

# Board Governance Report

---

EDE 9817 – Dr. Manley

**Lucianna Basilice  
Angela Hughes-Johnson  
Patricia Murthy**

**3/3/2013**

## Governance Study

### 1. Describe the subjects in the study.

There were 165 New York Board Trustees who participated in this survey are described by experience, gender, community residence (rural, suburban and urban), having or not having children, education, age and ethnicity. The participants were attendees from the NYSSBA Conference. Experience of board members was within ranges of 1-6 years, 7-12 years, and more than 12 years of experience. The subjects in this study were 46.1% male and 52.1% female. The attendees at the conference were 34.5% rural, 35.8% suburban and 4.2% of the attendees were from city districts. There were 38.8% of the attendees that did not have children in school and 60.6% that did have children in school. The education levels of the attendees were 38.2% with four or more years of college, 27.9% of attendees had two years of college. The percent of those who earned a high school diploma was 21.8% and 11.5% did not graduate high school. The age ranged from 35 years to 75 years of age. Finally, the majority of the attendees were Caucasian with a measure of 92.1%; 2.4% were African American; 2.4% were Hispanic; 1.6% classified themselves as other. There were no attendees present, who classified themselves Asian Pacific Islander or Native American.

*Table 1*

*Descriptive Statistics*

		Race	Edu	Children	Expstatus	Gender
N	Valid	162	164	164	162	162
	Missing	3	1	1	3	3

Race		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	152	92.1	93.8	93.8
	2	4	2.4	2.5	96.3
	3	4	2.4	2.5	98.8
	6	2	1.2	1.2	100.0
	Total	162	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		165	100.0		

Education		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	19	11.5	11.6	11.6
	2	36	21.8	22.0	33.5
	3	46	27.9	28.0	61.6
	4	63	38.2	38.4	100.0
	Total	164	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		165	100.0		

Children		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	64	38.8	39.0	39.0
	2	100	60.6	61.0	100.0
	Total	164	99.4	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.6		
Total		165	100.0		

Expstatus

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1.00	29	17.6	17.9	17.9
	2.00	106	64.2	65.4	83.3
	3.00	27	16.4	16.7	100.0
	Total	162	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		165	100.0		

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1	76	46.1	46.9	46.9
	2	86	52.1	53.1	100.0
	Total	162	98.2	100.0	
Missing	System	3	1.8		
Total		165	100.0		

2. How do male and female New York State trustees who attend the NYSSBA Conference differ in their descriptions of board practices and effectiveness?

Table 2

*Comparisons between male and female trustees*

<i>Gender</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>SEM</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
---------------	----------	----------	-----------	------------	----------	-----------	----------

SDM	1	71	17.56	3.28	0.39	0.10	152.00	0.92
	2	83	17.51	4.05	0.44			
TMWK	1	71	47.14	5.31	0.63	-0.86	142.00	0.39
	2	73	48.01	6.83	0.80			
CMGMT	1	73	11.32	2.45	0.29	-1.75	142.00	0.08
	2	71	12.00	2.24	0.27			
BDEFF	1	72	25.00	5.95	0.70	-0.95	153.00	0.34
	2	83	25.93	6.13	0.67			

The P values are all greater than 0.05 which indicates that there are no significant differences between male and female trustees for all three board practices of structured decision making, teamwork, conflict management and board effectiveness.

In the Independent T-test, board effectiveness was the dependent variable and teamwork, conflict management, shared decision making and gender were the independent variables

3. What relationships are there among New York school board trustee descriptions of school board practices and school board effectiveness?

*Table 3*

*Correlations of board practices and board effectiveness with age and years of experience*

		BDEFF	SDM	TMWK	CMGMT	Age	Exp.
BDEFF	r	1	.468**	.472**	.617**	-.006	.196*
	P		.000	.000	.000	.937	.014
	N	158	153	143	144	149	156
SDM	r		1			.078	
	P	.000		.000	.003	.346	.008
	N	153	157	142	143	149	154
TMWK	r			1		.114	
	P	.000	.000		.014	.180	.049

	N	143	142	147	139	139	145
CMGMT	r				1	.059	.022
	P	.000	.003	.014		.493	.796
	N	144	143	139	146	139	143
Age	r	-.006	.078	.114	.059	1	
	P	.937	.346	.180	.493		.000
	N	149	149	139	139	155	152
Exp	r				.022		1
	P	.014	.008	.049	.796	.000	
	N	156	154	145	143	152	162

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

A correlation analysis was done and a moderate correlation was found for board effectiveness and structured decision making accounting for 22% of the variance in the binary relationship and teamwork also accounting for 22% of the variance. The binary relationship between board effectiveness and conflict management accounts for 38% of the variance and the relationship is considered strong. A P-value of .00 was noted for all correlation tests indicating that the relationship is significant.

4. When New York State school board trustees attending the state conference are divided into low, moderate and high experience groups, how do they differ in their descriptions of board practices and board effectiveness?

A one-way ANOVA was used to test differences of Experience Status of Board members among four variables: Board Effectiveness (BDEFF), Teamwork (TMWK), Conflict Management (CMGMT) and Shared Decision Making (SDM). There were significant differences among

BDEFF,  $p = .002$  and SDM,  $p = .007$ . There was no significant difference among CMGMT,  $p = .460$  and TMWK,  $p = .240$ .

*Table 4*

*Mean and Standard Deviation for Teamwork (TMWK), Conflict Management (CMGMT), Shared Decision Making (SDM), and Board Effectiveness (BDEFF) with Years of Experience*

	Years of Experience	N	M	SD
TMWK	1.00	26	46.58	6.22
	2.00	98	47.60	6.00
	3.00	21	49.48	4.84
	Total	145	47.69	5.91
CMGMT	1.00	25	11.20	2.48
	2.00	96	11.82	2.40
	3.00	22	11.45	2.09
	Total	143	11.66	2.36
SDM	1.00	28	15.64	2.96
	2.00	100	17.92	3.78
	3.00	26	18.38	3.42
	Total	154	17.58	3.69
BDEFF	1.00	27	19.07	5.65
	2.00	102	22.31	5.22
	3.00	27	24.04	5.34
	Total	156	22.05	5.49

*Table 5*

*Anova*

		df	F	p
TMWK	Between Groups	2	1.44	0.24

	Within Groups	142		
	Total	144		
CMGMT	Between Groups	2	0.78	0.46
	Within Groups	140		
	Total	142		
SDM	Between Groups	2	5.18	0.01
	Within Groups	151		
	Total	153		
BDEFF	Between Groups	2	6.25	0.00
	Within Groups	153		
	Total	155		

Table 6

*Multiple Comparisons*

Dependent Variable	(I)	(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	p	95% Confidence Interval		
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
TMWK	Bonferroni	1.00	2.00	-1.03	1.30	1.00	-4.17	2.12
			3.00	-2.90	1.73	0.29	-7.09	1.29
		2.00	1.00	1.03	1.30	1.00	-2.12	4.17
			3.00	-1.87	1.42	0.56	-5.31	1.56
		3.00	1.00	2.90	1.73	0.29	-1.29	7.09
		2.00	1.87	1.42	0.56	-1.56	5.31	
	Dunnett T3	1.00	2.00	-1.03	1.36	0.84	-4.42	2.37
			3.00	-2.90	1.61	0.22	-6.90	1.10
		2.00	1.00	1.03	1.36	0.84	-2.37	4.42
			3.00	-1.87	1.22	0.34	-4.93	1.18
3.00		1.00	2.90	1.61	0.22	-1.10	6.90	
	2.00	1.87	1.22	0.34	-1.18	4.93		
CMGMT	Bonferroni	1.00	2.00	-0.62	0.53	0.73	-1.91	0.67
			3.00	-0.25	0.69	1.00	-1.93	1.42
		2.00	1.00	0.62	0.53	0.73	-0.67	1.91
			3.00	0.37	0.56	1.00	-0.99	1.73
		3.00	1.00	0.25	0.69	1.00	-1.42	1.93
			2.00	-0.37	0.56	1.00	-1.73	0.99

	Dunnett	1.00	2.00	-0.62	0.55	0.60	-2.01	0.76
	T3		3.00	-0.25	0.67	0.97	-1.91	1.40
		2.00	1.00	0.62	0.55	0.60	-0.76	2.01
			3.00	0.37	0.51	0.85	-0.90	1.64
		3.00	1.00	0.25	0.67	0.97	-1.40	1.91
			2.00	-0.37	0.51	0.85	-1.64	0.90
SDM	Bonferroni	1.00	2.00	-2.74176*	0.77	0.01	-4.14	-0.42
			3.00	2.27714*	0.98	0.02	-5.11	-0.37
		2.00	1.00		0.77	0.01	0.42	4.14
			3.00	-0.46	0.79	1.00	-2.38	1.45
		3.00	1.00		0.98	0.02	0.37	5.11
			2.00	0.46	0.79	1.00	-1.45	2.38
	Dunnett	1.00	2.00	-2.74176*	0.68	0.00	-3.94	-0.62
	T3		3.00	2.27714*	0.87	0.01	-4.90	-0.59
		2.00	1.00		0.68	0.00	0.62	3.94
			3.00	-0.46	0.77	0.91	-2.38	1.45
		3.00	1.00		0.87	0.01	0.59	4.90
			2.00	0.46	0.77	0.91	-1.45	2.38
BDEFF	Bonferroni	1.00	2.00	-4.96296*	1.15	0.02	-6.02	-0.46
			3.00	3.23965*	1.45	0.00	-8.46	-1.46
		2.00	1.00		1.15	0.02	0.46	6.02
			3.00	-1.72	1.15	0.41	-4.51	1.06
		3.00	1.00		1.45	0.00	1.46	8.46
			2.00	1.72	1.15	0.41	-1.06	4.51
	Dunnett	1.00	2.00	-4.96296*	1.20	0.03	-6.24	-0.24
	T3		3.00	3.23965*	1.50	0.01	-8.65	-1.28
		2.00	1.00		1.20	0.03	0.24	6.24
			3.00	-1.72	1.15	0.36	-4.58	1.14
		3.00	1.00		1.50	0.01	1.28	8.65
			2.00	1.72	1.15	0.36	-1.14	4.58

\*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

For this question, we completed an ANOVA for four variables. There were significant differences between shared decision making and board effectiveness. Follow up tests were conducted to evaluate this relationship.

## Conclusion:

The Independent Samples T-test showed there was no significant difference between experience status and board effectiveness, Shared Decision Making Conflict with regard to gender. There were no significant differences between experience status and Shared Decision Making, Conflict Management, Teamwork with regard to board effectiveness. There was significant difference with the ANOVA with experience status and shared decision making and board effectiveness. There was a moderate correlation among conflict management and board effectiveness.

Possible recommendations include increased training in shared decision-making for all board members as well as conflict management.