility for educational outcomes. Set specific improvement goals for your superintendent, and examine data regularly to see that progress is being made. Stover suggests “if goals aren’t being met, your board must decide how to respond—whether it’s through personnel changes, an injection of new resources, or a new plan of action” (Stover, 2011, p. 18). Effective school boards are keenly

focused on improving student achievement and are willing to make adjustments to the strategic plans when goals are not being met. (Stover, 2011).

It is a sad but common phenomenon that once community leaders, parents, and board members become frustrated with the slow pace of educational reform in their districts they often rally behind hiring new leaders, adopting new policies, and purchasing new programs, in order to support their promises for change (Stover, 2008). Stover also found that new policies often require new structures be put into place and new leadership hired to make those policies live in practice. Research has also found that effective school districts do not engage in these policy churns that ultimately result in repeated failed attempts to improve student achievement especially in urban, high poverty school districts. School boards that have proven to be successful do not look for one size fits all programs but rather look to put systems in place that will build staff capacity to educate the students that are in their classroom at that time.

A Summary of School Board Leadership

Being a part of a school board allows individuals to participate in a unique and rewarding experience unlike any other (Mayer, 2011). School board members are almost always servant leaders in a literal sense, recognizing the power of their work is not about individual accomplishments, but rather collective efforts that will result in a collective win for their communities (Cassel & Holt, 2008). Eadie (2003) stated,

“But policies themselves cannot produce high-impact governing; they can only provide a foundation to build on. Key ingredients of high-impact governing include the systematic development of the school board as a human resource, the use of well-designed standing committees to prepare for board meetings, and the mapping out of detailed processes for

board involvement in strategic and operational planning and performance monitoring” (p. 26).

Stover (2011) found that school boards that fall into the pit of focusing on daily operational issues are less likely to govern effectively.

Burgett (2013) describes school board leadership as an art that captures the true essence of what it means to have a process of steering and influencing change. School board members should assume the role expecting some degree of conflict and having to justify why they chose to make certain decisions. Burgett also concludes that school board members are elected or appointed to a position of public authority with the power to influence decisions that will impact lives.

“While the impact of good leadership may be difficult to determine, the effects of poor leadership are easy to see” (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003, p.11). A growing number of researchers focus only on in-school leadership such as the formal leadership of school principals, and the leadership practices of teachers (e.g., department heads, textbook adoption committees, grade level chairpersons). Superintendent leadership has also long been the subject of study by professional organizations, leadership preparation programs, and educational theorists. Yet, the school board’s leadership was moderately involved in research even though they are the policy makers and governing agents of public education at the grass roots level. Their leadership is critical in directing the schools that they serve to educational excellence (Lawrence, 1989). The major responsibility lies on their shoulders for guiding the public school and creating the conditions under which school success and school reform are possible.

The public school system is experiencing change at an almost exponential rate. Schools are an increasingly complex environment that challenges educational leaders and makes good

leadership essentials to lead quality schools. Curriculum standards, achievement benchmarks, programmatic requirements, budget shortages, an increasing population of at-risk students, and federal and state mandates have generated complicated and unpredictable requirements for public schools. All of these factors place tremendous pressure on actors at all levels, i.e., teachers, principals, superintendents and school boards. The complexity of the work requires school leaders to possess the ability to address these frequent intense challenges by clearly defining and framing reality (Bolman & Deal, 2002).

Like other complex human activities, leadership is a rather indescribable phenomenon that cannot be adequately defined. “At the core of most definitions of leadership are two functions: providing direction and exercising influence” (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003, p.11). Poniowski (2006), defined leadership as the ability to identify patterns of behavior from the local to the federal level as having emergent properties that may be unexpected and potentially negative or positive depending upon the ability of leadership to understand the whole system rather than to concentrate solely upon the parts that are changing or causing change (Usdan, 2001). Public Education Leadership Project (PELP) confirmed the similarities between high-performing businesses and high-performing school systems: “the effective leadership and management are linked to high-performance both in a thriving business and in a thriving urban school district” (Public Education, 2012).

Building School Board Capacity

Guiding and leading change requires board members to be knowledgeable about new innovations, best practices, current research that will help inform their decisions (Dillon, 2010). Superintendents recognize school board training as one of the most urgent matters they must address (Sheehan, 2013). Eadie (2005) suggests that a natural first step for individuals who acquire a school board position should be to invest in their own capacity to perform their duties

at a high level. However, the process is accelerated and has a greater return when the superintendent and the board agrees that an investment in board capacity to govern signals to critical stakeholders, other governing officials and to parents that the board pays meticulous attention to its human resource development and distinguishes itself as a board that recognizes its value as a governing body (Eadie, 2005). Probably one of the most essential responsibilities of school board members is to remain knowledgeable about what it takes to be an effective school board (Burgett, 2014). For effective school boards, remaining abreast of the research and continued self improvement is not an option, it is a must (Dillion, 2010). Many school boards in the United States never reach their full capacity to lead because they are severely underdeveloped and undermanaged. Eadie (2005) further proposes that the main priority for executive leadership for school districts should be to build their board's capacity to lead. An effective board works to enable the other members of the board to lead (Weber, 2007). Eadie (2005) argues that effective school board members are developed not born. Traditionally, administrators have often viewed the school board as a damage control challenge and not a human capital asset worthy of being developed. Building a school board's capacity to lead requires executive leadership to consciously and strategically develop the school board to operate as an organization with detailed governing functions, and with clear and concise roles aligned to the vision and mission of the school district. Effective school boards continuously reflect on their practice by evaluating themselves against their goals and outcomes, make necessary shifts in their organizational design and by fostering team work on the board (Eadie, 2005). Board members should be able to articulate how their thought processes are changing as research gives birth to new ideas and thoughts about how to do the work of the board at a high level, if not, there will almost certainly be stagnation on the board (Reeves, 2012). The process of managing

changing and avoiding stagnation requires that the board and superintendent create a working atmosphere where there is a continuous process of learning, renewal, and improvement (Harris & Hopson, 2011).

Since boards are dealing with new issues and many within new context as communities are changing, it only makes sense to change the traditional modes of training board members (Dillon, 2010). It takes approximately four years to understand the complex issues that educators face (Campbell, 2010). It is this recognition of the need to change that caused states such as Washington to develop a new curriculum for board training in three categories: (1) strategic planning (2) community engagement and (3) data-driven decision making (Dillon, 2010).

Bolman and Deal's Multi-Frame Perspective

In 1984, Bolman and Deal introduced an entirely different concept of leadership. Their concept is based on the fact that leaders need to know and synthesize vague information into an understandable diagnosis before acting, because their action will determine what their organization notices, does and what it eventually becomes (Bolman & Deal, 1993). They also underlined the fact that leaders are most successful when they are able to look at things from different views (Bolman and Deal, 2002). Thus they introduced a multiple perspective framework; the term "frames" is used to explain various points of view (Bolman and Deal, 1984, 2003). The core of Bolman and Deal's multiple perspective framework centers on the understanding of the cognitive orientations of leaders, as the frames of reference that leaders operate from will determine the interpretation of the situations and guide their actions (Bolman & Deal, 1992). It is important to note that each frame is distinct and has its own image of reality (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

They describe four frames: Structural, Human Resources, Political, and Symbolic. Each of the frames has a distinct purpose and function in creating a clearer image of understanding and in describing the orientations used to classify situations. These four frames provide the conceptual framework for this study.

The Structural Frame

In light of this frame, Bolman and Deal (1992a) suggested the metaphor of “the school as a factory.” The structural frame’s origins are found in the work of early twentieth century industrial analysis such as Frederick W. Taylor who conducted time management studies to help workers maximize their time at work (Bolman & Deal, 2013). According to Bolman and Deal (2013), six core assumptions provide the basis for the structural frame:

1. Organizations exist to achieve established goals and objectives.
2. Organizations increase efficiency and enhance performance through specialization and appropriate division of labor.
3. Suitable forms of coordination and control ensure that diverse efforts of individuals and units mesh.
4. Organizations work best when rationality prevails over personal agendas and extraneous pressures.
5. Effective structures fit an organization’s current circumstances (including its goals, technology, workforce, and environment).
6. Troubles arise and performance suffers from structural deficits, remedied through problem solving and restructuring.

This defines the role of the leader as promoting an environment where clear goals, rationality, efficiency, and accountability are integral characteristics of the organization.

The Human Resource Frame

The human resource frame as proposed by Bolman and Deal focus on the needs of people rather than the needs of the organization adopting the assumptions that any organization that strives to meet the basic needs of the individual will be successful; the metaphor of “the school as a family” is introduced. The core of the human resource frame is relationships. “Our most important asset is our people (Bolman & Deal, 2013, p. 113). Leaders who see the school as a family their primary concern is to care for the children, teachers, and administration. Bolman and Deal (2003) list the following as core assumptions for the human resource frame:

1. Organizations exist to serve human needs rather than the reverse.
2. People and organizations need each other. Organizations need ideas, energy, and talent; people need careers, salaries, and opportunities.
3. When the fit between individual and system is poor, one or both suffer. Individuals are exploited or exploit the organization – or both become victims.
4. A good fit benefits both. Individuals find meaningful and satisfying work, and organizations get the talent and energy they need to succeed.

These assumptions respect the nature of individual needs, how those needs serve to motivate, and the value of honoring individual needs to fit the organization. Leadership is achieved through empowerment and facilitation. According to Bolman and Deal (2013) the leader and employee both desire finding the proper “fit”. The leader looks for talented individuals who are capable of doing the work and the employee looks for an organization that will meet their individual needs. When there is a proper “fit” it allows leaders to “align organizational and human needs” (Bolman & Deal, 2003).

The Political Frame

In this frame, the source of power is found through authority, expertise, controlling rewards, and personal power or characteristics (such as charisma, intelligence, communications skills, etc.) (Bolman & Deal, 1984). Political frame is described by the metaphor of “school as a jungle” where everyone has to fight for their part of the resources. Conflict is often rampant because of differences that exist within the group (Bolman & Deal, 2013). The success of the organization depends on political skill and the ability to determine when to consider an open and collaborative approach or to use a more adversarial strategy. The political frame operates based on five basic assumptions (Bolman & Deal, 2003):

1. Organizations are coalitions of diverse individuals and interest groups.
2. There are enduring differences among coalition members in values, beliefs, information, interests, and perceptions of reality.
3. Most important decisions involve allocating scarce resources – who gets what.
4. Scarce resources and enduring differences make conflict central to organizational dynamics and underlie power as the most important asset.
5. Goals and decisions emerge from bargaining, negotiation, and competing stakeholders jockeying for their own interests.

The Symbolic Frame

The Symbolic frame is used to give meaning and predictability to a disordered world. It focuses on how people cope with confusion, uncertainty, and chaos. Symbolic frame is described by the metaphor of a temple. The central themes for this frame are meaning, metaphor, ritual, ceremony, stories, belief, and faith, described by the temple as metaphor (Bolman & Deal, 2013). There are several core assumptions that define the symbolic frame (Bolman & Deal, 2013):

1. What is important is not what happens but what it means.
2. Activity and meaning are loosely coupled; events have multiple meanings because people interpret experience differently.
3. In the face of widespread uncertainty and ambiguity, people create symbols to resolve confusion, increase predictability, find direction, and anchor hope and faith.
4. Many events and processes are more important for what is expressed than what is produced. They form a cultural tapestry of secular myths, heroes, and heroines, rituals, ceremonies, and stories that help people find purpose and passion in their personal and work lives.
5. Culture is the superglue that bonds an organization and unites people around shared values and beliefs. The organization creates symbols to provide a shared sense of community and human behavior. The leader's job is to inspire commitment and enthusiasm using rituals and drama.

Multi-Framing

Each one of the frames provides a powerful lens for examining a challenge from a single perspective. School leaders who can view situations from more than one angle are more successful. The skillful leader is one who can use multiple frames to examine certain situation in order to identify the challenge clearly; to create different options; and to consider alternative strategies. Bolman and Deal (2003) wrote:

Those who master the ability to reframe report a liberating sense of choice and power.

Managers are imprisoned only to the extent that their palette of ideas is impoverished.

This lack of imagination is a major cause of the shortfall between the reach and the grasp

of so many organizations – the empty chasm between dreams and reality, between noble aspirations and disappointing results (p. 17).

The four-frame model presented by Bolman and Deal has been used as the basis for a variety of studies exploring leadership orientations. In fact, the research on framing continues to suggest that leaders who are capable of reframing and looking at situations through multiple frames are more successful than those who view situations with a limited perspective. Dunford and Palmer (1995) found that over ninety-eight percent of the respondents found that courses teaching multi framing approaches proved to be effective in both the short and long term. Ninety percent also found that an understanding of multi-framing gave them an advantage over their competition (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

Each of the four frames also have eight subscales: (1) analytic, (2) supportive, (3) powerful, (4) inspirational, (5) organized, (6) participative, (7) adroit, and (8) charismatic. These eight sub-scales are used in this study as they provide additional insights into the levels of leadership and management within each of the four frames.

Summary of Literature Review

Bolman and Deal (2013) suggest the key to effective leadership in any organization is an understanding of the mental models from which leaders make sense out of ambiguous situations, determine possible pitfalls, and make decisions that address the reality of problems as they arise. In this review of literature, research is presented to support the investigation of four hypotheses and two research questions. This study examined the leadership frame preferences of elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi. Although there is a number of studies examining frame preferences, there is limited research on frame preferences of school boards.

The first section of the review of literature includes research regarding Bolman and Deal's frame theory and an examination of the use of structural, human resources, political, and symbolic frames. The research suggest that leaders who are capable of defining, analyzing, and addressing situations from multiple perspectives are more likely to experience success (Bolman & Deal, 2013). A number of studies are discusses in the review of literature including a 2005 study conducted by the Iowa Association of School Boards (IASB). In this study, researchers grouped the results of numerous studies and research that focused on the evolving role of school boards and the comparison of school board practices in districts with substantially different student outcomes. Additional research included in this study suggest that there are ten distinct characteristics of effective school boards: (a) are visionaries and strategic planners, (b) focused on student achievement, (c) makes governing a priority, (d) promotes open communication and community engagement, (e) are fiscally responsible, (f) are data driven, (g) seeks to establish and maintain a positive relationship with the superintendent, (h) are committed to professional development, (i) regularly and routinely monitor progress, and (j) promotes team work.

The second section includes research on the evolution of the school boards, the actual state of public schools in America, and the impact of school board leadership on student achievement. While studies on the impact of school board leadership is limited, research presented in this review of literature suggest that effective school board leadership is an essential and key component to the success of schools (Eadie, 2005).

The third section reviewed studies specifically related to Bolman and Deal's leadership orientation frame categorization based on use of the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S. This section also provides a more comprehensive description of each of the four frames:

1. Human Resource
2. Political

3. Structural
4. Symbolic

The emphasis in this section was to include available research on the leadership orientation frames of school board members and those that addressed other demographic data that will be included in this study. The review of literature shows that more research on this topic is needed. The implications of this study could have an impact on how school board members are trained in the state of Mississippi and other states. This study may also have implications on the selection process of school board members.

Chapter three describes the methodology for the study including the procedures used for data collection and analysis.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Procedure

The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership orientation frame preferences (as developed by Bolman & Deal 1984, 1991c, 1997, 2008, 2013) of school board members in Mississippi. The Leadership Orientation Self-Survey (LO(S)S (Bolman & Deal, 1990) was utilized to determine leadership orientation frame preferences of board members participating in the study.

This study investigated the self-reported leadership orientation frame preferences to determine whether there were any differences in leadership frame use by school boards in Mississippi. A total forty-one selected school boards will be surveyed; twenty-one appointed school boards twenty elected school boards. School Board secretaries were contacted by phone explaining the study, timeline, and informed how to access and complete the study. Results were made available to each participating school board.

Research Questions

1. Is there a difference in frame preference score means for elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi?
2. Is there a difference in leadership style preference for elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi?
3. Is there a difference in frame preferences when gender, educational attainment, and years of experience are considered?
4. Does a relationship exist between frame preferences and QDI?

Null Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between frame preference score means of elected and appointed board members who completed the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S.
2. There is no significant difference between the frame preference of elected and appointed board members who rate themselves as managers or leaders using the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S.
3. There is no significant difference between frame preferences and gender, highest academic degree earned, and years of experience on the school board.
4. There is no significant relationship between frame preferences of school board members in Mississippi using the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S and the Quality Distribution Index (QDI) for the school districts represented in this study.

Type of Study

Survey methodology was used to investigate the research questions and hypotheses.

Reactions to Bolman and Deal's (1990) *LO(S)S* Sections I, II, and III was analyzed to determine frame preferences. Section IV was used to collect demographic data on participants.

Study Population

According to the Mississippi Department of Education, (<http://www.mde.k12.ms.us/map?ShowList=1>), there are 155 school districts with 731 school board members. Five hundred board members are elected and 231 are appointed. This study surveyed 21 appointed school boards with 87 completed surveys and 20 elected school boards with 101 completed surveys from each of the four regions of the state: Northeast, Northwest, Southeast, and Southwest. The sample population included 101 elected board members and 87 appointed school board members. Surveys were made available at the Mississippi School Board Association's Winter Conference where over 200 school board members were in attendance. A brief explanation of the study and the process for completing the survey was described to participants. Participants were allowed to complete the survey during intermission and at the

conclusion of the conference. Attendees were also given the option to sign their board up to receive the electronic version of the survey via Survey Monkey or a hard copy mailed to the district's office.

Instrumentation

The Four Frames Leadership Orientations Self-Survey or the LO(S)S (Bolman & Deal, 1990) instrument was used to identify board members' self-reported leadership style preferences as defined by Bolman and Deal. The instrument includes forty items, as well as eight subscales to represent each frame, and is divided into three sections. Section I includes 32 questions to be rated on a Likert type scale of 1 (Never) to 5 (Always) depending on how often each of the items applied to the respondent. As illustrated in table 1, the questions are divided equally among the Structural, Human Resource, Political, and Symbolic frames.

Table 1

Leadership Frame Preferences

Human Resource (2, 6, 10, 14, 18, 22, 26, 30)	Supportive (2, 10, 18, 26) Participative (6, 14, 22, 30)
Political (3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 23, 27, 31)	Powerful (3, 11, 19, 27) Adroit (7, 15, 23, 31)
Structural (1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 21, 25, 29)	Analytic (1, 9, 17, 25) Organized (5, 13, 21, 29)
Symbolic (4, 8, 12, 16, 20, 24, 28, 32)	Inspirational (4, 12, 20, 28) Charismatic (8, 16, 24, 32)

There are two leadership dimensions associated with each of the four frames: (1) Management and (2) Leadership (Bolman & Deal, 2001). There are four (4) frames with eight statements to assess each of the four frames. As table 2 shows, there are eight sub-scales: (1) analytic, (2) supportive, (3) powerful, (4) inspirational, (5) organized, (6) participative, (7)

adroit, and (8) charismatic. Items 1, 9, 17, and 25 are associated with the Analytic section of the Structural Frame, while items 5, 13, 21, and 29 assess the organized component of the Structural Frame. The Supportive sub-scale of the Human Resource Frame is assessed by items 2, 10, 18, and 26; and items 6, 14, 22, and 30 are associated with the Participative component of Human Resource. The Political Frame is composed of the Powerful sub-scale (items 3, 11, 19, 27) and the Adroit sub-scale is composed of (items 7, 15, 23, 31). The Inspirational sub-scale consists of (items 4, 12, 20, and 28) and the Charismatic sub-scale consists of items 8, 16, 24, 32 make up the Symbolic Frame.

A concise description of each frame and characteristics observed by participants are also provided in table 2. According to Deal and Bolman (2013), individuals who are capable of multi-framing will have a more precise view of the organization, its purpose, and goals. The descriptions include the eight subcategories that make up the four frames. It should also be noted that recent research about multi framing has stimulated an interest in the impact of leadership and management on organizations.

Table 2

Descriptions of dimensions of leadership of the LO(S)S

Frame Dimensions	Description
Human Resource Supportive	Concerned about the feelings of others; supportive and responsive.
Participative	Fosters participation and involvement; listens and is open to new ideas.
Political Powerful	Persuasive, high level of ability to mobilize people and resources; effective at building alliances and support.
Adroit	Politically sensitive and skillful; a skillful negotiator in face of conflict and opposition.
Structural Analytic	Thinks clearly and logically; approaches problems with facts and attends to detail.
Organized	Develops clear goals and policies; holds people accountable for results.
Symbolic Inspirational	Inspires others to loyalty and enthusiasm; communicates a strong sense of vision.
Charismatic	Imaginative, emphasizes culture and values; is highly charismatic.

Respondents were given four options to determine their frame preference for all four frames:

- 1 – Never true
- 2 – Occasionally true
- 3 – Sometimes true
- 4 – Often true
- 5 – Always true

Section II of the *LO(S)S* consists of six forced-choice items which “produces a sharper differentiation among the frames because it does not permit rating someone high on everything” (Bolman & Deal, 1992a, p. 320). Section III, is comprised of two items, and asks the respondents to rate their own effectiveness as managers and as leaders. These two terms are purposely not defined. The ratings are compared with other leaders with comparable levels of experience and responsibility. The section employs an anchored scale with the lowest score (1) being the bottom 20% and the highest score (5) being the top 20%. Bolman and Deal (1992) expected to see a high correlation between the two measures.

Participants were asked to respond to all three sections of the *LO(S)S*; however, only the responses to Section I was used to identify frame use. The items in Section II contains six forced choice items that provided insight on respondents views of themselves as leaders and managers. Section III consists of two one item measures: effectiveness as a manager and effectiveness as a leader. Section IV is a demographic addendum including age, gender, highest academic degree earned, and years of experience on the school board. These data were used to determine if these characteristics have a significant influence on the respondent’s frame preferences on the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey (LO(S)S).

Reliability of the Leadership Orientations Self-Survey

Bolman and Deal (2004) reported reliability statistics for the *LO(S)S* based on 1309 colleague ratings of managers in education and business. It should be noted that the alpha coefficients for items in Section I are usually consistently higher than the reliability coefficients for Section II. Using Cronbach’s Alpha, internal reliability for the frame measures of the original instrument ranged between .91 and .93 (Bolman & Deal, 1991b). Chronbach alpha coefficients for all items are reported in table 1.

Table 3

Reliability Coefficients for the LO(S)S

Frame	Coefficient alpha (Section I)	Coefficient alpha (Section II)
Structural	.92	.84
Human Resource	.93	.84
Political	.91	.79
Symbolic	.93	.84

Validity of the Leadership Orientations Self-Survey

According to Salkind (2006), the maximum level of validity “is equal to the square root of the reliability coefficient” (p. 117). Bolman and Deal (1991a, 1991b, 1992a) examined the validity of the *LO(S)S* using regression analysis. They determined that the self-rating of managerial and leadership effectiveness (Section III) was predicted by the four frames. A minimum of 66% of the variance in managerial effectiveness and 74% in leadership effectiveness were predicted. Bolman and Deal also concluded that those variables that were associated with managerial effectiveness were almost the opposite of those associated with leadership effectiveness. The structural frame was determined as the best predictor for management effectiveness and the worst for leadership effectiveness. The symbolic frame proved to be the best predictor for leadership effectiveness and the worst for managerial effectiveness.

Bolman and Deal (1991a) employed factor analysis to indicate the internal consistency of frame scores of the *LO(S)S*. They deleted six of the 32 items that showed loading factors of less than .50 and retained all of those with .50 and above. It should be noted that the original instrument with 32 questions has been used successfully in many other studies (Cote, 1999; Durocher, 1995; Harlow, 1994; Hodge, 2003; Johnson, 1995; Rivers, 1996; Suzuki, 1994).

Data Collection

Approval to conduct the study was granted by the University of Mississippi's Internal Review Board. Permission was also requested from Dr. Lee Bolman and Dr. Terrence Deal who developed the Frame Theory and the LO(S)S survey that was used in this research study. A copy of the findings of the study as well as the actual raw data was made available to them. The Mississippi School Boards Association (MSBA) and the National School Board Association (NSBA) received a written description of the study and were asked to endorse the study by encouraging school board members to participate in the study. Although no response was received from NSBA, MSBA's executive director did encourage attendees at their winter conference to participate in the study. Participating school boards at the winter conference were given two options for completing the LO(S)S survey: (1) Hard copy and (2) On-line. Each school board secretary was contacted by phone to explain the purpose of the study, given instructions for completing the survey, provided timelines for completion, and provided contact information if additional support was needed. Ten hard copies of the LO(S)S survey were mailed to each of the school districts along with a cover letter explaining the significance of the study, the importance of the study as it relates the work of the school board, and directions for completing and returning the survey. The on-line version of the survey is hosted by SurveyMonkey^R. The data will remain stored on SurveyMonkey's database for a period of one year. This data is accessible for analysis using a selected user name and password. Two different survey links were created to distinguish between elected and appointed school boards for data analysis purposes. A follow-up phone call was made to each board member to answer any questions about the survey and to encourage survey completion. Hard copies of surveys were completed and collected at the Mississippi School Boards Association Winter Conference.

The Mississippi Department of Education makes its achievement data available to the public at its website and also provides a description of how QDI is calculated. The QDI data used in this study was retrieved online from the Mississippi Center for Public Policy's website and the Mississippi Department of Education's website.

Data Analysis

Each item response for Section I of the *LO(S)S* was scored based on the respondents' rating of how often each behavior item was scored, using a five-point scale:

- 1 – Never true
- 2 – Occasionally true
- 3 – Sometimes true
- 4 – Often true
- 5 – Always true

Scores for the eight items measuring each frame was added and then divided by eight to provide a mean score that reflected the board member's preference for using that frame.

Leadership orientation studies that have used only the questions in Sections I and III to investigate leader's leadership orientation frames have used the mean of the eight items on each of the four subscales in Section I to identify frame use (Durocher, 1995; Hodge, 2005; Johnson, 1995; Rivers, 1996; Suzuki, 1994). The highest possible mean was five and the lowest was zero. For the purposes of this study, the scores for each of the four frames were computed by finding the average rating of each of the subscales (eight items per subscale) in Section I. A mean score of 4.0 or greater was used to indicate frame use often or always; frames with scores lower than 4.0 indicated less often (Durocher, 1995; Hodge, 2003).

The quantitative data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), Version 22.0. Descriptive statistics, analysis of variance, and Pearson r were computed. The self-reported leadership frame preferences of elected and appointed school board members

were compared on each of the four frames (Structural, Human Resource, Political, and Symbolic). Frames were analyzed using two variables. Frame indicated which frame (1 for Human Resource, 2 for Structural, 3 for Political, and 4 for Symbolic). Frame score was the score indicated by a board member for a frame.

Four analyses of variance were performed, with frame score as the dependent variable for all four. All the independent variables for these analyses were fixed effects variables. A two-way analysis of variance was performed to test for significant differences between the four frames and for interaction between board member selection, appointed versus elected, and frame.

A three-way analysis of variance was performed to test for interaction effects from effectiveness type and frame, and from effectiveness type, selection, and frame. A four-way analysis of variance was performed to test for interaction effects from gender, education, and experience with frame. Frame score was used as the dependent variable for all ANOVA's in this study. A Pearson's r was computed for QDI with frame score to determine if a relationship existed between frame preference and QDI.

Another focus of this study was to determine leadership styles of participating board members. Section II of the LO(S)S examined leadership style preferences as a manager or leader. Both selections asked participants to rate themselves in the following order: (1) Bottom 20%, (2) Middle 20%, or (3) Top 20%. The leader and manager proficiency scores were used to create the worker type variable which divided board members into four groups. The 27 members that rated their proficiency as leaders greater than that as managers were designated leaders. The 40 that rated their proficiency as managers greater than that as leaders were designated managers. The 42 board members that rated their leader and manager proficiencies equal, but not in the upper

20%, were designated adaptive. The 79 that rated both their leader and manager proficiency in the upper 20% were designated super adaptive.

Summary

Chapter three describes the method used to investigate the leadership orientation frames used by school boards in Mississippi. The Leadership Orientation Self-Survey and was used to collect data. Chapter four presents the results from the survey instrument as well as the data analysis and interpretation in view of the research questions and hypotheses. Chapter five presents conclusions, implications of the study, and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Bolman and Deal found frames to be, “vital because organizations don’t come with computerized navigation systems to guide you turn-by-turn to your destination” (Bolman & Deal, 2013, page 10). The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership orientation preferences (as developed by Bolman & Deal 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013) of both elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi. The Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S (Bolman & Deal, 1990) was employed to determine leadership orientation frame preferences of the school board members included in this study and leadership style effectiveness. An additional analysis was conducted to determine if a relationship existed between frame preferences and QDI. The study also investigated the effects of three demographic characteristics: gender, highest academic degree earned, and years of experience on board members’ leadership orientation frame preferences. The Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S (Bolman & Deal, 1990) was used to determine leadership orientation frame preferences of Mississippi school board members included in this study. Four research questions and four hypotheses were used to frame and structure this study:

Research Questions

1. Is there a difference in frame preference score means for elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi?
2. Is there a difference in leadership style preference for elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi?

3. Is there a difference in frame preferences when gender, educational attainment, and years of experience are considered?
4. Does a relationship exist between frame preferences and QDI?

Null Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between frame preference of elected and appointed board members who completed the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S.
2. There is no significant difference between the frame preference of elected and appointed board members who rate themselves as managers or leaders using the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S.
3. There is no significant difference in frame preferences due to gender, highest academic degree earned, and/or years of school board experience.
4. There is no significant relationship between frame preferences of school board members in Mississippi using the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S and the Quality Distribution Index (QDI) for the school districts represented in this study.

Chapter four presents the results of the analysis of quantitative data. The results are presented based on the proceeding research questions and hypotheses. First descriptive data are presented. These include the demographic characteristics as well as descriptive statistics and comparisons of participants' self determined cognitive frames. Following descriptive data are an analyses and results of statistical tests, analyses of variance, and pearson r that were used to examine relationships between variables and self-reported leadership orientation frames. Because the F value for effectiveness * frame, $F=2.480$, p value = 0.009, indicates that effectiveness and frame interact significantly to affect frame score, four additional one – way ANOVA's were used to determine for each of the four effectiveness groups, if there were any statistically significant frame preferences (Tables 16 – 23). Participants' leadership frames were determined by summarizing their responses to Section I of the LO(S)S (Bolman & Deal, 1990). Scores on leadership and management effectiveness were taken from participant responses to Section III

but were not used to determine leadership orientation preferences. Demographic characteristics of board member responses were reported from Section IV.

Participating school boards at the Mississippi School Boards Association or MSBA winter conference were given two options for completing the LO(S)S survey: (1) hard copy and (2) on-line. The on-line version of the survey was hosted by SurveyMonkey^R. The data will remain stored on SurveyMonkey's database for a period of one year. This data is accessible for analysis using a selected user name and password. A link was emailed to each school board member, per their request, along with an attached cover letter explaining the significance of the study, the importance of the study as it relates to the work of the school board, and directions for completion. Two different survey links were created to distinguish between elected and appointed school boards for data analysis purposes. Hard copies of surveys were completed and collected at the Mississippi School Boards Association Winter Conference.

The Leadership Orientation Self-Survey instruments were made available to the entire population of attending school board members at the Mississippi School Boards Association winter conference and an additional forty LO(S)S were requested by attendees to be emailed. Surveys were available to all attendees at MSBA'S winter conference and attendees were given the option to have the survey sent electronically. One hundred and eighty-three surveys were collected during the conference and five surveys were completed electronically resulting in a total of 188 completed surveys. Eighty-seven surveys (46.2%) were from appointed board members representing 21 districts and 101 surveys (53.7%) were from elected board members representing 20 districts.

Descriptive Data

Tables 4 provides demographic data by age, gender, and ethnicity. Participants were asked to identify their ages according to the following ranges: (a) 24 or younger, (b) 25 – 34, (c) 35 – 44, (d) 45 – 54, or (e) 55 or older. Ethnicity was identified by six categories: (a) American Indian or Alaskan Native, (b) Asian or Pacific Islander, (c) Black or African American, (d) Hispanic or Latino, (e) White or Caucasian, or (f) Other. One hundred four (55.3%) of respondents indicated that they were male. Seventy-six (40.4%) of respondents age ranged from 45 – 54 and 94 of respondents indicated that they were Black or African American and 94 respondents indicated that they were White or Caucasian. No other ethnic group was represented in the population.

Table 4

Age, gender, and ethnicity of board members (N = 188)

Characteristic	Frequency	Percentage	Appointed	Elected
<i>Age</i>				
24 or <	0	0	0	0
25 – 34	0	0	0	0
35 – 44	46	24.5	32	14
45 – 54	76	40.4	30	46
55 or >	66	35.1	25	41
<i>Gender</i>				
Female	84	44.7	41	43
Male	104	55.3	48	56
<i>Ethnicity</i>				
Black	94	50.0	45	49
White	94	50.0	42	52

Table 5 presents demographic data by educational attainment, method of selection, and years served. Educational attainment was identified by six categories: (a) High school degree or equivalent, (b) Two years of college, (c) Bachelor’s degree, (d) Masters, (e) Specialist, (f)

Doctorate. Total years served on the board was identified by four categories: (a) Less than 1 year, (b) 1 – 5 years, (c) 6 – 15 years, or (d) 16 or more years. One hundred one (53.7%) participants indicated that they hold a bachelor’s degree. Of this number, the greatest percentage (33.5%) of college graduates was in the appointed group. A majority of the population, 63.3%, has served on the school board between 6 – 15 years.

Table 5

Education, method of selection, years served (N = 188)

Board Members	Frequency	Percentage	Appointed (87)	Elected (101)
Highest Degree				
H.S	62	32.9	7	55
2 + college	11	6.0	4	7
Bachelors	101	53.7	63	38
Masters	4	2.1	4	0
Specialist	0	0	0	0
Doctorate	10	5.3	9	1
Method of Selection				
Appointed	87	46.3		
Elected	101	53.7		
Years Served				
>1	1	.53	1	0
1 – 5	53	28.2	22	31
6 – 15	119	63.3	51	68
16+	15	8	13	2

Analysis of Research Questions & Testing of Hypotheses

Research Question 1:

Research question one asked: Is there a difference in frame preference score means of elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi?

Based on research question 1, the following null hypothesis was tested:

H₁: There is no significant difference between frame preference score means of elected and appointed board members who completed the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S.

The analysis revealed that both elected and appointed board members most often used the human resource frame followed by the structural frame. The least used frame was the political frame with a mean score of 3.5 for the group. Table 6 shows the mean scores for the four frames: Structural, Human, Political, and Symbolic. For the entire sample (N = 188), the Human Resource Frame has a mean score of 4.60 and the Structural Frame mean was 4.32. The scores indicate that board members in this study use the human resource frame most often. The political frame's higher standard deviation indicates that the responses by school board members for this frame have the most variability of all the frames. This would suggest that within the items measuring use of the political frame the board members are likely to have the least homogenous opinions and ratings. Thus the scores on these items will be the most likely to avoid clustering near the mean score 3.50.

Table 6

Means, standard deviations, and range of responses

Frames	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
HR	4.60	.63	3	5
Structural	4.32	.69	3	5
Political	3.50	1.02	1	4
Symbolic	3.85	.85	1	4

This finding suggests that participants are multi-framers; however, participants preferred the human resource frame and the structural frame followed by symbolic and the least preferred was political. Mean score results and standard deviations by selection type are reported in table 7.

Table 7

Means and standard deviations by selection and frame

Selection	Frame	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Appointed	Human	4.59	.60	87
	Resource	4.24	.69	87
	Structural	3.38	1.06	87
	Political	3.79	.89	87
	Symbolic	4.00	.95	348
	Total			
Elected	Human	4.61	.66	101
	Resource	4.40	.68	101
	Structural	3.60	.98	101
	Political	3.90	.82	101
	Symbolic			

	Total	4.13	.89	404
Total	Human Resource	4.60	.63	188
	Structural	4.32	.69	188
	Political	3.50	1.02	188
	Symbolic	3.85	.85	188
	Total	4.07	.92	752

Two-way analysis of variance results found that there is no statistical difference of frame preference score means of elected and appointed school board members that participated in this study. Table 8 provides the results of the two – way ANOVA with frame score as the dependent variable. The F value for frame and selection interaction was not significant ($F = .48$ $df = 1,3$, $p = .69$).

Because no significance was found to exist between reported frame use and selection to the board, post hoc Tukey HSD tests to determine any differences within the selection groups were not performed.

Table 8

ANOVA results for mean score and selection ($\alpha = .05$)

Dependent variable: Frame score						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Corrected Model	139.344 ^a	7	19.906	30.160	.000	
Intercept	12353.395	1	12353.395	18716.487	.000	
Frame	135.895	3	45.298	68.631	.000	
Selection	3.097	1	3.097	4.693	.031	

Frame * Selection	.959	3	.320	.484	.693
Error	491.060	744	.660		
Total	13082.000	752			
Corrected Total	630.404	751			

a. R Squared = .221 (Adjusted R Squared = .214)

Research Question 2:

Research questions 2 asked: Is there a difference in leadership style preference of elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi?

Based on research question 2, the following null hypothesis was tested:

H₂: There is no significant difference between the mean scores of elected and appointed board members who rate themselves as managers or leaders using the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S.

Table 9 represents the mean scores and standard deviations for the self-ratings for effectiveness as managers and as leaders. Board members were asked to rate themselves using the following scale: (1) Bottom 20%, (2) Middle 20%, and (3) Top 20%. Seventy-nine of the participants in this study rated themselves equally in top 20% for effectiveness as a manager and effectiveness as a leader. Forty – one participants rated themselves equally in the middle 20% for effectiveness as a manager and effectiveness as a leader. One individual rated himself equally in the bottom 20% for effectiveness as a manager and effectiveness as a leader. Forty individuals distinctively rated themselves as most effective managers and 27 distinctively identified themselves as most effective leaders.

Table 9

Leadership effectiveness mean scores (N = 188)

Leadership Style	N	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Manager	188	2.53	.59	1	3
Leader	188	2.44	.69	1	3

A three-way analysis of variance (table 10) was used to test for significance of frame preferences of elected and appointed board members and effectiveness and a manager or leader. Frame preference score was the dependent variable in this analyses. The null hypothesis was accepted because the analysis found that no significance exist between selection type, frame use, and effectiveness as a manager of leader ($F = 1.24, df = 3, 9, p = .27$).

Table 10

ANOVA results for leadership or management effectiveness ($\alpha = .05$)

Dependent variable: Frame score						
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
Corrected Model	162.862 ^a	31	5.254	8.090	.000	
Intercept	9544.598	1	9544.598	14698.367	.000	
Frame	3.818	1	3.818	5.880	.016	
Effectiveness	1.521	3	.507	.781	.505	
Selection * Frame	3.485	3	1.162	1.789	.148	
Selection * Effectiveness	3.499	3	1.166	1.796	.147	

Frame *					
Effectiveness	14.495	9	1.611	2.480	.009
Selection * Frame					
* Effectiveness	7.245	9	.805	1.240	.267
Error	467.542	720	.649		
Total	13082.000	752			
Corrected Total	630.404	751			

a. R Squared = .258 (Adjusted R Squared = .226)

Because no significance was found to exist between reported frame use and selection to the board, post hoc Tukey HSD tests to determine any differences within the selection groups were not performed.

Research question 3:

Research Question 3 asked: Is there a difference of frame preferences when gender, educational attainment, and years of experience are considered?

Based on research question 3, the following null hypothesis was tested:

H₃: There is no significant difference between frame preferences and gender, highest academic degree earned, and years of experience on the school board.

Male and female respondents in this study reported a preference for the human resource frame, followed by the structural frame, then symbolic and the least reported used frame was the political frame. Means and standard deviations by gender are listed in table 11.

Table 11

Means and standard deviations by gender

Gender	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Female			
Human Resource	4.70	.51	84
Structural	4.36	.71	84
Political	3.44	1.02	84
Symbolic	3.67	.83	84
Male			
Human Resource	4.52	.71	104
Structural	4.30	.68	104
Political	3.55	1.02	104
Symbolic	4.00	.85	104

Table 12 provides the results in which the dependent variable was frame scores at an alpha level of .05. The results of this analysis revealed that neither of the three demographic variables; age, gender, or years of experience is statistically significant in regards to frame preference of participants in this study. The results indicated no significance in regards to demographic variables and frame use ($F = .23$, $df = 1,3$, $p = .87$).

Table 12

ANOVA results for age, gender, and years of experience ($\alpha = .05$)

Dependent variable: Frame score

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	176.815 ^a	83	2.130	3.137	.000
Intercept	1781.565	1	1781.565	2623.708	.000
Frame	34.782	3	11.594	17.075	.000
Gender	.841	1	.841	1.239	.266
Education	2.598	4	.649	.956	.431
Experience	1.271	3	.424	.624	.600
Frame * Gender	2.457	3	.819	1.206	.307
Frame * Education	6.239	12	.520	.766	.686
Frame * Experience	1.582	9	.176	.259	.985
Gender * Education	2.398	2	1.199	1.765	.172
Gender * Experience	1.461	2	.731	1.076	.342
Education * Experience	4.370	7	.624	.919	.491
Frame * Gender * Education	2.807	6	.468	.689	.659
Frame * Gender * Experience	.851	6	.142	.209	.974

Frame *					
Education *	5.331	21	.254	.374	.995
Experience					
Gender *					
Education *	.102	1	.102	.150	.698
Experience					
Frame * Gender *					
Education *	.473	3	.158	.232	.874
Experience					
Error	453.589	668	.679		
Total	13082.000	752			
Corrected Total	630.404	751			

a. R Squared = .280 (Adjusted R Squared = .191)

Research question 4: Is there a difference in QDI based on preferred use of frames?

Based on research question 4, the following null hypothesis was tested:

H₄: There is no significant relationship between frame preferences of school board members in Mississippi using the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S and the Quality Distribution Index (QDI) for the school districts represented in this study

The state of Mississippi assigns a growth target for each school district to determine if the district is making adequate year to year academic gains. Achievement is measured by the Quality of Distribution Index (QDI), with the minimum QDI zero and the maximum at 300. Table 13 shows the QDI status for school districts that participated in this study. Growth, on the other hand, is based on whether students demonstrate performance equal to or better than expected based on how they performed the previous school year. The state assigns two possible QDI description to districts: (1) Not Met or (2) Met along with a numeric score. Sixty – three or 72.4% of appointed boards did meet their QDI goal for 2013 – 2014 and sixty – six or 65.3% of

elected boards met their QDI goal for 2013 – 2014 (table 18). School districts are also assigned a letter grade that is determined by several criteria including QDI, graduation rates, etc. Twenty – eight (32.1%) of participating districts with appointed school boards have a B or A for 2013 – 2014 and thirty-five participating (34.6%) of districts elected boards have a B or A for 2013 – 2014.

Table 13

QDI and letter grade scores

Academic Rating	Frequency	Percentage (N = 188)	Appointed (87)	Elected (101)
Letter Grade				
A	4	2.1	4 (5%)	0 (0%)
B	59	31.4	24 (27.6%)	35 (34.7%)
C	47	25	31(35.6%)	16 (15.8%)
D	47	25	12 (13.8%)	35 (34.7%)
F	31	16.5	16 (18.4%)	15 (14.9%)
QDI				
Met	87	46.3	63 (72.4%)	66 (65.3%)
Not Met	101	53.7	24 (27.6%)	35 (34.7%)

A Pearson correlation coefficient was performed using QDI numeric values assigned by the state. An additional analysis of variance was run using Met and Not Met values as categorical data to determine if significance existed between frame preferences and QDI. Pearson correlation was used because it is the most common measure used for bivariate relationship measures (Garson, 2008). The results of the Pearson’s r analysis are illustrated in Table 14 in which no relationship between QDI and frame preferences exist with $r = -.06$.

Table 14

Pearson r correlation for QDI and frame preference

	Frame Score	QDI
Frame Score		
Pearson Correlation	1	-.064
Sig. (2 – tailed)		.084
N	732	732
QDI		
Pearson Correlation	-.064	1
Sig. (2 – tailed)	.084	
N	732	732

Table 15 lists Quality Distribution Index (QDI) scores for each participating district and the mean score by selection process. Appointed school districts had a mean QDI of 156 and elected school boards had a mean QDI of 150.

Table 15

QDI mean scores and standard deviations

Boards	N	Mean	Standard Deviation
Appointed	21	155.90	29.03
Elected	20	149.79	21.98

Additional Analysis

Since the interaction between effectiveness type and frame was significant, four additional one-way analyses of variances were computed. Frame was the independent variable and frame score was the dependent variable. The first analysis was performed using the 40 effectiveness type 1 board members who rated themselves as most effective as managers. The second included 27, effectiveness type 2 board members who rated themselves as most effective leaders. The third included 41, effectiveness type rated themselves equally as middle and lower 20% most effective managers and leaders. And the fourth included 79, effectiveness type who rated themselves equally in the top 20% most effective as managers and leaders.

The order of the size of the mean frame preferences for all four analyses was the same as that of the mean preferences across effectiveness type. The human resource frame had the highest preference, structural second, symbolic third, and political last. However, unlike preferences measured across all effectiveness, not all the differences within each worker type were statistically significant.

Mean scores and standard deviations for the first group that rated themselves as most effective managers are listed in table 16. This group preferred the human resource frame, followed by the structural frame, and least preferred is the political frame with a mean score of 3.43.

Table 16

Means and standard deviations for managers (N = 40)

Frame	M	SD
Human Resource	4.45	.68
Structural	4.13	.76
Political	3.43	1.03
Symbolic	3.78	1.05
Total	3.94	.97

Table 17 provides the results for respondents who rated themselves as most effective managers. Using frame score as the dependent variable, significance was found with ($F = 9.76$, $df = 1, 3$, $p = .000$). A Tukey HSD post hoc was analyzed to determine if the differences were statistically significant for each frame mean in this group. The results determined that for the human resource frame there is not a significant difference for the structural frame with a p value of .368 but there is a significant difference between the mean scores for the human resource frame and the political frame, $p = .000$ and the human resource frame and symbolic frame, $p = .005$. Significance was also found to exist between mean scores for the structural frame and political frame, $p = .003$.

Table 17

One-way ANOVA for managers (N = 40, $\alpha = .05$)

Dependent variable = Frame Score					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	23.469a	3	7.823	9.761	.000
Intercept	2488.506	1	2488.506	3105.035	.000
Frame	23.469	3	7.823	9.761	.000
Error	125.025	156	.801		
Total	2637.000	160			
Corrected Total	148.494	159			

a. R Squared = .158 (Adjusted R Squared = .142)

The same analysis, one-way ANOVA, was used to test for significance for the 27 respondents who rated themselves as most effective leaders to determine if significance existed between mean scores of their preferred frame use. Means and standard deviations for this group are listed in table 18.

Table 18

Means and standard deviations for leaders (N = 27)

Frame	M	SD
Human Resource	4.59	.57
Structural	4.22	.64
Political	3.70	1.03
Symbolic	3.88	.75
Total	4.10	.83

A similar pattern existed in terms of frame preference where human resource is the most used frame, followed by structural, symbolic, and least preferred is political. The results of the

ANOVA are found in table 19. Using frame score as the dependent variable, significance was found with ($F = 6.99$, $df = 1, 3$, $p = .000$).

Table 19

One-way ANOVA for leaders (N = 27, $\alpha = .05$)

Dependent variable = Frame Score					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	12.398a	3	4.133	6.991	.000
Intercept	1817.120	1	1817.120	3073.780	.000
Frame	12.398	3	4.133	6.991	.000
Error	61.481	104	.591		
Total	1891.000	108			
Corrected Total	73.880	107			

a. R Squared = .168 (Adjusted R Squared = .144)

Because significance was found to exist, a Tukey HSD post hoc was analyzed to determine if the differences were statistically significant for each frame mean in this group. The results determined there is a significant difference between the mean scores for the human resource frame and the political frame, $p = .000$ and the human resource frame and the symbolic frame, $p = .006$ for this group.

A third analysis was used to test for significance between mean more score preferences for the third group of respondents who rated themselves equally, middle and bottom 20% for effectiveness and managers and leaders. Mean scores and standard deviations for this group are listed in table 20. A similar pattern emerged with this group where the human resource frame is most used, followed by structural, symbolic, and least preferred is political.

Table 20

Means and standard deviations for adaptive group (N = 42)

Frame	M	SD
Human Resource	4.81	.45
Structural	4.40	.62
Political	3.19	1.11
Symbolic	3.88	.77
Total	4.07	.98

The results of the ANOVA are found in table 21. Using frame score as the dependent variable, significance was found with ($F = 33.89$, $df = 1, 3$, $p = .000$).

Table 21

One – way ANOVA for middle and bottom 20% (N = 42, $\alpha = .05$)

Dependent variable = Frame Score					
Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	61.667a	3	20.556	33.889	.000
Intercept	2784.857	1	2784.857	4591.215	.000
Frame	61.667	3	20.556	33.889	.000
Error	99.476	164	.607		
Total	2946.000	168			
Corrected Total	161.143	167			

a. R Squared = .383 (Adjusted R Squared = .371)

Tukey HSD post hoc was analyzed to determine if the differences were statistically significant for each frame mean in this group. The results determined that there is a significant difference between the mean scores for the human resource frame and the political frame, $p = .000$ and the human resource frame and the symbolic frame, $p = .006$. Significance was also

found to exist between structural and political frames, $p = .000$ and structural and symbolic, $p = .013$.

A fourth one-way ANOVA was conducted on the fourth group, $N = 79$, that ranked themselves in the top 20% effective both as managers and leaders. Standard deviations and means are listed in table 22.

Table 22

Means and standard deviations for super adaptive (N = 79)

Frame	M	SD
Human Resource	4.57	.69
Structural	4.42	.69
Political	3.63	.94
Symbolic	3.86	.83
Total	4.12	.88

This group also preferred the human resource frame with a mean of 4.57, followed by structural, symbolic, and least preferred was also the political frame. The results of the ANOVA are found in table 23.

Table 23

One – way ANOVA for top 20% effectiveness as managers and leaders (N = 79, $\alpha = .05$)

Dependent variable = Frame Score

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	47.025a	3	15.675	24.901	.000
Intercept	5364.570	1	5364.570	8521.907	.000
Frame	47.025	3	15.675	24.901	.000
Error	196.405	312	.630		
Total	5608.000	316			

Corrected Total	243.430	315
-----------------	---------	-----

a. R Squared = .193 (Adjusted R Squared = .185)

The results of the ANOVA are found in table 23. Using frame score as the dependent variable, significance was found with ($F = 24.90$, $df = 1, 3$, $p = .000$). Tukey HSD post hoc was analyzed to determine if the differences were statistically significant for each frame mean in this group. The results determined that there is a significant difference between the mean scores for the human resource frame and the political frame, $p = .000$ and the human resource frame and the symbolic frame, $p = .000$. Significance was also found to exist between structural and political frames, $p = .000$ and structural and symbolic, $p = .000$.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

“A world ever more dependent on organizations now finds them evolving too slowly to meet pressing social demands. Without wise leaders and artistic managers to help close the gap, we will continue to see misdirected resources, massive ineffectiveness, and unnecessary pain and suffering” (Bolman and Deal, 2013, p. 434).

Findings and Suggestions for Future Research

This final chapter offers a brief summary of the research problem and findings. Also included are limitations to the study, implications of the research and suggestions for future research.

Summary of Research

The purpose of this study was to examine the leadership orientation preferences (as developed by Bolman & Deal 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013) of both elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi. The Leadership Orientation Self-Survey (LO(S)S); and sub-scale preferences (Bolman & Deal, 1990) was employed to determine leadership orientation frame preferences of the school board members included in this study. The study also investigated the effects of demographic characteristics (age, gender, highest academic degree earned, and years of experience on the school board) on board members' leadership orientation frame preferences. The complexities of the role of school board leaders has evolved to such as

degree that demands board members and superintendents to evaluate themselves on an ongoing basis to determine areas of opportunity to govern at a higher level (Eadie, 2005). Because school board leadership is essential to the success of school districts, an investigation into the leadership orientation frame preferences was significant in determining the organizational effectiveness of school boards particularly in Mississippi where students continue to perform at the lowest quartile in Reading and Math (NAEP, 2013).

Overview of Findings

Over 200 hundred Leadership Orientation Self-Survey instruments were distributed to the entire population of attending school board members at the Mississippi School Boards Association winter conference and an additional forty LO(S)S were emailed using SurveyMonkey^R to participating districts. One hundred and eighty-eight surveys were collected during the conference and electronically resulting in a return rate of 78.3%. Of the returned surveys eighty-seven (46.2%) were from appointed board members representing twenty one districts and one hundred one (53.7%) were from elected board members representing twenty districts. Four research questions and four hypotheses framed and structured this study:

Research Questions

1. Is there a difference in frame preference score means for elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi?
2. Is there a difference in leadership style preference for elected and appointed school board members in Mississippi?
3. Is there a difference in frame preferences when gender, educational attainment, and years of experience are considered?
4. Does a relationship exist between frame preferences and QDI?

Null Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference between frame preference score means of elected and appointed board members who completed the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S.
2. There is no significant difference between the frame preference of elected and appointed board members who rate themselves as managers or leaders using the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S.
3. There is no significant difference between frame preferences and gender, highest academic degree earned, and years of experience on the school board.
4. There is no significant relationship between frame preferences of school board members in Mississippi using the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey LO(S)S and the Quality Distribution Index (QDI) for the school districts represented in this study.

Chapter one established the purpose, limitations, and the significance of the study.

Chapter two presented a review of literature on school board leadership. Chapter three presented an overview of design and methodology of the study including information on the population, the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey, LO(S)S, and the statistical procedures for collecting and analyzing the data. Chapter four reported the results of the study and an analysis of the data with the aforementioned research questions and hypotheses as a frame to guide the research.

Demographic data were collected through participant responses to the Section IV of the LO(S). Data indicated that a majority of respondents were male (55.8%), between the ages of 45 – 54. The majority of respondents also indicated that they were Black or African American (50%) followed by White or Caucasian (50%). No other ethnic group was represented in the study. While the United States is becoming more diverse, Mississippi School Boards continue to lack diversity. The study also included educational attainment data which revealed that appointed board members have acquired more formal education beyond high school at 87.3% and only 38.6% of elected board members hold a degree beyond high school.

Participants were given four options to identify the number of years served on the board: (a), >1, (b) 1 – 5, (c) 6 – 15, and (d) 16+. The study found that 63.2% of participants in this study have currently served on the board six or more years. There are no term limits for school boards in Mississippi and most term limits range from four to six years.

Academic data from districts in which participants represented in the study was also collected to determine if any relationships existed between leadership frame preferences and academic achievement. Research on school board leadership suggests that effective school boards lead student achievement and conducts all board meetings and centers their work on student achievement (Gemberling, Smith, & Villani, 2009). The Mississippi Department of Education scores each district in two ways: (1) Districts are assigned a letter grade, A – F, based on a number of variables including academic achievement and graduation rates, (2) a Quality Distribution Index (QDI) score with the minimum QDI zero and the maximum at 300. The state determines if the district “Met” or “Did Not Meet” sufficient growth each year. Table 13 shows the data that was collected during this study in which 72.4% of appointed districts met QDI for the 2013 – 2014 school year and 65.3% of elected board members’ districts met QDI for the same academic year. The study also revealed that 32.1% of appointed school districts earned a B or A for 2013 and 34.6% of elected school districts earned a B or A for the same academic year.

Mississippi School Board Frame Use

In 1984, Bolman and Deal introduced an entirely different concept of leadership. Their concept is based on the fact that leaders need to know and synthesize vague information into an understandable diagnosis before acting because their action will determine what their organization notices, does and what it eventually becomes (Bolman & Deal, 1993). They also underlined the fact that leaders are most successful when they are able to look at things from

different views (Bolman and Deal, 2002). Thus they introduced a multiple perspective framework; the term “frames” is used to explain various points of view (Bolman and Deal, 1984, 2003). The core of Bolman and Deal multiple perspective framework centers on the understanding of the cognitive orientations of leaders, as the frames of reference that leaders operate from will determine the interpretation of the situations and guide their actions (Bolman & Deal, 1992). It is important to note that each frame is distinct and has its own image of reality (Bolman & Deal, 2013).

They describe four frames: Structural, Human Resources, Political, and Symbolic. Each of the frames has a distinct purpose and function in creating a clearer image of understanding and in describing the orientations used to classify situations. These four frames provide the conceptual framework for this study. Deal & Bolman suggest that leaders are more effective when they are capable of using multiple frames to adapt to situations.

1. The **structural frame** is based on a division of labor and the creation of policies, rules and procedures. It is a more traditional approach rooted in the factory metaphor (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013).
2. The **human resource frame** emphasizes the needs of individuals within an organization and adapts the needs of the organization to fit the people so that they might experience improved self-esteem when performing their responsibilities (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013).
3. The **political** frame views organizations as groups of different interests vying for power and scant resources; conflict is the central theme of this perspective (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013).

4. The **symbolic frame** emphasizes the culture of organizations and is concerned with rebuilding the expressive or spiritual aspects of the organization through the use of stories, myths, metaphors, heroes, ceremonies, and rituals (Bolman & Deal, 1984, 1991, 1997, 2008, 2013).

Respondents were given four options to determine their frame preference for all four frames:

- 1 – Never true
- 2 – Occasionally true
- 3 – Sometimes true
- 4 – Often true
- 5 – Always true

The study indicated that both appointed and elected board members used human resource and structural frames more frequently than symbolic and political.

Although no previous studies on frame usage by board members was found, two similar studies revealed similar results. Welch (2002) showed that college presidents preferred the use of the Structural and Human resource frames. Another study on leaders of independent schools (Roddy, 2010) preferred the Structural and Human Resource frames. A similar study on frame usage by superintendents (Landry, 2009) also found that school superintendents in three southern states including Mississippi also preferred the Human Resource and Structural frames.

Primary use of the Structural Resource frame by participants in this study may be related to the emphasis by the Mississippi School Boards Association (MSBA) emphasis on the board acting as a governing body with a heavy emphasis on policy, structures, and procedural processes. Secondly, the preference for Human Resource frame may also be the result of reform efforts by the MSBA in its training modules to encourage the board to work intentionally on engaging the community at large and having a positive working relationship with the superintendent.

Implications for Current Practice

Each state has its own criteria and qualifications for individuals who wish to serve as a school board member. Some qualifications include a minimum age of eighteen years, legal residency requirements, and at least a high school diploma or its equivalency. Requirements for Mississippi residents are as follows:

1. Board members must be bona fide residents and qualified electors of the school district.
2. Board members must have a high school diploma or its equivalent.
3. Board members are required to complete a basic course of training (12 hours) for new board members conducted by MSBA.
4. Each year, board members are required to complete 6-hours of continuing education conducted or approved by MSBA.

MSBA places clear emphasis on school boards having the right systems in place and consistently monitor those systems to ensure that these systems are working well. MSBA training courses focus on building school board members capacity to govern effectively and to carry out their duties as described in Table 24.

Table 24

MSBA School Board Job Description

Effective School Board Leadership	Specific Duties
Have good communication skills	Evaluating the superintendent (<i>all districts</i>) and hiring the superintendent (<i>some districts</i>)
Are able to accept criticism	Approving and monitoring the budget
Demonstrate good reasoning and critical thinking skills	Setting salaries for employees
Can manage stressful situations	Approving purchases
Are able to commit substantial time to board work	Establishing district policies
Take responsibility for actions	Adopting the school calendar
Maintain a good sense of humor	Ensuring local policies comply with all state and federal laws and regulations
Are respected in their communities	Building schools and closing schools
Understand the board's roles and responsibilities	Establishing district vision
Have the courage to make difficult decisions	Establishing district goals and monitoring progress
Understand that the board sets the standards for the district through board policy	Assess board effectiveness
Understand that the board makes decisions as a team and that individual board members may not commit the board to any action	Approving personnel actions based on superintendent's recommendation
Insist that all board and district business is conducted ethically and honestly	

Conclusions

Several conclusions may be drawn from this study. First, demographic characteristics of participants in this study mirror the demographics of the students that are served in the state. A majority of study participants identified themselves as being Black or African American, followed by White or Caucasian participants, and no other ethnic group was reported. Recent student demographic data reports that 49.6% of public school students in Mississippi are Black or African American and 46.0% of students are White, 2.5% Hispanic, and .9% Asian, .2% American Indian/Alaskan Native (<http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/states/>, 2015.)

Secondly, the results of this study suggest the need for Mississippi school board members may need further development in the awareness of the Political and Symbolic frames. MSBA may consider adding training modules on frame orientations as a part of required coursework. An understanding of the Political frame could enhance board members to enhance their negotiating skills particularly with other county or community officials. Additionally and understanding of the Symbolic frame would support the board's work to help the district market themselves around an identity. This is particularly important in small rural communities that are often very connected to traditions and their heritage.

The results of this study may serve as a basis for continued training and delivery of content for board members regardless of their selection process. MSBA may find value in how to design professional development modules including the four frames. The study revealed that a majority of board members are serving beyond their sixth year which also supports Bolman and Deals research that experience contributes to an individual's ability to multi-frame (2013).

Recommendations for Further Study

A replication of this study should be considered including administrative leadership. A comparison between results of such a study to this one could provide additional insight and further define the leadership orientation preferences for school leaders in the state.

Secondly, a study of teacher orientation frame preferences could add value to research by determining leadership orientation preferences. This study would then inform school leaders what and how professional development may become more impactful on student achievement results.

As this was the first study of leadership orientation frame preferences of school boards in Mississippi, it is suggested that future research continue to expand upon this study to include a larger sample of school board members, to investigate possible differences that may exist regionally, by years of experience, and socio economic status of participants and districts served.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Acker-Hocevar, M., & Ivory, G., (2007). *Successful school board leadership: Lessons from superintendents*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Anne L. Bryant & Michael A. Resnick. (2010, March). School boards we need: Why american education needs them. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(6), 11 - 14.
- Bartusek, L. (2000). School boards and student achievement. *Iowa school board compass*, V(2), 2-12. Retrieved from <http://www.iasb.org/uploadedFiles/IASB/Publications/Newsletters/Compass/Light2.pdf>
- Bolman, L. G., Deal, T. E. (1984). *Modern approaches to understanding and managing organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bolman, L. G., Deal, T. E. (1992a). Images of leadership. *American School Board Journal*, 192, 36-38.
- Bolman, L. G., Deal, T. E. (1992b). Reframing leadership: The effects of leaders' images of leadership. In Clark, K. E., Clard, M. B., and Campbell, D. (Eds.). *Impact of Leadership* (pp. 269-280). Greensboro, NC: Center for Creative Leadership
- Bolman, L. G., Deal, T. E. (2003). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. (3rd ed). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Bolman, L. G., Deal, T. E. (2008). *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice, and leadership*. (4th ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Bolman, L., G., & Deal, E., D., (2013). *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice & Leadership* (5th ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey - Bass.
- Black, S. (2007, Septemeber). Leadership & Learning. *American School Board Journal*, 56 - 59.
- Burgett, J. (2013). *The Art of School Boarding*. Novato, CA: Education Communication Unlimited.
- Campbell, D. W. (2010, April). Your leadership partners. *American School Board Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.asbj.com/MainMenuCategory/Archive/2010/April/Your-Leadership-Partners.html>
- Cassel, J., & Holt, T., (2008, October). The servant leader. *American School Board Journal*, 34 - 35.
- Coleman, P., & LaRocque, L., (2012). Characteristics of an effective school board [Blog] retrieved on August 12, 2013 from <http://uneduacion.blogspot.com/2012/07/characteristics-of-effective-school.html>

- Corcoran, T., & Goertz, M., (2005). The governance of public education. S. Fuhrman & M. Lazerson (Eds.), *The Public Schools* (25 – 51). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Cote, Anna-Marie Bastoni (1999) Leadership orientation frames of Florida elementary principals in relationship to school context and principal characteristics. Ed.D. dissertation, University of Florida, United States -- Florida. Retrieved February 1, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses @ University of Florida - FCLA database. (Publication No. AAT 9956561).
- Dailey, D. Fleischman, S., Gil, L., Holtzman, D., O’Day, J., Vosmer, C. (2005). Toward More Effective School Districts: A Review of the Knowledge Base. *American Institutes for Research (AIR)*. Retrieved on June 18, 2013 from <http://www.ped.state.nm.us/div/psb/dl10/AIR%20Toward%20more%20effective%20school%20districts.pdf>
- Danzberger, & Usdan, (1994). Local education governance: Perspectives on problems and strategies for change. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75(5), doi: 00317217, 1994010.
- Dervarics, C., & O'Brien, E. Center for public education , (2011). *Eight characteristics of effective school boards*. Retrieved on May 14, 2013 from <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/Main-Menu/Public-education/Eight-characteristics-of-effective-school-boards/Eight-characteristics-of-effective-school-boards.html>
- Dillon, N., & Kathleen Vail, K., (2005, September). 8 districts to watch: Across America, school districts large and small are making great strides as they grapple with tough issues. *American School Board Journal*, 22 - 25.
- Eadie, D. (2003, July). High impact governing. *American School Board Journal*, 26 - 29.
- Eadie, D. (2005). *Five Habits of High Impact School Boards*. Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Eadie, D. (2008, July). The Board-Superintendent Rx. *American School Board Journal*, 44 - 45.
- Eadie, D. (2009, March). The Cultured Club. *American School Board Journal*, 42 - 43.
- Eadie, D. (2013, January). Large - Scale Innovation. *American School Board Journal*, 26 - 27.
- Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. (2011, September 19). Issues A-Z: No Child Left Behind. Education Week. Retrieved Month Day, Year from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/issues/no-child-left-behind>

- Education Week: Quality Counts Report: Mississippi State Highlights 2014*. Bethesda, MD: Education Week. Retrieved April 24, 2014, from <http://www.edweek.org/media/ew/qc/2014/shr/16shr.ms.h33.pdf>
- Elmore, R. F. (2002). *Bridging the Gap Between Standards & Achievement*. Washington, DC: The Albert Shanker Institute.
- Emery, K. (2007). Corporate control of public school goals: High-stakes testing in its historical perspective. *Teacher education quarterly*, 34(20), 25-44. Retrieved on September 26, 2013 from http://www.teqjournal.org/Back_Issues/Volume_34/VOL34_PDFS/34_2/08emery-34_2.pdf
- Epstein, J. L. (2009). *School, Family, and Community Partnerships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Farmer, R. (2003). *Effective superintendents, effective boards: Finding the right fit*. Retrieved on January 15, 2014 from Education Writers Association website: <http://www.ewa.org/docs/leadership.pdf>
- Ford, F., & Uebbing, S., (2011). *The life cycle of leadership: Surviving and thriving in today's schools*. Oxford, OH: Learning Forward.
- Fullan, M. & Hargreaves, A., (2012) *Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press
- Gallup, A., M., & Rose, L.C., (2005). The 37th Annual Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup Poll Of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 41-57.
- Gemberling, K., W., Smith, C., W., & Villani, J., S., (2009). *The Key Work of School Boards Guidebook*. Alexandria, VA: National School Board Association.
- Glass, T. E. (2005, October). Management Matters. *American School Board Journal*, 34 - 39.
- Glickman, C. D. (1997). *Revolutionizing America's Schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey - Bass.
- Goens, C. A. (2009, March). Evaluating the Superintendent. *American School Board Journal*, 24 - 26.
- Gold, E., Henig, J., R., & Simon, E., (2011). Calling the Shots in Public Education: Parents, Politicians, and Educators Clash. *Dissent*, 34 - 40.
- Good, H. (2007, April). Leader of the Pack. *American School Board Journal*, 50 -51.
- Hall, P. & Hart, J.D. (1990). *Bootstrap Test for Difference Between Means in Nonparametric Regression*. Journal of American Statistical Association.

- Hamilton, L. (2008). *The Secrets of School Board Success: Practical Tips for Board Members*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education .
- Hanushek, Eric A., Link, S., Woessmann , L. (2013). Does School Autonomy Make Sense Everywhere? Panel Estimates from PISA. *Journal of Development Economics*, 212 – 232.
- Hanushek, Eric A. (2012). Education quality and economic growth. *The 4 percent solution: Unleashing the economic growth America needs*. New York: Crown Business, 227 – 239.
- Heifetz, R.A., & Linsky, M., (2002) *Leadership on the Line*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press
- Harris, S., & Hopson, M., (2011, February). Lessons Learned. *American School Board Journal*, 24 - 25.
- Hess, F.M., and Olivia Meeks, O., (2010). *School Board Circa 2010: Governance in the Accountability Era*. The Wallace Foundation. Alexandria: The National School Boards Association, the Thomas B. Fordham Institute & the Iowa School Boards Foundation.
- Houston, P. (2001). Superintendents for the 21st century: It's not just a job, it's a calling. *Kappan Professional Journal* (82)428-433.
- Iannaccone, L., & Lutz, F., (1994, Sep - Dec). The Crucible of Democracy: The Local Arena. *Journal of Education Policy*, 9, 39 - 52.
- Jacobsen, R., Rothstein, R., & Wilder, T., (2009). From Accreditation to Accountability. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 624 - 629.
- Land, D. (2002). The board role and effectiveness in relation to students' academic achievement. *Local school board under review*, (56).
- Landry, C.L. (2010). *Leadership Frame Preferences of Elected and Appointed School Districts in Alabama, Florida, and Mississippi*. ProQuest. UMI publishing 3400275
- Larson, D., & Rader, R., (2006, May). Working Together. *American School Board Journal*, 30 - 33.
- Lawrence, M. S. (1989). *Characteristics of boards of education that govern nationally recognized successful secondary schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Lister, G. (2006). A pocket guide to board service. *American School Board Journal*, 48 - 51.

- Leithwood, K., A., & Riehl, C., (2003). *What We Know About Successful School Leadership*. National College for School Leadership.
- Maeroff, G. I. (2010). School boards in America flawed, but still significant. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(6), 31. Retrieved on November 6, 2013 from http://www.pdkmembers.org/members_online/members/orders.asp?action=results&t=A&desc=School Boards in America Flawed, But Still Significant
- Mandated Training for School Board Members (2012). Retrieved December 12, 2013 from <http://www.nsba.org/resource-library/board-leadership?page=1>
- Manley, R. J. (2005, September). Evaluation: A Tune - Up Toolkit for Board Members. *American School Board Journal*, 64 - 65.
- Marino, J. (2011, July). A Study of School Boards and Their Implementation of Continuous Improvement Practices. *The Journal for Quality & Participation*, 27 - 30.
- Marzano, R. J., McNulty, B., A., & Waters, T., (2005). *School leadership that works: From research to results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Meyer, R., E., (2011). *How Not to be a Terrible School Board Member: Lessons for School Administrators and Board Members*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press
- McAdams, D. (2002). Strengthening Urban Boards. *The American School Board Journal*, 1 - 3.
- McClelland, S. S., & McQueen, D., (2010, April). Developing Leaders. *American School Board Journal*, 38 - 39.
- Mississippi District and School Information (2014). Retrieved June 1, 2013 from www.mde.k12.ms.us/map?ShowList=1
- Mississippi History Timeline (2014). Retrieved April 24, 2013, from 1
- Mississippi School Boards Association (2013). Retrieved June 1, 2103 from <http://www.msbaonline.org/AboutMSBA/tabid/387/Default.aspx>
- Mississippi Uniform School Law, Miss. Code Ann. § 37-6-7 (1972).
- Mizell, H. (2010, March). School Boards Should Focus on Learning for All. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(6), 20 - 23.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (2013). Retrieved November 10, 2013 from http://nationsreportcard.gov/reading_math_2013/#/

- Palandra, M. (2010, April - June). The role of instructional supervision in district - wide reform. *International Journal of Leadership in Education* , 13(2), 221 - 234 .
- Pickett, D. (2012, February). Becoming Stronger Board Members. *American School Board Journal*, 30 - 31.
- Poniatowski, D. (2006). The relationship of student achievement to principals' self-reported use of the four frame theory (Doctoral dissertation, University of Central Florida, 2006). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 67(09).
- Public Education Leadership Project at Harvard University*. (2012, April 14). Retrieved from Harvard University: <http://pelp.fas.harvard.edu/book/our-origins>
- Quinby, Lee (2012). Time for a New Look at Board Leadership. *Independent School*, pp. 88-91
- Reeves, D. B. (2011). Changing the System. *American School Board Journal*, 38 - 39.
- Reimer, L. (2008). *Leadership and School Boards*. Lanham, MA: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Resnick, M. (2000). *Communitites count: A school board guide to public engagement*. (pp. 1-20). Alexandria, VA: National School Board Association. Retrieved on February 13, 2014 from <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/Libraries/Document-Library/School-Boards-and-the-Power-of-the-Public.pdf>
- Riehl, C., & Leithwood, K. (2003). *What we know about successful school leadership*. Informally published manuscript, University of North Carolina, University of North Carolina, Greensboro, NC.
- Roddy, T. (2010). Frame Analysis of the Self-Perceived Leadership Orientations of Headmasters of the Independent Schools Association of the Southwest, Southern Association of Independent Schools, and the Association of Independent Schools of Greater Washington Member Schools. Retrieved from <http://scholarworks.uno.edu/td/1217>
- Rothstein R., Jacobsen R., Wilder T. (2009). Measuring results: From accreditation to accountability. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 90(9), 624-629. Retrieved on March 13, 2013 from http://www.pdkmembers.org/members_online/members/orders.asp?action=results&t=A&desc=Measuring
- Salkind, N.,J., (2006). *Statistics for People Who (Think They) Hate Statistics*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications
- Santoyo, P. B. (2010). *Driven by Data*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey - Bass.

- Senge, P. M. (2012). *Schools That Learn: A Fifth Discipline Fieldbook for Educators, Parents, and Everyone Who Cares About Education*. New York, NY: Crown Publishing Group.
- Sell, S. (2006). Running an effective school district: School boards in the 21st century. *The Journal of Education* , 186(3), 71-97.
- Sheehan, B. A. (2013, May 7). Educational Ecosystems: Identifying the Next Generation of Superintendents . *American School Board Journal*, 1-3.
- Smoley, E. (1999). *Effective school boards strategies for improving board performance*. New York, NY: Jossey-Bass Inc. Retrieved from <http://nancylynn.net/Harvard Graphics - Board.pdf>
- Sparks, Dennis (2007). *Leading for Results: Transforming Teaching, Learning and Relationships in Schools*. Corwin Press. Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Stone, C., (2005). Civic Capacity: What, Why, and From Whence. S. Fuhrman & M. Lazerson (Eds.), *The Public Schools* (25 – 51). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Stover, D. (2010). Turning It Around. *American School Board Journal*, 20 – k25.
- Stover, D. (2011, February). Walking the Line. *American School Board Journal*, 17 -20 .
- Stover, D. (Nov/Dec, 2013). Doing What Needs to Be Done. *American School Board Journal*, 20 - 21.
- Stover, D. (Nov 2008). Reform School. *American School Board Journal*, 15 – 18.
- Stover, D., The Work of School Boards (2011). Retrieved January 18, 2014 from <http://www.asbj.com/MainMenuCategory/Archive/2011/June/The-Work-of-School-Boards.html>
- Thomas, A. & Wohlstetter, P. (2010, May). Six keys to success: Districts attempting urban reforms can learn from strategies that work. *American School Board Journal*. Alexandria, VA: National School Boards Association, 197(5), 36-38.
- Thomas, K. (2002). *Perceptions regarding leadership orientations of local school board* . (Doctoral dissertation).
- Thompson, J. (1994). Systemic education reform. *ERIC*, 90, doi: ED370178
- Usdan, M. (2001). Restructuring school district leadership. *Leadership for student learning*, doi: ISBN 0-937846-18-X

- Usdan, M. D. (2005, April). A Story of School Governance: Conflicts in San Diego hold important lessons for school boards elsewhere. *American School Board Journal*, 32 - 36.
- Wadsworth, D. (2003, September). Conversations Along the Road: Eight educators comment on Deborah Meier's prescription for rebuilding public trust in education. *American School Board Journal*, 22.
- Ward, M. (2007, March). Practicioners & Practice. *American School Board Journal*, 26 - 29.
- Webb, H. V. (1977, December). School Boards and the Curriculum: A Case of Accountability. *Education Leadership*, 177 - 182.
- Weber, P. (2007, March). What I Wish I Had Known. *American School Board Journal*, 33 - 35.
- Weiss, E. (2013, April). The gap between school reform rhetoric and reality in 3 cities. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com>

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: LETTER OF RECRUITMENT AND IRB CONSENT

Patrick L. Washington
Email: plwashi1@go.olemiss.edu

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am University of Mississippi student working to fulfill the requirements for a doctoral degree in Education, Curriculum & Instruction. I am conducting a research investigation of School Boards in Mississippi to determine to leadership orientation frame preferences (as developed by Bolman & Deal, 2013).

As a former Superintendent of Schools and partner with the Mississippi School Board Association, I recognize the tremendous sacrifice, service, and leadership that you provide for your district. This research will provide Mississippi school board members with valuable information that can be used to inform future work sessions, strategic plans, and hopefully prompt discussions about how school boards can best leverage individual talents to accomplish positive results for school districts. All data will be made available to participating school districts upon completion of the study. Each participating board member will receive a link via email to complete the survey. Hard copies will also be mailed to each participating board member. The survey is anonymous and takes approximately ten minutes to complete. You may contact me if you have any additional questions or concerns.

IRB Approval

This study has been reviewed by The University of Mississippi's Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding your rights as a participant of research, please contact the IRB at [\(662\) 915-7482](tel:662-915-7482) or irb@olemiss.edu.

With Gratitude,

Patrick Washington

APPENDIX B: PERMISSION LETTERS

Patrick L. Washington
Email: plwashi@go.olemiss.edu

Dear Dr. Lee Bolman,

I am University of Mississippi (Ole Miss) student working to fulfill the requirements for a doctoral degree in Education, Curriculum & Instruction. I am conducting a research investigation of School Boards in Mississippi to determine leadership orientation frame preferences (as developed by Bolman & Deal). As a former superintendent, one of my most difficult challenges was executing a plan with the board that focused on building our collective capacity to lead the district forward. This experience prompted my interest in your research and influenced my decision to conduct this study. I am confident that this study will be beneficial for school boards throughout the state.

The purpose of this letter is to secure your permission to use the Leadership Orientation Self-Survey developed by you and Dr. Deal. The results of this research could have implications for school boards throughout the country and be instrumental in developing new policies as it relates to the school board selection process and school board governance.

I will provide you and Dr. Deal with a copy of the results of this study, including any papers or publications that are based in whole or in part on the survey.

Thank you in advance for your consideration of this request and I am looking forward to your response.

With Gratitude,

Patrick Washington

Patrick L. Washington
Email: plwashi@go.olemiss.edu

Dear Dr. Michael Waldrop,

I am University of Mississippi Student working to fulfill the requirements for a doctoral degree in Education, Curriculum & Instruction. I am conducting a research investigation of School Boards in Mississippi to determine to leadership orientation frame preferences (as developed by Bolman & Deal).

The purpose of this communication is to inform you of this study with hopes that you may have some additional insight in terms of how I might increase school board participation in this study. As a former partner with the Mississippi School Board Association, I value the leadership and efforts of the organization to continue to improve the quality of education in Mississippi by building school board capacity. This study will provided data to inform the MSBA's planning and creation of training modules that will support your efforts to improve Mississippi public schools.

With Gratitude,

Patrick Washington

APPENDIX C: LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION SELF-SURVEYS

Leadership Orientation Frame Preferences Self-Survey
Section I

Directions: Choose the response that best describes you.

1. Think very clearly and logically.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

2. Show high levels of support and concern for others.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

3. Have exceptional ability to mobilize people and resources to get things done.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

4. Inspire others to do their best.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

5. Strongly emphasize careful planning and clear time lines.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

6. Build trust through open and collaborative relationships.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often

- Always

7. Am a very skillful and shrewd negotiator.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

8. Am highly charismatic.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

9. Approach problems through logical analysis and careful thinking.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

10. Show high sensitivity and concern for others' needs and feelings.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

11. Am unusually persuasive and influential.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

12. Am able to be an inspiration to others.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

13. Develop and implement clear, logical policies and procedures.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

14. Foster high levels of participation and involvement in decisions.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

15. Anticipate and deal adroitly with organizational conflict.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

16. Am highly imaginative and creative.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

17. Approach problems with facts and logic.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

18. Am consistently helpful and responsive to others.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

19. Am very effective in getting support from people with influence and power.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

20. Communicate a strong and challenging sense of vision and mission.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

21. Set specific, measurable goals and hold people accountable for results.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

22. Listen well and am unusually receptive to other people's ideas and input.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

23. Am politically very sensitive and skillful.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

24. See beyond current realities to generate exciting new opportunities.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

25. Have extraordinary attention to detail.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

26. Give personal recognition for work well done.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

27. Develop alliances to build a strong base of support.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

28. Generate loyalty and enthusiasm.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

29. Strongly believe in clear structure and chain of command.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

30. Am a highly participative manager.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

31. Succeed in the face of conflict and opposition.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

32. Serve as an influential model of organizational aspirations and values.

- Never
- Occasionally
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

Leadership Orientation Frame Preferences Self-Survey
Section II

Directions: Choose the response that best describes you.

1. My strongest skills are:

- Analytic skills
- Interpersonal skills
- Political skills
- Ability to excite and motivate

2. The best way to describe me is:

- Technical expert
- Good listener
- Skilled negotiator
- Inspirational leader

3. What has helped me the most to be successful is my ability to:

- Make good decisions
- Coach and develop people
- Build strong alliances and a power base
- Energize and inspire others

4. What people are most likely to notice about me is my:

- Attention to detail
- Concern for people
- Ability to succeed, in the face of conflict and opposition
- Charisma

5. My most important leadership trait is:

- Clear, logical thinking
- Caring and support for others
- Toughness and aggressiveness
- Imagination and creativity

6. I am best described as:

- An analyst
- A humanist
- A politician
- A visionary

Leadership Orientation Frame Preferences Self-Survey
Section III

Directions: Choose the response that best describes you.

1. Overall effectiveness as a manager.

- Bottom 20%
- Middle 20%
- Top 20%

2. Overall effectiveness as a leader.

- Bottom 20%
- Middle 20%
- Top 20%

Leadership Orientation Frame Preferences Self-Survey
Section IV

Directions: Choose the response that best describes you.

1. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

2. What is your age?

- 24 or younger
- 25 – 34
- 35 – 44
- 45 – 54
- 55 or older

3. What is your ethnicity?

- American Indian or Alaskan Native
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Black or African American
- Hispanic or Latino
- White/Caucasian
- Other

4. What is the highest level of school you have completed or the highest degree you have received?

- High school degree or equivalent (e.g., GED)
- Two years of College
- Bachelors degree
- Masters
- Specialist
- Doctorate

5. Method of Selection to the Board:

- Appointed
- Elected

APPENDIX D: 2012 – 2013 MISSISSIPPI QDI DESCRIPTION

MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
MISSISSIPPI PUBLIC SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY STANDARDS, 2012

PERFORMANCE STANDARDS

INTRODUCTION

The accountability system is designed to improve student achievement and increase the level of accountability for both school districts and individual schools. The accountability model focuses on student achievement at each school and at the district level. Performance standards have been established, and student assessment data from the statewide assessment program will be used to determine individual school performance classifications and district level performance classifications.

SCHOOL LEVEL PERFORMANCE CLASSIFICATION

Information concerning school performance is reported to the Commission on an annual basis, and annual performance classifications will be assigned in the fall of each school year. Each public school that has both achievement and growth data will be assigned an annual performance classification. Available assessment data will be reported for those schools that do not have both achievement and growth data, but a school performance classification will not be assigned. An alternative school will not be assigned a school performance classification. (See State Board Policy 901 and 902 and the Glossary page 77 for definition of alternative school.)

The results from the Achievement Model and the Growth Model (QDI) are combined to assign each school a school performance classification. A graduation rate or a High School Completion Index (HSCI) is also used for any school configuration of 9-12.

DISTRICT LEVEL PERFORMANCE CLASSIFICATION

Information concerning district performance is reported to the Commission on an annual basis, and annual performance classifications will be assigned in the fall of each school year. Each public school district will be assigned an annual performance classification based on achievement, growth and graduation/dropout rate. The district rating should be based on the performance of all students in the district (i.e., the district will be treated as one K-12 school).

ANALYSIS OF STATE LAW {MS Code 37-18-1 et. seq.}

The following specifications for establishing school and district performance standards and accountability requirements are addressed in Sections 37-18-1 through 7 of the *Mississippi Code of 1972, Annotated*.

The State Board of Education (SBE) shall establish, design, and implement a program for identifying and rewarding public schools that improve. Upon full implementation of the statewide testing program, Star School, High Performing, or School At-Risk designation shall be made by the SBE as follows:

1. **Growth Expectation.** A growth expectation will be established by testing students annually and, using a psychometrically approved formula, by tracking their progress. This growth expectation will result in a composite score each year for each school.

2. **Percentage of Students Minimal, Basic, Proficient and Advanced in each school and school district.** A determination will be made as to the percentage of students minimal, basic, proficient and advanced in each school. The definition of minimal, basic, proficient and advanced shall be developed for each grade, based on a demonstrated range of performance in relation to content as reflected in the *Mississippi Curriculum Frameworks*. This range of performance must be established through a formal procedure including educators, parents, community leaders, and other stakeholders.

A school shall be identified as a School At-Risk and in need of assistance if the school:

- (a) Does not meet its growth expectation and it has a percentage of students functioning below grade level, as designated by the State Board of Education;
- (b) Is designated as a Failing School; or
- (c) Is designated as Low Performing or At-Risk of Failing for two (2) consecutive years.

STATE ACCOUNTABILITY RATING SYSTEM

Quality of
Distribution
Index (QD)

200-300

High Performing (B)	Star School (A)
---------------------	-----------------

200

166-199

Successful (C)	High Performing (B)
Successful (C)	Successful (C)

166

133-165

Academic Watch (D)	Successful (C)
--------------------	----------------

133

100-132

Low Performing (F)	Academic Watch (D)
--------------------	--------------------

100

0-99

Failing (F)	At-Risk of Failing (F)
-------------	------------------------

Inadequate Academic Gain

Appropriate Academic Gain

PERFORMANCE CLASSIFICATIONS OF ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH

The School and District Performance classification is based on the Quality of Distribution Index (QDI) achieved by the school or district. The QDI measures the distribution of student performance on state assessments around the cut points for Basic, Proficient, and Advanced performance.

The state assessments included in the state accountability system are the Mississippi Curriculum Test, Second Edition (MCT2) Grades 3-8 Language Arts and Math; Subject Area Testing Program, Second Edition (SATP2) which includes Algebra I, Biology I, English II-Multiple Choice, and U.S. History; Mississippi Science Test (MST) Grades 5 and 8; and Alternate Assessment (MAAECF) Language Arts, Math, and Science Grades 5, 8, and 12.

In accordance with State Board of Education Policy 404, the first operational year of any state mandated assessment that is a part of the accountability model will not be included in the Statewide Accountability System.

Note: The Mississippi Science Test (MST) Grades 5 and 8 and the Alternate Assessment (MAAECF) for Science Grades 5, 8, and 12 will be included in the state accountability system beginning school year 2012-2013.

THE PERFORMANCE CLASSIFICATION MODEL FOR 2009-2011

Cut points on QDI	Inadequate Academic Gains	Appropriate Academic Gains
200-300	High Performing	Star School
166-199	Successful	High Performing
133-165	Academic Watch	Successful
100-132	Low Performing	Academic Watch
0-99	Failing	At-Risk of Failing

THE PERFORMANCE CLASSIFICATION MODEL FOR 2012 AND THEREAFTER

SB 2776 2012 Legislative Session

Cut points on QDI	Inadequate Academic Gains	Appropriate Academic Gains
200-300	High Performing (B)	Star (A)
166-199	Successful (C)	High Performing (B)
133-165	Academic Watch (D)	Successful (C)
100-132	Low Performing (F)	Academic Watch (D)
0-99	Failing (F)	At-Risk of Failing (F)

QUALITY OF DISTRIBUTION INDEX (QDI)

1. The Quality of Distribution Index (QDI) should be used to measure achievement. The QDI measures the distribution of student performance on state assessments around the cut points for Basic, Proficient, and Advanced performance. The formula for the QDI is

$$\text{QDI} = \% \text{ Basic} + (2 \times \% \text{ Proficient}) + (3 \times \% \text{ Advanced})$$

2. The performance levels of the QDI should be phased in over five years.
- The highest performance level should have an eventual QDI cut score of approximately 240, which should reflect performance comparable to high performing schools nationally.
 - Performance at a national average level should be linked to a QDI in the second highest performance level initially. The model should become increasingly challenging such that national average level performance is linked to a QDI at the third or middle performance level.
 - The Quality of Distribution Index (QDI) value defining the lowest school/district performance level should be 100.

Cut Score Range	Year				
	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Top Range	200-300	200-300	200-300	200-300	TBD
	166-199	166-199	166-199	166-199	TBD
	133-165	133-165	133-165	133-165	TBD
	100-132	100-132	100-132	100-132	TBD
Bottom Range	Below 100	Below 100	Below 100	Below 100	TBD

ALGEBRA I AND BIOLOGY I

Algebra I and Biology I scores will be combined across middle/junior high school, 9th grade school, and the corresponding high school. That is, the Algebra I and Biology I results for calculating the QDI will be based on the performance of all students in middle/junior high school, 9th grade school, and the corresponding high school in a given year, and both the middle/junior high school, 9th grade school, and corresponding high school will receive the same QDI for Algebra I and Biology I. Including the performance at both levels will encourage middle schools, 9th grade schools, and high schools to work together to support students taking Algebra I and Biology I when they are ready for the course. A student will contribute equally to the accountability based on their performance level (Minimal, Basic, Proficient, or Advanced) on the assessment regardless of the grade level at which the assessment is first taken.

GRADUATION/DROPOUT COMPONENT

The High School Completion Index (HSCI) should be included in determining the accountability rating of schools with grades 9-12 and districts and a school or district should demonstrate high performance on the HSCI to receive the highest rating in addition to meeting QDI performance and growth. Districts with schools where 9th grade is contained separate from 10-12 grades will be issued a HSCI value based on the students who actually attended the school containing 9th grade and the 1012 grade school will be issued a HSCI value based on the students who actually attended the school containing grades 10-12. The High School Completion Index (HSCI) should be based on the status of students five years after first entering ninth grade. Eventually the HSCI should be based on the status of students seven years after first entering seventh grade. The weights for the HSCI student statuses:

Standard Diploma	300
Met Requirements Except Graduation Test	150
Occupational Diploma	175
Certificate of Attendance	150
GED	200
Still Enrolled	50
Dropout	-300

There will initially be two levels for the HSCI corresponding to the two highest levels of performance on the QDI. The Department of Education should monitor the reporting of this information. The Commission will consider revising or adding levels to the graduation/dropout component in the future.

- a. The highest level of the HSCI should be a HSCI of 230 or a graduation rate of 80% or higher.
- b. The second highest level of the HSCI should be an HSCI of 200 or a graduation rate of 75%.

Note: The Graduation/Dropout Component of the Mississippi Statewide Accountability System will be calculated and reported; however, Districts and Schools will be held harmless for the Graduation/Dropout Component for the 2012 Accountability Results only.

THE ACHIEVEMENT MODEL

A school's achievement level is based on the current year performance of students who were enrolled in the school for a full academic year (at least 70% of instructional time). The Quality of Distribution Index (QDI) should be used to measure achievement. The QDI measures the distribution of student performance on state assessments around the cut points for Basic, Proficient, and Advanced performance.

The formula for the QDI is

$$\text{QDI} = \% \text{ Basic} + (2 \times \% \text{ Proficient}) + (3 \times \% \text{ Advanced})$$

THE GROWTH MODEL

A multiple regression model is used to predict scale score growth on the Mississippi Curriculum Test (MCT2) and scale score on certain Subject Area Tests (SATP) for each student based on the student's earlier MCT2 performance. Predictions are made only for students who were enrolled in the school for a full academic year. There are separate prediction equations for each grade level in each content area and each subject area test.

The "met" growth determines the degree to which the school met its basic growth expectation. The regression equations in the pilot growth models predict performance at the student level. Although the predictions are not accurate enough for use at the student level, the positive and negative prediction errors tend to cancel each other, so average residual values for groups of students within a school or district are much more accurate. R^2 indicates the proportion of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by the prediction equation. Generally, a higher R^2 value indicates better predicting ability. The formula for R^2 is shown below.

$$R^2 = \text{SS}_{\text{Model}} / \text{SS}_{\text{Total}} \text{ where, } \text{SS}_{\text{Total}} = \text{SS}_{\text{Model}} + \text{SS}_{\text{Error}}$$

R^2 values for the MCT SS change prediction equations in the growth model used from 2003 through 2007 were similar to the new equations for predicting MCT2 and SATP scale scores.

To ensure the most accurate predictions, students included in the regression analyses must:

- Meet full academic year (FAY) at the district level for the two years used in the regression;
- Have MCT2 scores from the prior school year or grade 8 for students taking Subject Area Tests in grade 9 or later; and
- Have MCT2, Grade 8 Algebra, Grade 9 Algebra, Grade 9 Biology, Grade 10 Algebra, Grade 10 Biology, or Grade 10 English Multiple-Choice test scores from the most recent school year.

STUDENTS INCLUDED IN THE PERFORMANCE MODEL

A student is included in the achievement and growth models for a school if the student was enrolled in the school for a **full academic year**, which is defined as at least 70% (approximately) of the instructional time. The percentage of time enrolled is determined from the monthly student level enrollment records in MSIS as follows:

- End of Month 8 School = Same School on 6 of the 7 Earlier End of Month Reports (Month 1 through Month 7)
- End of Month 7 School = Same School on all 6 of the Earlier End of Month Reports (Month 1 through Month 6)

INCLUSION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES AND ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS (ELL)

The Mississippi Statewide Assessment System provides procedures to ensure the inclusion of all students in the assessment programs, including a wide range of testing accommodations, instructional level testing on the MCT2, and alternate assessments. The data for students using testing accommodations are treated no differently from any other test data. For students with disabilities taking instructional level tests or alternate assessments, their scores are included in the achievement model. The weighting procedures in the achievement model ensure that those students count equally within the achievement level assigned to the school.

School districts are allowed to exclude the academic achievement results only for first year English Language Learners (ELL) students (on a case-by-case basis) from determinations of state Achievement Model and Growth Model results. This policy is consistent with the requirements for calculating AYP.

SCHOOLS THAT CANNOT BE INCLUDED IN THE ACHIEVEMENT AND GROWTH MODELS

A school must be included in both the achievement and growth models in order to be assigned a School Performance Classification. Schools with no assessment data at grades 3-8 and no appropriate SATP data cannot be included in the achievement and growth models. Most of the schools that cannot be assigned a School Performance Classification are schools serving grades kindergarten and first grade and schools serving kindergarten through second grade.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (NCLB) AND THE ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM

The development of Mississippi's new statewide accountability system began in 1999. The system was designed to comply fully with the requirements in federal legislation related to Title I (ESEA 1994) and to student with disabilities (IDEA 1997). The new statewide assessment system was also designed for use within the achievement and growth models for school accountability.

The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB) was signed into law in January 2002. This federal legislation includes additional student assessment requirements and mandates that states develop and implement a single statewide accountability system by the beginning of school year 2003-2004. The legislation includes specific requirements for calculating adequate yearly progress (AYP) for schools and school districts. Mississippi's new assessment programs already incorporate many of the new federal assessment requirements. For example, students in grades 3-8 must be assessed in both reading/language arts and mathematics.

The conceptual model for Mississippi's Statewide Accountability System that incorporates the federal AYP component is illustrated on the following page. Each school district will be assigned an annual accountability designation based on its accreditation status and the AYP model. Each school will be assigned an annual accountability designation based on the School Performance Classification and AYP model.

Mississippi Statewide Accountability System: A Conceptual Framework

APPENDIX E: SELECTION OF MISSISSIPPI SCHOOL BOARDS AND
SUPERINTENDENTS

Selection of Mississippi School Board Members and Superintendents

School District	Board Members Appointed	Board Members Elected	Term Length	Superintendent Elected/Appointed
Consolidated School Districts				
Benoit		5	5 Years	Appointed
Cleveland		5	5 Years	Appointed
Coffeeville		5	5 Years	Appointed
East Jasper		5	5 Years	Appointed
East Tallahatchie		5	5 Years	Appointed
Enterprise		5	5 Years	Appointed
Hollandale		5	5 Years	Appointed
Leland		5	5 Years	Appointed
Mound Bayou		5	5 Years	Appointed
North Bolivar		5	5 Years	Appointed
North Panola		5	5 Years	Appointed
North Pike		5	5 Years	Appointed
North Tippah		5	5 Years	Appointed
Quitman		5	5 Years	Appointed
Shaw		5	5 Years	Appointed
South Delta		5	5 Years	Appointed
South Panola		5	5 Years	Appointed

School District	Board Members Appointed	Board Members Elected	Term Length	Superintendent Elected/Appointed
South Pike		5	5 Years	Appointed
South Tippah		5	5 Years	Appointed
Water Valley		5	5 Years	Appointed
West Bolivar		5	5 Years	Appointed

West Jasper		5	5 Years	Appointed
West Tallahatchie		5	5 Years	Appointed
Total		115		
Line Consolidated School Districts				
Lumberton Line		5	5 Years	Appointed
Nettleton Line		5	5 Years	Appointed
Western Line		6	5 Years	Appointed
Total		16		
County School Districts				
Alcorn		5	6 Years	Elected
Amite County		5	6 Years	Elected
Attala County		5	6 Years	Elected
Benton County		5	6 Years	Elected
Calhoun County		5	6 Years	Elected

Carroll County		5	6 Years	Elected
Chickasaw Co		5	6 Years	Elected
Choctaw County		5	6 Years	Elected
Claiborne County		5	6 Years	Elected
Clay County		5	6 Years	Elected
Coahoma County		5	6 Years	Elected
Copiah County		5	6 Years	Elected
Covington County		5	6 Years	Elected
DeSoto County		5	6 Years	Elected
Forrest County		5	6 Years	Elected
Franklin County		5	6 Years	Elected
George County		5	6 Years	Elected
Greene County		5	6 Years	Elected
Hancock County		5	6 Years	Elected
Harrison County		5	6 Years	Elected
Hinds County		5	6 Years	Appointed
Holmes County		5	6 Years	Elected
Humphreys Co		5	6 Years	Elected
Itawamba County		5	6 Years	Elected
Jackson County		5	6 Years	Elected
Jefferson County		5	6 Years	Elected
Jeff Davis County		5	6 Years	Elected
Jones County		5	6 Years	Elected

Kemper County		5	6 Years	Elected
Lafayette County		5	6 Years	Appointed
Lamar County		5	6 Years	Elected
Lauderdale Co		5	6 Years	Elected
Lawrence County		5	6 Years	Elected
Leake County		5	6 Years	Elected
Lee County		5	6 Years	Elected
Leflore County		5	6 Years	Elected
Lincoln County		5	6 Years	Elected
Lowndes County		5	6 Years	Elected
Madison County		5	6 Years	Elected
Marion County		5	6 Years	Elected
Marshall County		5	6 Years	Elected
Monroe County		5	6 Years	Elected
Montgomery Co		5	6 Years	Elected
Neshoba County		5	6 Years	Elected
Newton County		5	6 Years	Elected
Noxubee County		5	6 Years	Elected
Oktibbeha County		5	6 Years	Conservator
Pearl River Co		5	6 Years	Elected
Perry County		5	6 Years	Elected
Pontotoc County		5	6 Years	Elected
Prentiss County		5	6 Years	Elected

Quitman County		5	6 Years	Elected
Rankin County		5	6 Years	Elected
Scott County		5	6 Years	Elected
Simpson County		5	6 Years	Elected
Smith County		5	6 Years	Elected
Stone County		5	6 Years	Elected
Sunflower County		5	6 Years	Appointed
Tate County		5	6 Years	Appointed
Tunica County		5	6 Years	Elected
Union County		5	6 Years	Elected
Walthall County		5	6 Years	Elected
Wayne County		5	6 Years	Elected

Webster County		5	6 Years	Elected
Wilkinson County		5	6 Years	Elected
Yazoo County		5	6 Years	Elected
Total		330		
Municipal Separate School Districts				
Aberdeen	3	2	5 Years	Conservator
Amory	4	1	5 Years	Appointed
Baldwyn	3	2	5 Years	Appointed

Bay St. Louis- Waveland	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Biloxi	5		5 Years	Appointed
Booneville	5		5 Years	Appointed
Brookhaven	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Canton	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Clarksdale	5		5 Years	Appointed
Clinton	4	1	5 Years	Appointed
Columbia	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Columbus	5		5 Years	Appointed
Corinth	5		5 Years	Appointed
Durant	5		5 Years	Appointed
Forest	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Greenville	5		5 Years	Appointed
Greenwood	5		5 Years	Appointed
Gulfport	5		5 Years	Appointed
Hattiesburg	5		5 Years	Appointed
Hazlehurst	5		5 Years	Appointed
Holly Springs	4	1	5 Years	Appointed
Houston	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Indianola	0	0	5 Years	Conservator
Jackson	5		5 Years	Appointed
Kosciusko	3	2	5 Years	Appointed

Laurel	5		5 Years	Appointed
Long Beach	5		5 Years	Appointed
McComb	4	1	5 Years	Appointed
Meridian	5		5 Years	Appointed
Moss Point	4	1	5 Years	Appointed
New Albany	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Newton	5		5 Years	Appointed
Ocean Springs	4	1	5 Years	Appointed
Okolona	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Oxford	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Pascagoula	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Pass Christian	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Pearl	4	1	5 Years	Appointed
Petal	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Philadelphia	5		5 Years	Appointed
Picayune	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Pontotoc	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Poplarville	5		5 Years	Appointed
Richton	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Senatobia	4	1	5 Years	Appointed
Starkville	4	1	5 Years	Appointed
Tupelo	5		5 Years	Appointed
Union	5		5 Years	Appointed

West Point	3	2	5 Years	Appointed
Winona	5		5 Years	Appointed
Yazoo City	5		5 Years	Appointed
Total	205	50		
Special Municipal School Districts				
Louisville		5	5 Years	Appointed
Grenada		5	5 Years	Appointed
Natchez-Adams	5		5 Years	Appointed
Tishomingo County		5	5 Years	Appointed
Vicksburg Warren		5	5 Years	Appointed
Total	5	20		
AHS School Districts				
Coahoma Co. AHS	11	3		CC President
Forest County AHS	5	1	4 Years	Appointed
Hinds Co. AHS	5	1		CC President
Total	21	5		

APPENDIX F: SELECTION OF SCHOOL BOARDS BY STATE

Selection of Local School Boards June 2009 Updated by NSBA				
	How local board members		How election dates are determined	When elections are held
State	Elected	Some appointed	Local, state, or both	
Alabama		X	Both	County elections Nov. each year. City elections Aug. (with some exceptions).
Alaska	X			1st Tues. of Oct. each year.
Arizona	X		State	Nov. general election day.
Arkansas	X		State	3rd Tues. of Sept. each year, with run-off elections three weeks later.
California		X	Both	Usually Nov. of either odd- or even-numbered years, as determined by local county board of supervisors, with general elections. Others held with primaries for city council or mayor in June, or on their own in April.
Colorado	X		State	1st Tues. after 1st Monday in Nov. of odd-numbered years.

Connecticut		X	Locally	Almost all on Nov. general election day, with some exceptions held in odd-numbered years and 12 held in May.
Delaware		X	State	2nd Tues. in May.
District of Columbia	Direct mayoral control instead of local school board.		State	
Florida	X		State	1st Tues. after 1st Mon. in Nov. of even-numbered years. Primary, if necessary, on Tues. 10 weeks prior to general election.
Georgia	X		Locally	During general elections and special elections.
Hawaii	X		State	Nominated in nonpartisan Sept. primary and elected in nonpartisan general election in even-numbered years.
Idaho	X		State	3rd Tues. in May of odd-numbered years.
Illinois	X		State	1st Tues. in April in odd-numbered years.
Indiana		X	Both	204 (70.3%) in May; 82 (28.3%) in

				Nov.; 4 (1.4%) on other dates.
Iowa	X		State	2nd Tues. in Sept. of odd-numbered years.
Kansas		X	State	1st Tues. in April of odd-numbered years
Kentucky	X		State	Nov. of even-numbered years. No more than three members up for election in any given year.
Louisiana	X		State	Oct. every four years. Next elections to be held 2010.
Maine	X		Locally	Throughout year, most commonly Mar., June, Nov.
Maryland		X	State	1st Tues. in Nov. of even-numbered years. Others appointed in July.
Massachusetts		X	Both	Cities in Nov. of odd-numbered years. Towns vary by town meeting dates, usually Mar.-June.
Michigan		X	Both	Mostly May, although more districts are shifting to Nov.
Minnesota		X	Both	Districts choose Nov. election day in either

				odd- or even-numbered years.
Mississippi		X	State	Nov.
Missouri	X		State	1st Tues. in Apr.
Montana	X		State	1st Tues. after the 1st Mon. in May.
Nebraska	X		Both	Except for largest districts, 1st Tues. after 1st Mon. of Nov. of even-numbered years.
Nevada	X		State	1st Tues. after 1st Mon. of Nov. in even-numbered years.
New Hampshire	X		Both	10 cities in Nov. with other city elections. Others between Mar. 1-25, unless district operates under official ballot referenda system splitting town meeting into a deliberative and a voting session, in which case voting session can be 2nd Tues. in Mar., 2nd Tues. in Apr., or 2nd Tues. in May.
New Jersey	X		State	3rd week in Apr.

New Mexico	X		State	1st Tues. in Feb. of odd-numbered years.
New York		X	State	Default date is 3rd Tues. in May, unless that date poses religious conflict, in which case 2nd Tues. in May. By law, the Albany City School District in general election on 1st Tues. in Nov. of even-numbered years, and Rochester, New York City, Yonkers, Syracuse, Rochester and Buffalo at different specified dates and times.
North Carolina		X	Both	With May primary or Nov. general elections.
North Dakota	X		Both	Board can schedule election between Apr. 1 and June 30, unless election held with city elections on 2nd Tues. in June in even-numbered years. Most are held 2nd Tues. in June, some

				every year, some in even-numbered years only.
Ohio		X	State	Nov. of odd-numbered years.
Oklahoma	X		State	1st Tues. in Feb.
Oregon	X		State	During statewide primary elections in May.
Pennsylvania		X	State	Nov. of odd-numbered years
Rhode Island				Primary election in May and general election in November of even-numbered years.
South Carolina		X	Locally	Mostly Nov., but some in other months, including Feb. March, May, June, and Sept.
South Dakota	X		Both	Between April and June every year. Usually 3rd Tues. in June; often in April in cities.
Tennessee		X	Both	County school systems: 4th Thurs. of Aug. in even-numbered years. City and special school systems: Varies by system.
Texas	X		Both	Elections held jointly with a

				city held on either May or Nov. date. Elections held jointly with a county must be held on Nov. date in even-numbered years.
Utah	X		State	June primary election and Nov. general election
Vermont	X		State	Town meeting day, 1st Tues. in March.
Virginia		X	State	May and Nov.
Washington	X		State	1st Tues. after 1st Mon. in Nov. in odd-numbered years. Primary election, if necessary, 3rd Tues. in Aug.
West Virginia	X		State	2nd Tues. in May of even-numbered years.
Wisconsin	X		State	1st Tues. in April every year.
Wyoming	X		State	

APPENDIX G: STATE REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCAL SCHOOL BOARDS

**State Requirements for Local School Board Service
September 2007**

Current mandated requirements a person must meet to be elected or appointed to a local school board:

State	Resident of the school district	High school diploma or GED	Minimum age	Minimum age defined
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona	X			
Arkansas	X			
California	X		X	18; legal voting age
Colorado				
Connecticut	X		X	at least 18
Delaware	X		X	18
Florida				
Georgia	X			
Hawaii				
Idaho	X		X	18
Illinois	X		X	18
Indiana	X		X	21
Iowa	X		X	18
Kansas	X		X	18
Kentucky				
Louisiana	X		X	18
Maine				
Maryland	X		X	registered voter
Massachusetts			X	18
Michigan			X	18
Minnesota	X		X	21 at time the term begins
Mississippi	X	X	X	18
Missouri				
Montana	X		X	18
Nebraska	X		X	18
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey	X	X	X	18
New Mexico				
New York	X		X	18
North Carolina	X		X	21
North Dakota	X		X	18
Ohio	X		X	18

Oklahoma				
Oregon	X		X	18
Pennsylvania	X		X	18
Rhode Island				
South Carolina	X		X	18
South Dakota	X		X	18
Tennessee	X	X	X	18
Texas	X		X	18
Utah	X		X	18
Vermont				
Virginia	X		X	18
Washington				
West Virginia				
Wisconsin	X		X	18
Wyoming	X		X	18
Totals	34	3	30	

State Requirements for Local School Board Service September 2007	
Additional requirements mandated by states	
Arizona	Gather a specified number of petition signatures.
Arkansas	To qualify for school board membership in Arkansas, a candidate must be a bona fide resident and a qualified elector of the district (and sometimes a specific zone) he or she wants to serve.
California	As long as you are a registered voter and a legal resident of the district, you may serve on the school board. The only prohibitions are: 1. A school district employee may not serve as a member of the county board of education in the county in which they are employed. 2. The school district cannot hire a relative of a sitting school board member. If, however, a relative of a district employee is elected to the board, they may not participate in any action that would affect the employees status.
Delaware	Must be qualified to vote. This means they cannot have any felony convictions.
Georgia	Must have been a resident of the county from which elected for 12 months immediately preceding election. Must be a qualified voter. Must not be employed or serving on the governing board of any private educational body or institution; employed by the local board of education and be on the same board; employed by either the State Dept. of Education or the State Board of Education.
Idaho	School Board Trustees must be a qualified "elector" in the district, i.e., able to vote.
Louisiana	Each member of a city and parish school board shall receive a minimum of six hours of training and instruction in the school laws of this state, in the laws governing the powers, duties, and responsibilities of city and parish school boards, and in educational trends, research, and policy. Such instruction may be received from an institution of higher education in this state, from instruction sponsored by the State Department of Education, or by an in-service training program conducted by a city or parish school board central office or the Louisiana School Boards Association.
Maryland	Each County in Maryland that has an elected (as opposed to appointed) school board is so authorized by specific home rule legislation, and there are variations such as "must live in a specific part of the district if not running at large" in each of those pieces of legislation. Would be far more information than anyone would need or want re: Maryland's peculiarities.
Massachusetts	Get more votes than the next guy. That's all.
Michigan	Must be a registered voter in the school district where he or she is a candidate.
Minnesota	Be an eligible voter, which includes the requirement that the individual be a citizen of the US. A sex offender who has been convicted of an offense which requires registration under the Predatory Offenders Registration Act is ineligible to become a candidate for school board.
New York	Must be able to read and write; be a qualified voter of the district; cannot be judged to be incompetent; must be a resident of the district for at least

	one year; may not reside with another member of the same board as a member of the same family; may not be a current employee of the district; cannot be a convicted felon if maximum sentence has not been served; has not been removed from the same board within the past year; may not serve simultaneously in an incompatible public office.
North Carolina	A convicted felon cannot run.
Oregon	1. Not an employee of the district; 2. Resident in school district for 12 months prior to taking office; 3. An "elector" which we interpret as a registered voter.
Pennsylvania	Section 322 of Pennsylvania's Public School Code contains the following eligibility requirements for school directors: 1. Must be a citizen of Pennsylvania having "good moral character." 2. Must be at least 18 years of age. 3. Must be a resident of the school district for at least year prior to being elected or appointed. Section 322 also provides a list of incompatible offices. An individual holding one of those offices would be ineligible for the office of school director.
South Dakota	Registered voter and resident of director district, if any.
Tennessee	Citizen of TN and registered voter in county. File a petition signed by at least 25 qualified voters of the school district. Show evidence of a high school diploma or G.E.D. Once elected, board members are mandated by law to attend a two-day orientation plus one seven-hour module in their first year of service. Veteran board members are required to attend one seven-hour module annually.
Texas	Resident of US and State of Texas; registered voter; no felony convictions; not adjudged mentally incompetent.
Utah	
Vermont	Must be a legal voter in the school district; may not be an employee of school district or of any school district within same supervisory union.
Virginia	Must be a resident of the district from which he/she is elected or appointed if selection is by district.

**State Requirements for Local School Board Service
September 2007**

College education or continuing education requirements that a school board member must meet to remain on the board once appointed or elected.

Arkansas	Newly elected board members must obtain 9 hours of training within the first 15 months of their election. All other board members must obtain six hours per year.
Delaware	Only mandated financial training, developed and delivered by the Department of Education.
Georgia	In the sense that training is required. New board members must have 12 hours of training including six hours of training in school finance in the first 12 months after being elected. After that, they must have six of hours of training each year. Training plans are approved by the State Department of Education and hours are reported to them.
Louisiana	Board members have to have the 6 hours completed within the four year term of office.
Massachusetts	Eight-hour orientation on school issues to be provided by the state school boards association. There are no penalties for failure to complete the training.
Minnesota	Minn. Statute provides: "A member shall receive training in school finance and management developed in consultation with the Minnesota School Boards Association and consistent with section 127A.19. The School Boards Association must make available to each newly elected school board member training in school finance and management consistent with section 127A.19 within 180 days of that member taking office. The program shall be developed in consultation with the department and appropriate representatives of higher education." Note that this statute does not carry a penalty for noncompliance.
Mississippi	Twelve hours basic education for newly appointed or elected board members; six hours of continuing education for veteran board members.
North Carolina	Board members are required to have 12 clock hours of training annually; however, there is no penalty for failure to get the training.
North Dakota	Attend a seminar for new school board members within the first year of serving on the board. Beyond that, there are no additional requirements.
South Carolina	Six hours of mandated training for newly elected school board members in the first year of serving on the board. Training is done by SCSBA under contract with the state board of education.
Tennessee	Once elected, board members are mandated by law to attend a two-day orientation plus one seven hour module in their first year of service. Veteran board members are required to attend one seven-hour module annually.
Texas	The link below takes you to the CE requirements for Texas. In addition, one hour of training is required on the Texas Open Meetings Act. http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=19&pt=2&ch=61&rl=1
Virginia	Each school board must require its members to participate annually in high quality professional development activities at the state, local or national levels on governance, including, but not limited to personnel, curriculum, and current issues in education as part of their service on the local board.

APPENDIX H: VITA

VITA

PATRICK L. WASHINGTON

EDUCATION

Mississippi State University ▪ Starkville, MS
Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education ▪ 1997

University of Mississippi ▪ Oxford, MS
Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction ▪ 1999

Union University ▪ Germantown, TN
Educational Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership ▪ 2003

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT

Evans Elementary School ▪ Memphis, TN
Teacher and Chair of Curriculum of Instruction ▪ 1998 – 2004

Egypt Elementary School ▪ Memphis, TN
New Leaders, Inc. Resident Principal ▪ 2004 – 2005

Georgia Avenue Elementary School ▪ Memphis, TN
Principal ▪ 2005 – 2008

Benton County Schools ▪ Ashland, MS
Superintendent of Schools ▪ 2008 – 2012

New Leaders, Inc. ▪ Memphis, TN
Aspiring Principals Director ▪ 2012 – 2013

Promise Academy Spring Hill Charter School ▪ Memphis, TN
Founding Principal ▪ 2013 – Present