



RETURNING MATERIALS:

Place in book drop to
remove this checkout from
your record. FINES will
be charged if book is
returned after the date
stamped below.

NOV 15 1993		
--------------------	--	--

**A PROFILE OF THE CHARACTERISTICS, COMPOSITION AND ROLE
OF THE GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
IN THE UNITED STATES**

By

Thomas Francis Xavier Hoar, S.S.E.

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration

1985

Copyright by
THOMAS FRANCIS XAVIER HOAR, S.S.E.
1985

This work is dedicated to
my brothers in the
Society of St. Edmund

and

To my parents, brother and sisters,
and their families
all of whom I love and cherish.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

**"A faithful friend is a strong defense:
and he that hath found such a one hath
found a treasure."**

Apocrypha, 6:14

I have been blessed with many friends. A number of them have been actively involved in the preparation of this work.

I am grateful to the members of the Society of St. Edmund who supported and encouraged me during my studies, and to the staff and people of St. Casimir Parish who welcomed me as a brother and friend.

I appreciate the willingness of Dr. Eldon Nonnamaker, Dr. James Rainey, and Dr. Keith Anderson to serve as members of my Guidance Committee. I am deeply appreciative of the kindness and direction that Dr. Louis C. Stamatakis has shown me as my Chairman, member and friend.

I am indebted to the unselfish efforts of Ms. Betty Denczek, Ms. Sally Ellis, Ms. Liz Arasim, Mr. Bryan Coyle, Miss Thelma Joseph, and Mrs. Betty Rafoul for their assistance in the planning, preparation and presentation of this study.

In addition, I wish to acknowledge and thank

Dr. Richard I. Ingram of the Association of Governing
Boards of Universities and Colleges and Dr. Fred L.
Hofheinz of Lilly Endowment for their interest, support
and advice.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
The Reason for the Study	3
The Purpose of the Study	5
Significance of the Study	6
Research Questions	9
Methodology	10
Selection of the Sample	10
Assignment of the Sample to Subgroups	11
The Instrument	11
Data Collection	13
Data Analysis	13
Assumptions of the Study	14
Limitations of the Study	15
Definitions	17
Organization of the Study	19
II. SURVEY OF LITERATURE	21
Introduction	21
A Historical Perspective	22
Summary	32
The Governance of American Higher Education	32
The Legal and Moral Obligation of Governing Boards	35
Leadership	38
Financing an Institution	45
Institutional Mission	57
Academic Responsibilities	61
Educational Programming	61
Institutional Autonomy	68
Academic Board of Review	69
Board Maintenance	70

Chapter	Page
II. SURVEY OF LITERATURE (continued)	
Selection of Board Members	72
Orientation of Continuing Education of Trustees	76
Trustee Development	79
Summary	81
Theological Education	82
Trusteeship of Theological Schools and Seminaries	109
Summary	118
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	120
Population of the Study	120
Assignment to Subgroups	122
Survey Methodology	123
Survey Instrument Construction and Data Collection	123
Data Coding	128
Data Analysis	129
Summary	131
IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA	132
Introduction	132
Survey Response Rate	132
Size and Occupancy Level of the Governing Boards	134
Demographic Characteristics	137
The Primary Occupation	143
Multiple Board Membership	149
Denominational Funding and Fund- raising Activities	152
Election and Selection of Board Members	154
Length and Limitation of Board Terms	158
Standing Committees	162
The Executive Committee	166
Committee and Board Activities	168
Board Participation	171
Summary	182
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	186
Introduction	186

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS (Continued)	
Major Findings and Conclusions	190
Question 1	190
Question 2	191
Question 3	195
Question 4	200
Question 5	201
Question 6	203
Question 7	205
Implications and Recommendations	208
Recommendations for Future	
Research	214
Concluding Statement	216
BIBLIOGRAPHY	218
APPENDICES	
A. TIMETABLE OF STUDY	230
B. INITIAL LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	231
C. FOLLOW-UP LETTER	232
D. SURVEY INSTRUMENT	233
E. COMPOSITION OF POPULATION	241
F. MASTER CODE BOOK	251

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Survey Instrument Response Rate by Denominational Groups for the Governing Boards of Theological Schools and Seminaries	134
2. The Size and the Occupancy Level of Governing Boards of Theological Schools and Seminaries	136
3. Characteristics of Voting Members of Governing Boards of Theological Schools and Seminaries	139
3A. Denominational Analysis of the Characteristics of Voting Members of Governing Boards of Theological Schools and Seminaries	142
4. Primary Occupation of the Voting Members of Governing Boards of Theological Schools and Seminaries . . .	145
4A. Denominational Analysis of the Primary Occupation of the Voting Members of Governing Boards of Theological Schools and Seminaries	149
5. Multiple Board Membership of Board Members of Theological Schools and Seminaries	151
5A. Denominational Analysis of the Multiple Board Membership of Board Members of Theological Schools and Seminaries	152
6. Denominational Funding and Fund- Raising Activities of Theological Schools and Seminaries	154
7. Election/Selection of Board Members of Theological Schools and Seminaries	156

Table	Page
7A. Denominational Analysis of the Election/Selection of Board Members of Theological Schools and Seminaries	157
8. Length and Limitations of the Terms of Services of Governing Boards of Theological Schools and Seminaries	160
9. Board-Chair CEO Requirements for Theological Schools and Seminaries	162
10. Standing Committees of the Governing Boards of Theological Schools and Seminaries	165
10A. Denominational Analysis of the Standing Committees of Governing Boards of Theological Schools and Seminaries	166
11. Characteristics of Executive Committees of Theological Schools and Seminaries	168
12. Committee and Board Activities of Theological Schools and Seminaries	170
13. The History of Active Participation by the Governing Boards of Theological Schools and Seminaries . . .	173
13A. Denominational Analysis of the History of Active Participation by the Governing Boards of Theological Schools and Seminaries . . .	178

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

The role of the governing board in institutions of higher education has been the focus of many studies and debates over the past two decades. Campus turmoil of the 1960s renewed interest in the traditional structures of campus governance. The 1970s saw an increase in the demand for accountability by funding agencies, sponsoring bodies, and the public in general. The 1980s have brought challenges to institutions of higher education that demand these institutions be or become flexible "in their responsiveness to new consumer needs and other pressures of the eighties. . . ."¹

The involvement of the governing boards of institutions of higher education has become a critical component in the response of colleges and universities to the changing nature of higher education. Numerous studies have been

¹Richard T. Ingram, "Toward Effective Trusteeship for the Eighties," in Handbook of College and University Trusteeship by Richard T. Ingram et al. (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), p. 3.

conducted in an effort to define the proper role of the governing board in higher education.

The tradition of lay boards governing institutions of higher education is long and complex, dating to medieval Europe.² W. H. Cowley, in his 1980 work, Presidents, Professors and Trustees, provided a detailed description of the development of the lay governing board from medieval Europe to colonial America. A review of the historical records of American higher education underscores the influential role the lay governing board has played in the development of higher education in this country.

The early American colleges, established in theocratic colonies,³ were dominated by a mission and a curriculum which had the expressed purpose of educating members of the colony for a life of service to the colony and the church. The governing boards and faculties of these institutions were comprised mostly of clergymen. This style of religiously-oriented institutions dominated American higher education for two-thirds of its history. As the country developed and the needs of society changed, colleges and universities were forced to adjust their institutional missions and structures. Theological education became a

²W. H. Cowley, Presidents, Professors and Trustees (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), p. 29.

³Ursula Delworth; Gary R. Hanson and Assoc., Student Services: A Handbook for the Profession (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981), pp. 3-6.

specialized discipline and eventually was relegated to specialized institutions. Institutions dedicated to the preparation of ministers are not predominant in American higher education. It is not difficult to understand why in contemporary times these institutions, which exist on the fringe of the academic community, have often been overlooked. A review of the literature on governing boards of higher educational institutions reflects this situation. There is inadequate information available on the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries.

THE REASON FOR THE STUDY

Although theological schools and seminaries have been over-shadowed by the secular institutions of the academic world, they have not been immune from the societal forces which have enveloped and changed the direction and academic structures of many colleges and universities during the past two decades. Jesse H. Ziegler, in a series of articles published between 1972 and 1977 in Theological Education,⁴ addressed the issues facing institutions of theological education. An examination of Ziegler's writings reveals his concerns and those of other theological educators which parallel the issues affecting other institutions of American higher education. Among the issues Ziegler identified as

⁴Jesse H. Ziegler, Theological Education, Autumn 1972, 1976 and 1977.

influencing the development and status of these institutions were: (1) financial constraints and limited institutional resources; (2) the quality of education and academic tenure; (3) the changing nature of the student body; 4) external pressures and accreditation; and (5) retrenchment, reduction in staff and deferred maintenance of the physical plant. Institutions of higher education, including institutions of theological education, require strong leadership to effectively and efficiently meet the challenges caused by these conditions.

In 1982, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching issued a report on the governance of higher education which stated:

In recent years, demands for accountability by agencies beyond the campus have caused confusion about where authority is lodged and have worn down the traditional governance structures of higher education. We conclude that if the correct balance between integrity and accountability is to be maintained, the academy must assume more responsibility for regulating itself.⁵

The authors contend that any discussion of the leadership or the governance of higher educational institutions must begin with an examination and a discussion of the role of the governing board. As a result of their comprehensive study, the authors called for a renewal of leadership in the governance of American higher education by trustees,

⁵Carnegie Foundation, The Control of the Campus: A Report on the Governance of Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982), p. 4.

administrators, the faculty and sponsoring bodies. As the authors state: "What is most required is no less than a rebirth of leadership in higher education."⁶

Prior to, and in response to, the Carnegie Commission's report, a number of research studies were conducted to investigate the composition, nature, and role of the governing boards of American public and private institutions of higher education. Additional studies conducted have examined the character of the governance and the governing boards of specialized institutions. However, to this investigator's knowledge, there have been no comprehensive studies conducted to explore the characteristics, composition, and role of the governing board of American theological schools and seminaries.

THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Robert Lynn, Vice President, Religion Division of the Lilly Endowment, Inc., has stated that events of the last two decades have forced theological educators "toward a belated discovery of trusteeship."⁷ This study was designed to investigate and describe trusteeship as it is exercised by the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries.

⁶Ibid., p. 89.

⁷Robert W. Lynn, "The Responsibilities of Stewardship," in The Good Steward. See Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983, p. 2.

Specifically, this study has developed a descriptive profile of a representative sample of the governing boards of accredited institutions of theological education in the United States. In addition, a profile has been developed for each of the subgroups of the study. The profile, in turn, provides an opportunity to compare and contrast the characteristics, structures, and activities of these boards by denominational affiliation. Furthermore, this study has identified areas of concern regarding the governing boards of these institutions which should be used to focus future research.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

A review of the literature reveals a substantial amount of material concerning the governance of colleges and universities. However, until recently, there has been a notable lack of material pertaining to the governance of institutions of theological education. A number of studies are currently underway which examine various aspects of these institutions. There have been several works published regarding the role of trustees in theological schools and seminaries, including Robert Greenleaf's, Seminary as Servant: Essays on Trusteeship, (1983); and The Good Steward: A Guide to Theological School Trusteeship, published by the Association of Governing Boards (1983). However, these works are experienced-based discussions rather than research-oriented presentations. Therefore, documentation

of the existing characteristics, structures, and activities of the governing boards of these institutions is needed.

Several specialized and limited studies have been or soon will be undertaken. Representative of these studies are William C. Miller's case study on the Governance of Nazarene Theological Seminary, 1983,⁸ and a 1981 study prepared for Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary on the organization of boards of trustees of theological seminaries.⁹ Although Miller conducted an in-depth study of theological education governance patterns, his investigation was limited to one theological seminary. The 1981 study by Ben Fisher, prepared for the Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, investigated the institutions of theological education for thirty-two denominations. Yet Fisher's work is limited in that its purpose ". . . was to develop a profile of seminary board organization, and to determine the extent to which these institutions are now engaged in trustee orientation."¹⁰ Because both of these studies were limited in their scope, they have limited utility.

⁸William Charles Miller, The Governance of Theological Education: A Case Study of Nazarene Theological Seminary, 1945-1976, Ph.D. diss., Kent State University, 1983.

⁹Ben C. Fisher, Summary of Findings on Organization of Boards of Trustees of Accredited Theological Seminaries in the United States and Canada (Wake Forest, N.C.: Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1981).

¹⁰Ibid., p. 2.

An interest in these long-neglected institutions is emerging, and they are now becoming the subjects of discussion and study. Some of the literature which has appeared in recent years and the activities of Lilly Endowment and the Association of Governing Boards support the notion that, like other institutions of higher education, the organization and the nature of institutions of theological education are evolving. Therefore, these theological schools and seminaries should be candidates for study.

Historically, any significant development in institutions of higher education has resulted in a corresponding development in educational administration and governance. The governance of colleges and universities has been studied, and there exists a great deal of documentation on how these institutions have adapted their structures and activities to meet the challenges of changing societal needs. This is not the case with information currently available about the governance of theological schools and seminaries. Any available research is sketchy and limited because it does not document the existing characteristics, structures, composition, and activities of the governing boards which oversee the operation of these institutions. This study has documented the nature and activities of these boards, as well as provided a basis by which the future evolution of these boards may be compared and contrasted. As a result of being a foundational and

descriptive study which crosses denominational lines, this study has identified areas which deserve further study.

Furthermore, this study provides information to chief executive officers, governing boards and denominational officers that may be useful to them as they plan to meet the challenges which face their institutions.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This descriptive study gathered the responses of chief executive officers of post-baccalaureate institutions of theological education throughout the United States to a structured questionnaire designed to elicit responses to each of the following questions:

- (1) Is the institution free standing; does it have an independent governing board?
- (2) What is the relationship of the institution to the sponsoring body/denomination?
- (3) What is the current composition of the governing boards of theological education (occupation, level of education etc.)?
- (4) Who are the trustees; how are they chosen; and how long may they serve as members of the board?
- (5) What is the size of the governing board; and how often does it meet?
- (6) What structures exist to facilitate the governing board's trusteeship, (i.e., does the board employ a committee system)?

- (7) In what activities does the governing board participate, (i.e., policy formation, election of board members, appointment of the president, etc.)?

METHODOLOGY

A. Selection of the Sample

The chief executive officers of 134 post-baccalaureate theological schools and seminaries representing forty-three denominations, communions, and ecclesiastic communities of the United States, plus the chief executive officers of fifteen nondenominational or interdenominational institutions constitute the population of this study (see Appendix E). Those chief executive officers and their institutions were selected from the 1984 ATS Bulletin published by the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada. The total list of participants in the study will be 149, (for a detailed discussion on the process of selection of members of this study see Chapter III).

The chief executive officer was selected as the participant in this study because this individual was expected to have an overall knowledge of the governing board and the mission and nature of the institution. It was further expected that this individual possessed the necessary information to accurately complete the survey instrument. Finally, it was expected this individual, in conjunction with the chair of the governing board, plans

the agenda, supplies information to the governing board, and executes the directives and the policies of the governing board. Therefore, this individual has an intimate knowledge of the workings, structure, nature, and composition of the governing board.

B. Assignment of the Sample to Subgroups

In order to facilitate the analysis of the data obtained from the respondents, each member of the sample was assigned to one of the twelve subgroups based on denominational affiliation. This allowed the investigator to determine: whether or not the characteristics, structures, or activities of the governing boards of these institutions are unique to one denomination; and whether or not the characteristics, structures, and activities of these boards transcend denominational sponsorship. The denominational classification that was employed in the assignment of participants to subgroups coincides with the denominational classification contained in the 1984 ATS Bulletin. Subdenominations were classified under the heading of the principal denomination (see Appendix E).

Group one consists of those institutions that are the sole theological school or seminary for their denomination. Group two constitutes those denominations that have two or three institutions of theological education. Groups three through eleven are comprised of those primary denominations that have four or more associated institutions. Group

twelve consists of fifteen institutions which are classified as either interdenominational or nondenominational institutions.

C. The Instrument

Information for this study was gathered through the use of a forced choice written questionnaire containing thirty-five items (see Appendix D). The instrument was designed to determine: (1) if the institutions in the sample of this study are governed by an independent governing board; (2) the characteristics, structures, activities, process of selection for membership, and composition of the governing boards of the institutions under consideration; (3) how, if at all, the characteristics, structures, activities, process of selection for membership or composition of these boards are determined or influenced by the sponsoring body or denomination; and (4) how, if at all, the characteristics, structures, activities, process of selection for membership or the composition of these governing boards differ according to denomination.

The instrument was pilot tested by: two former chief executive officers of theological schools; a chief executive officer of a private religious affiliated college; a faculty member of the Department of Educational Administration at Michigan State University (MSU); the executive vice president of the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities; a senior consultant of Lilly Endowment; a vice chair of trustees who is currently the director of

graduate theology at a private college with religious affiliation; and a bishop of a large metropolitan Roman Catholic diocese who serves on the governing boards of several institutions of higher education including a diocesan seminary. None of those involved in the pilot test were members of the sample. The members of the test group were chosen because of their experience and knowledge of trusteeship. A number of them are also familiar with the governance of theological schools and seminaries. In addition, a research consultant reviewed the questionnaire.

Criticisms and suggestions for revisions were gathered from the research consultant, the MSU faculty member, and members of the pilot group; and appropriate revisions were made in the questionnaire to clarify and improve the instrument. Face validity of the survey instrument was assumed as a result of this pilot test.

D. Data Collection

Data was collected through a survey instrument which was mailed to the chief executive officers of the institutions under study on November 20, 1984. Each member of the sample received a personally addressed cover letter (see Appendix B), a survey instrument and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for the return of the completed instrument. A follow-up letter to nonrespondents was sent on December 4, 1984 (see Appendix C). All survey instruments received

on or before January 11, 1985, constitute the total response group.

E. Data Analysis

The items of the survey instrument were coded. The information gathered from each survey was translated into the developed code and transferred to a "mark sense" data entry form. Data on these forms was transferred to a data tape with the use of an optic scanner. The data was processed by the Michigan State University Cyber 170/750 computer with the use of a descriptive statistical program.

Descriptive information was tabulated and analyzed. From this data, a profile of the characteristics, structures, activities, process of selection and composition of the governing boards of the sample and each of the groups has been developed. In addition three subgroups were formed for the purpose of analysis of variance. The supgroups are: Catholic, Denominations other than Catholic and Inter/nondenominational institutions.

ASSUMPTIONS OF THE STUDY

In investigating the research questions for the study, the following assumptions were made. If these assumptions were violated, the findings of this study could have been influenced.

- (1) The person to whom the questionnaire was sent was, in fact, the person who completed it.

- (2) The respondent was the chief executive officer of a free standing accredited theological school or seminary.
- (3) The respondent had full knowledge and understanding of the total governance structure of the institution, the workings of the governing board, its characteristics and structure, and the relationship of the institution and its governing board to any sponsoring group or denomination.
- (4) The respondent's answers to the questionnaire were honest, complete, accurate and current.
- (5) The items of the survey instrument were understood by the respondent and had face validity.
- (6) The institutions selected for this study share as a common educational purpose the transmission and development of theological education.
- (7) Survey research is an acceptable and adequate method of gathering data for descriptive studies in the social sciences and education.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study has been conducted under the following limitations:

- (1) The study was undertaken as a study of educational governance, not one of theological issues. The unique theological traditions of the numerous

denominations, communions, and ecclesiastic communities which influence theological education has not been considered. Only those issues that influence the educational governance characteristics and structures of the governing boards of institutions of theological education were considered.

- (2) The sample surveyed was composed of the chief executive officer of post-baccalaureate institutions of theological education in the United States. Only those institutions which are accredited schools, candidates for accreditation or associate schools of ATS, as listed in the 1984 ATS Bulletin, were included in this study. Therefore, the results of this study may not be generalized with confidence to institutions of other countries or to other institutions of higher education.
- (3) This study concerns the characteristics, structures and activities of the governing boards of the stated institutions. Therefore, it was limited in its ability to report on the rationale and theology that underpin the mission of these institutions. For example, the theology of ministry and the faith life of individual denom-

inations, communions, and ecclesiastic communities were largely undetected.

- (4) Due to the unique nature of theological education, the results of this study may not be generalized with any degree of confidence to other professional preparation programs or specialized post-baccalaureate institutions.
- (5) Due to the unknown characteristics, structures and activities of the governing boards of institutions of theological education, this study was limited to describing the characteristics, structures, and activities of the governing boards. This study made no attempt to judge the quality or efficiency of these boards.
- (6) As a result of being a foundational study, this study did not test hypotheses.

DEFINITIONS

Each of the following terms are used throughout this study and are defined as follows:

The Church--The community of believers and followers of Jesus Christ and his teachings. The one church comprises numerous denominations, communions, and ecclesiastic communities of various traditions and structures.

Theological Education--The general term used for the study of theology, ministry and church administration.

Theological School--A post-baccalaureate institution specializing in theological education, including ministerial preparation programs, graduate degree programs and continuing education programs. The term most often used for schools of theology which are part of a comprehensive university or a consortium of institutions of theological education.

Seminaries--Post-baccalaureate institutions of theological education with a primary mission of ministerial preparation for a specific denomination.

Sponsoring Body/Denomination--An ecclesiastic community or church that either endorses, supports or controls an institution of theological education.

Governing Board--Denotes the corporate body of an institution of higher education whose primary responsibility is the determination of policy of the institution,¹¹ and is the steward of the mission and resources of the institution.¹²

Free Standing Institution--An institution of higher education which is independent, that is, it is not a subunit of any other college or university.

Chief Executive Officer--The chief administrator of an educational institution who is appointed by the

¹¹Sr. Marie Fox, Changes in Relationships Between Governing Boards of Catholic Colleges and Universities and Their Sponsoring Religious Bodies, Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 1974, p. 23.

¹²Robert W. Lynn, "The Responsibilities of Stewardship," in The Good Steward. See Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983, pp. 2-3.

governing board to administer the institution under the guidelines and policies set by the board.

Canon Law--A code of law governing the activities of the Roman Catholic Church.

Diocese--A geographic and jurisdictional area of a denomination or ecclesiastic community.

A Sacred Congregation--An administrative entity of the Roman Catholic Church, sharing the jurisdiction of the Pope by his delegated authority, but not final authority.¹³

Clerics or Clergy--Generic term used to denote ordained ministers of any denomination, community, or ecclesiastic communion.¹⁴

Laity--Term used to denote a member of a church who is not an ordained minister. It is not used, as is customary in educational writings, to denote noneducators.¹⁵

Stewardship--Term used to denote an understanding of trusteeship that has a sense moral duty rather than legal responsibility.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

The investigator has presented a review of the per-

¹³Walter D. Wagoner, The Seminary: Protestant and Catholic. (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966), pp. 3-4.

¹⁴Fox, Changes in Relationships Between Governing Boards, p. 24.

¹⁵Ibid.

inent literature in Chapter II of this study. The review of the literature focuses on three topical areas: (1) the role, responsibilities, and nature of governing boards of private institutions of higher education; (2) the nature and purpose of theological education; and (3) the various aspects of the administration and governance of theological schools and seminaries.

Chapter III contains a detailed presentation of the methodology used in this study. This description includes the processes for selection of the sample, the design and pilot testing of the survey instrument, data collection, and procedures used for data analysis.

The investigator presents an analysis of the data and the findings of the study in Chapter IV.

Chapter V is a summary of the study, the major findings, conclusions, and implications: recommendations for consideration by theological educators, governing boards of institutions of theological education and denominational officers; and recommendations for further research. Insofar as possible, the investigator has developed inferences from the findings and presented recommendations pertinent to the governance of theological schools and seminaries. In addition, the investigator presents suggestions for future research in the area of governing boards of institutions of theological education.

CHAPTER II

SURVEY OF LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

In order to provide a framework for this study, an extensive review of the literature in three topical areas is presented. The first topical area focuses on the role, responsibilities, and the nature of governing boards of private institutions of higher education. A limited historical review is presented as a foundation upon which to build an understanding of the current practices of trusteeship in American higher education. In addition, a thematic discussion of the current practices and responsibilities of governing boards and the nature of trusteeship, as it has been presented in the literature, is provided.

The second topical area is an examination of the nature and purpose of theological education. In order to understand the governance of theological schools and seminaries, a familiarity with the special nature and mission of these institutions is required. The presentation of this topical area centers upon the educational aspects of these institutions. Similarities and differences in educational philosophy and structures are noted. Since they are not

germane to this study, theological differences that may or may not exist between institutions of various denominations are not discussed.

The third, and final, topical area delves into the various aspects of the administration and governance of theological schools and seminaries. The unique nature of institutions of theological education has been investigated, and its influence upon the structure and functions of the governing boards of these institutions is presented. In addition, the relationship of these institutions to sponsoring denominations is discussed.

A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Although thought to be an American invention, the origin of lay governing boards of trustees can be traced to fourteenth-century Italian universities. During the two centuries prior to the founding of the first colonial college in America, patterns for controlling institutions of higher learning by lay governing boards had developed not only in Italy but throughout Europe.

Thus, some 200 years before the founding of the first American college and at least half a century before Columbus set sail to discover the Americas, the primary progenitors of American boards of trustees had begun to take command of Italian higher education. These boards arose in Italy over a concern for trusteeship over the public funds made available to the professors.¹

¹W. H. Cowley, Presidents, Professors and Trustees (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980), p. 30.

Out of the traditions of Bologna, Basel, Geneva, Leyden, Edinburgh, Dublin, Oxford, and Cambridge, the institutions of colonial America established lay governing boards to oversee the operation of higher education. W. H. Cowley provides an enlightening presentation on the historical developments of the American adaptations of the lay governing board.

As society took root on the East Coast of North America, the leaders of the colonies realized that "in the future the state would need competent rulers, the church would require a learned clergy, and society itself would need the adornment of cultured men."² In this context, the American system of higher education was born. The purpose of this review is not to examine the entire history of American higher education, but to present the roots from which today's institutions of higher education draw direction and tradition. For a detailed examination of the historical development of American higher education, the reader is referred to the 1961 history of Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith³ and to the 1962 work of Frederick Rudolph.

In its brief history, American society has undergone numerous periods of upheaval, change, and growth. The

²Frederick Rudolph, The American College and University: A History (New York: Vintage Books, 1962), p. 6.

³Richard Hofstadter and Wilson Smith, eds., American Higher Education: A Documentary History (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961).

influences that changed society also affected its institutions. The theocratic colonies, which spawned the first American institutions of higher education, have given way to a pluralistic, technological nation. In response to these changes in the national and world order, American institutions of higher education have developed from institutions ". . . whose basic and chief duty was to train its students to be religious and moral men",⁴ to multipurpose institutions.

One of the greatest periods of massive and rapid expansion of American higher education occurred after World War II. The Serviceman's Readjustment Act, commonly known as the G. I. Bill, offered financial incentives and created opportunities for hundreds of thousands of returning servicemen and women to pursue their education. The Cold War and "the impending tidal wave of students in the early 1960s"⁵ gave further impetus for expansion and development of colleges and universities in this country.

In 1960, John J. Corson wrote in Governance of Colleges and Universities, that the succeeding four decades would be a time of adaptation, expansion, and creativity for this country's institutions of higher education. To be successful

⁴Ursula Delworth; Gary R. Hanson and Assoc., Student Services: A Handbook for the Profession (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981), p. 5.

⁵Ibid., p. 11.

during this period of growth, he argued, a working consensus would be needed among all members of an institution--including trustees, faculty and administrators--especially with regard to the purpose of the institution.⁶

Corson was concerned with the growing complexity of the governmental structure of colleges and universities. He perceived and identified a number of areas of confusion to which educators must be attentive.

As institutions expanded and as academic disciplines developed into highly specialized fields of study, Corson recognized that the decision-making process which had traditionally existed on the campuses was breaking down.

In the university the problem of synthesizing the activity of many self-oriented individuals and of the competing faculties of many departments and several schools becomes the point at which the academic success of an institution is often made or lost.⁷

This high degree of specialization which was developing at the time had the potential to promote a myopic vision of the institution. In many senses, the faculty was losing its ability to wisely govern the institution.

Additionally, Corson stated, there was an increasing dependence by these institutions on the interests and favor of external groups. He argued that governmental and industrial involvement in research, along with the dependency of

⁶John J. Corson, Governance of Colleges and Universities (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960), p. 4.

⁷Ibid., p. 29.

institutions on external sources of funding, would muddy the already murky waters of the decision-making process used by institutions of higher education.

The failure or inability of governing boards during the past century to take the lead in formulating educational policy has created a power vacuum. Their delinquency has given rise to one of the most provocative contributions of recent decades to planning for higher education. . . .⁸

This failure and the long-standing tradition of faculty autonomy created a serious problem in the governance of these institutions. Where there is no leadership, there is no institutional vision, Corson concluded. The responsibilities which the governing board delegated to other constituencies were not being fulfilled, according to Corson. Rather, he affirmed that trustees have full and broad powers, and stated:

They may abdicate from their position of authority, but they cannot annul it; they may vacate their posts, but they cannot destroy them; they may delegate activities and decisions but they cannot thereby avoid their own responsibilities.⁹

One of the reasons for this breakdown in the authority and function of the governing board, according to Corson, was that the board was seldom called to account for its stewardship to any higher authority. He saw this as a major flaw in the governance of American institutions of higher education.

⁸Ibid., p. 45.

⁹Ibid., p. 49

Succeeding developments in higher education would underscore the insightfulness of Corson's observations. The publication of his theories preceded a period of turmoil and sweeping change in the governance of higher educational institutions by their governing boards. As campuses erupted in the late 1960s with protests and the demands by students and younger faculty members for a more active voice in the governance of these institutions, trustees responded by reclaiming some of the authority which they had previously abdicated.

At the time, Corson articulated three central problems facing trustees: (1) communication needed to be improved between the board and the faculty so both would be informed on educational issues and problems, while allowing the faculty to freely exercise their roles; (2) the responsibilities of governing boards must be defined and board members must be educated in their proper role in order to fulfill these responsibilities; (3) the needs of society and the institution need to be respected to ensure that the institution meets its social responsibilities. In order for the institution to achieve the greatest good, he added, trustees must provide leadership and balance.¹⁰

Corson concluded his work with a summary of the major publications which had preceded his study. He indicated

¹⁰Ibid., p. 171.

that there had been a lack of indepth material presented up to that time. As a result, it was necessary for trustees to work from a loosely built theoretical foundation. However, he was able to identify three areas previously covered by other authors: (1) comments of trustees on their experiences; (2) works (or manuals) designed to tell trustees how to carry out their roles; and (3) a few volumes that analyzed the role of the trustees in the field of education as representative of society and as its administrators.¹¹

A contemporary of Corson, Gerald P. Burns, wrote in 1962 that the sole purpose of the governance and administration of a college or university is to facilitate, enhance, and operate the total program of the institution in the fulfillment of the institutional mission.¹²

In this same volume, Harry J. Carman examined the role of the governing board and individual trustees in faithfully discharging their responsibilities for the overall administration of institutions of higher education in this country. Carman chastised those members of governing boards who, while having enormous power legally vested in them, are incompetent to serve as board members. He was especially critical of

¹¹Ibid., p. 188.

¹²Gerald P. Burns, ed., Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination (New York: Harper and Row, 1962), pp. 28-30.

those who ". . . attempt to meddle with those aspects of the educational program with which they have no competence to deal."¹³

However, Carman cited two reasons why, despite these shortcomings, American institutions of higher education would continue to grow and develop as quality institutions. The first, as Corson clearly pointed out, was the willingness of governing boards to abdicate their responsibilities to others within the institution. The second, was that governing boards granted autonomous authority to the faculty to deal with all academic matters. They were governed only by broadbased policies, including the design and implementation of the curriculum.

Carman acknowledged that debate was developing at the time over whether this style of governance was appropriate. However, he pointed out that no matter what was being discussed in the halls of academia, the tradition of delegation would continue. His concern was how this tradition of delegation would develop without the governing boards relinquishing their moral and legal responsibilities.

In 1966, Burns expanded on his previous work and published Trustees in Higher Education. The author provided a historical perspective to the evolution of trusteeship in American higher education. He aptly pointed out the

¹³Harry J. Carman, "Boards of Trustees and Regents," in Administrators in Higher Education, see Burns 1962, p. 81.

need for understanding the foundations upon which governance and administration were built. Although brief, this introduction provided the reader with an overall appreciation for the continuing processes and refinement of the role of the governing board in higher education. From this historical perspective, Burns identified and succinctly expanded on what he believed to be the state of affairs of higher education in 1966.

The current scope and status of American higher education can best be presented in terms of the major problems and potentialities facing the field. Those considered potentialities are positive, and among the more important are public interpretation, curriculum revision, extra-curricular possibilities and competition with other institutions. Those considered problems are negative, and among the more important are financial hazards, government interference, personnel shortages, and enrollment problems.¹⁴

In the succeeding chapter the author promised to investigate theory and practice of academic governance as they apply to trustees. However, it was devoted primarily to an investigation of the practice of academic governance and lacked any discussion of theory. Burns articulated what he believed to be required of a member of a governing board: "They are expected to give considerable time, material support and sound judgment to their

¹⁴Gerald P. Burns, Trustees in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination, (np.: Independent College Funds of America, 1966), p. 18.

responsibilities."¹⁵ However, Burns did not provide an indepth discussion of theory.

The issue of the delegation of board authority and responsibility, which had been raised by previous authors, emerged again. Burns contended that the best way to examine the leadership responsibilities of the governing board was to analyze the major functions in which the board participated. This type of analysis may be affected by the relationship of the board under study to the president and other senior administrators of the institution.

Burns called for a strengthening of the board-president relationship. He also discussed some practical suggestions designed to ensure a productive relationship without creating ambiguous lines of responsibility for the board or the president.

Burns noted that the developments taking place in American society in 1966 would influence the development of colleges and universities in succeeding years. How colleges and universities would develop in this milieu would depend on the governing boards of these institutions. In order that boards of trustees be leaders in this development, Burns wrote that:

There must be continuing learning experiences offered by qualified professionals if the board member is to

¹⁵Ibid., p. 37.

remain abreast of new departures in his institution and new dimensions in higher education.¹⁶

He underscored the argument made by many that trustees must be attentive to and educated in their role and responsibilities so they may execute the public trust which has been legally and morally given to them.

At the time of publication, this was a welcome piece of scholarship. Burns' work was insightful and helpful in understanding the developments and literature pertaining to the field of academic governance.

SUMMARY

Although the tradition of lay governing boards of institutions of higher education is long and rich, there was, prior to the 1960s, little understanding of the proper role and responsibilities of board membership in American institutions of higher education. As the campuses of this country evolved through the turbulent 1960s and 1970s a clear understanding of the trusteeship began to emerge.

THE GOVERNANCE OF AMERICAN HIGHER EDUCATION

As discussed above, the role and responsibilities of university trustees have evolved through the centuries as the institutions which they serve have developed and matured. This process continues and will continue as long as there are vibrant institutions of higher education. In

¹⁶Ibid., p. 144.

the past decade, there has been a resurgence of concern over the role that the governing board plays in the life of an institution.

J. R. Baldridge, regarding the importance of understanding the role of the governing board states:

Of all the issues that have been studied about higher education, the activities of a board of trustees is probably the least understood--and one of the most important.¹⁷

A renewed interest in the role of the governing board can, in some part, be attributed to the uncertainty that has engulfed institutions of higher education. For example, institutions which for several decades experienced uninhibited growth suddenly found themselves in the midst of declining enrollment and financial crisis.

During this climate of decline, many institutions began to examine their governance structures. The process of governance is always more difficult during the lean years than during the years of plenty.¹⁸

A substantial collection of literature is available to assist an investigation of the role and responsibilities of governing boards. Much of this literature presents a practical rather than theoretical perspective. From an

¹⁷John W. Nason, The Nature of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibilities of College and University Boards (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982), p. 52.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 10.

examination of the practical suggestions made by many of the authors, a clear model emerges. This section begins with an examination of the literature in which the major legal and moral obligation of the governing board are discussed. The remainder of this section centers upon the twelve responsibilities gleaned from the literature that are commonly held by the majority of scholars to be those responsibilities that pertain to all types of institutions of higher education. These twelve areas of responsibility have been, for the purpose of this study, classified as belonging to five general categories: leadership, finances, mission, academics, and board maintenance. The twelve areas of responsibility that are presented for consideration are: (1) the appointment of the president; (2) the support of the president; (3) assessment of presidential performance; (4) the assurance of financial solvency; (5) the approval of long-range plans; (6) the enhancement of the institution's public image; (7) the assurance of adequate physical facilities; (8) the publication and adherence to the statement of institutional mission; (9) the approval of educational programs; (10) the preservation of institutional autonomy; (11) the role of the board as a court of appeals; and (12) the self-evaluation of the board's performance. In addition, the issues of trustee selection, orientation, deployment and continuing education are discussed.

THE LEGAL AND MORAL OBLIGATIONS OF GOVERNING BOARDS

In the past, the role of trustees has been primarily viewed as legal. In recent years, this vision of institutional governance has been expanded. It now includes an understanding that the role of the trustee is rooted not only in the law but in the obligations incumbent upon those who accept a trust.

These boards hold in trust the physical and financial assets of the institutions over which they have legal control, and they have the power to direct and supervise operations and programs in the best interests of the intended beneficiaries.¹⁹

The traditional philosophy of governance of American higher education has been that trustees seek to promote their institutions for the good of society, while remaining unencumbered by any special interests that might threaten the integrity of the institution.²⁰

Gerald P. Burns captures the essence of the legalistic atmosphere that must permeate the functioning of the governing board:

The board of trustees is the legal entity of the institution. The board has the responsibility and authority to govern the college or university in accordance with the charter or articles of incorporation approved for it by the state in which it is located. In some ways the influence of the board goes beyond

¹⁹John Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," in Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, see Ingram 1980, p. 27.

²⁰Nancy Axelrod, A Guide for New Trustees, AGB Pocket Publications, no. 9 (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982), p. 2.

its strictly legal scope, and in some ways it never reaches (or at least exercises) its full legal responsibility. Many experienced trustees feel that fundamental as such legal prescriptions are, still more important is the spirit by which the letter of the law is interpreted and applied. This spirit is to be found in the actual procedure of the board and the personality of its membership. Although it defies description, this elusive thing called "spirit" is intimately related to the influence of the board in any given situation.²¹

The spirit by which a governing board can be identified is in large part a function of how it is organized.

Duke University's Commission on University Governance identifies three types of boards: (1) a controlling board; (2) a passive board; and (3) a supportive board.²²

A controlling board characteristically attempts to "maintain a direct, pervasive, and continuing influence on all major activities within the university."²³ As a result, the action of this type of board tends to be uninformed and at times arbitrary because of the inability of the board members to deal comprehensively with the volumes of information needed to administer an academic institution. The passive board characteristically is associated with those institutions where trusteeship is viewed primarily as an honor. This system of trusteeship

²¹Burns, Trustees in Higher Education, pp. 37-38.

²²Duke University, The Board of Trustees Interim Report of the Commission on University Governance (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 040 655, 1970), pp. 10-11.

²³Ibid., p. 10.

"effectively abdicates its legal authority by passive acquiescence."²⁴ Any and all proposals presented to the passive board by the administration are accepted with little or no discussion. The danger of this type of institutional model is that the administration which assumes the responsibility of the governance of the institution may become unresponsive to other parts of the institution, especially to the faculty and the student body.

The supportive board, which is the model of choice, assumes full responsibility for developing and governing the institution along continuously developing goals.

Zwingle noted that there is a great deal of encroachment upon the power and authority of institutional governing boards from within and without the academy. He contended that if the erosion of authority continues unchecked, institutional governing boards will become increasingly ceremonial and increasingly less a governing body.

"Board strength depends in great measure on the blending of personalities and experience and the careful deployment of these human resources."²⁵ Trustees have an obligation not only to exercise their legal responsibilities, but they have a moral obligation to ensure that the

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵J. L. Zwingle, "Build a Better Board," AGB Reports 18 (May-June, 1976), p. 34.

board is structured and functions so that the institutional mission is fulfilled.

The first duty of the trustees, then, is to understand the purpose of the institution, to determine direction, and to assist in holding a steady course. Purposes may change with changing times, but changes are matters for serious deliberation and sober judgment.²⁶

Trustees of American institutions of higher education no longer can be satisfied with the survival of their individual institutions. They must place the survival of their own institutions within the context of the growth and development of the American higher educational system for the benefit of society, ultimately for whom they hold in trust the assets of their institution.

LEADERSHIP

The administration of a college or university is an increasingly specialized and complex profession, so beset by varied and conflicting demands that it is frequently described as an impossible job. But it is an essential job, and the special task of those who bear primary legal and moral responsibility for a college or university--its trustees--is to see that this job is performed successfully.²⁷

Three of the twelve commonly held responsibilities of trustees can be classified as pertaining to leadership: (1) the appointment of a president; (2) the support of the

²⁶J. L. Zwingle, Effective Trusteeship: Guidelines for Board Members (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982), p. 6.

²⁷Barry Munitz, "Strengthening Institutional Leadership," New Directions for Higher Education 22 (1978): 11-12.

president; and (3) the assurance that the institution is well managed by assessing presidential performance.

The selection and the appointment of a president is one of the most critical matters which the governing board must address.²⁸ This responsibility rests with the board. However the board, in order to fulfill this responsibility, must seek the counsel of those members of the academic community who are well versed in the needs and operations of the institution. In recent years, many institutions have utilized a presidential search committee in the process of choosing a president. This system assists in articulating the qualities that are required for the president of an institution and provides a framework by which to assess the candidate's qualifications.²⁹

In addition to the all-important value of finding the right president, the search and selection process has three other advantages. First, it forces the institution to look critically at itself, its mission, its status, its needs, and its prospects. Second, through their intense cooperation in a common cause, trustees, faculty, students, administrative officers, and others can greatly increase their mutual understanding and trust. And finally, if done well, the choosing of a president can tell the institution's story to a wide audience in a way that will enhance its reputation.³⁰

²⁸Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," p. 28.

²⁹John W. Nason, "Selecting the Chief Executive," in Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, see Ingram 1980, pp. 119-22.

³⁰Ibid., p. 144.

The qualities and criteria established during the selection process are the building blocks by which the board is able to support and assess presidential performance.

The president is the agent of the board of trustees. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the board of trustees to support the actions of the president in the exercise of his or her responsibilities as directed by the governing board.

Tensions between president and governing board, while inevitable, must be minimized for an institution to be effective. The selection and equally important retention of quality executive leadership for colleges and universities are much more likely to be successfully achieved when the governing board is willing to analyze candidly what it is asking of the presidential candidate. In addition, the board must be willing to provide continuing understanding and support for those expectations, and to assess with the president how well those original objectives are being met and how many of them remain relevant in the context of current priorities.³¹

Only through an open and ongoing dialogue will the president and board be able to work as partners.

The chair of the board has a unique opportunity to ensure that the board and the president are fully aware of each other's activities and intentions. The personal relationship between the members of the governing board and the president will determine how well the board and the president fulfill their respective responsibilities.³²

³¹Munitz, "Strengthening Institutional Leadership," pp. 20-21.

³²Zwingle, "Build a Better Board," p. 35.

The working relationship that exists between the president and the chair of the board will greatly affect the overall function of the board and the institution. There must be a clear understanding of the authorities and responsibilities that belong to each position.³³ The president is the spokesperson of the institution, while the chair is the spokesperson of the governing board.³⁴ The blurring of these roles will lead to serious conflicts between the president and the board.

The single greatest contribution to be made to the president by the chairperson is to lead and manage the board well. This means seeing that the limits of the board's role are not breached, that issues addressed are important and time-relevant, that adequate information is available and sufficient time for discussion provided and that required decisions are rendered with all prudent dispatch. In all of this the chairperson should be in continuing consultation with the president as to purpose, procedure, timing and the potential responses of the administration to possible alternative decisions on matters brought to the board table. If the chairperson does not have the desire or personal capability to take on this task of board management and see it through, the chairperson/president team will have a pitifully unbalanced stride.³⁵

The president has the obligation to ensure that the policies of the board are implemented and that the board is fully informed. This often can be accomplished through

³³John W. Pocock, The Board Chairperson and the President, AGB Pocket Publications, no. 8 (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1981), pp. 10-12.

³⁴Zwingle, Effective Trusteeship, p. 28.

³⁵Pocock, The Board Chairperson and the President, p. 4.

ongoing communication with the chair, which allows the chair to assist the president in keeping the board informed.

Pocock pointed out three significant functions in which the president and the chair must join forces: planning, resource allocation, and evaluation.³⁶ These processes will fall short of their intended purpose should the chair and the president fail in maintaining a strong working relationship.

The maintenance of this relationship will allow the process of presidential assessment to occur in a non-threatening constructive atmosphere.

Assessment should occur not only initially as part of the search process but also continuously at predetermined intervals during the president's period of service. Systematic and periodic review provides a candid look at specific challenges confronting the chief executive, resulting in a calmer and more positive context for dealing with those challenges, reduced political tension, and a sound base for a subsequent presidential search whenever it is required; ad hoc or crisis-generated assessments cannot provide these benefits.³⁷

Munitz argues that a positive and constructive evaluation process can aid in the retention of strong educational leaders. This process provides an atmosphere and a framework which enhances the necessary partnership between the board and the president. The danger, as Munitz observed, is

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Munitz, "Strengthening Institutional Leadership," p. 12.

that crisis-generated and crude assessment processes tend to drive away our finest leaders.³⁸

Our challenge is to strengthen the person and the office. If that objective is achieved, then the institution as well as those whom it serves cannot help but benefit.³⁹

Munitz has identified three principal benefits which result from a well conceived and executed assessment process. This process:

- (1) allows the governing board, as a whole, to come to a better understanding of the role, responsibilities, and burdens of the office of the president. Additionally, it allows the president the opportunity to educate the board in the complexities of academic leadership.
- (2) provides the board with an opportunity to view the president's performance in context rather than in the hectic atmosphere of an isolated crisis.
- (3) allows the president to increase the fundamental credibility by which the administrative process is able to deal with the day-to-day implementation of board policy and the problems

³⁸Barry Munitz, "Measuring a President's Performance," AGB Reports 18 (January-February, 1976), pp. 36-37.

³⁹Ibid., p. 40.

of managing a complex institution of higher education.⁴⁰

Additionally, the board will benefit from an ongoing evaluation process by being able to: (1) establish standards by which to appoint, support, and evaluate the president; (2) sharpen the intensity and quality of its own perceptions and understanding of the institution; (3) assist and support the president when correct decisions are unpopular; and (4) be better prepared when the time arrives to begin again the process of a presidential search.⁴¹

As a result of an investigation of sixty-one college and university board chairs and sixty presidents, Robert Cleary has concluded that institutional factors affecting board-president relations must be set in a framework that takes into account the personalities involved as well as the need of mutual trust and respect. These conditions must exist between the board chair and the president so that the board may function properly in fulfilling its responsibilities. He stated:

Conclusions about structure and patterns must be understood in a framework that rests on the importance of personalities. As people interact with one another, the patterns which develop mandate the nature of the trustee-president relationship to a greater extent than anything else does. While this survey indicates that structural and experiential

⁴⁰Munitz, "Strengthening Institutional Leadership," pp. 13-14.

⁴¹Ibid, p. 14.

factors have significance in the relationship, a wise president or chairman will make every conceivable effort to relate personally to his opposite number in such a way as to advance mutually desirable goals and thus serve the best interests of the institution.⁴²

FINANCING AN INSTITUTION

As the ultimate authority of an institution, the governing board has the responsibility to ensure that the institution operates efficiently and effectively so that the assets of the institution are used wisely in order to fulfill the institution's stated mission. In trying to accomplish the mission of the institution, the board has the responsibility: to ensure financial solvency, to approve long-range plans, to assure adequate physical facilities, and to enhance the public image of the institution. Each of the four responsibilities are complex and multifaceted and must be undertaken with care and some attention to detail. These areas are intricately bound together. For example, in order to assure adequate physical facilities, the institution must have the financial resources required to build and maintain these facilities. A plan is needed that details facility requirements which will be necessary to accomplish the educational mission of the institution in the present and future. This may not be

⁴²Robert E. Cleary, "Institutional Factors Affecting Trustee-President Authority Relations," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., March 1980, p. 37.

possible if the institution has a poor image or is held in low esteem by its constituencies.

Boards of trustees were first formed to assist the president and professors of the early colleges in handling the business interests of their institutions. Since 1636 this aspect of the institutions' operations has in many instances, become big business.⁴³

Wise financial and physical asset management is essential for the fulfillment of an institution's mission. In times of tight money, good management may make the difference between success and failure. Trustees play an important role in the monitoring of the institution's assets.

While final authority and responsibility for the budget rests with the board of trustees, a wise board will avoid a line-by-line examination but rather devote its attention to broad policies and priorities reflected in the budget.⁴⁴

Radcock and Jacobson accurately note that trustees, more than any other group in the academic community, are in a better position to preserve and improve the financial health of an institution.⁴⁵ The trustees are sufficiently removed from the day-to-day operation of the institution. Therefore, they are theoretically in a position to ensure that the

⁴³Burns, Trustees in Higher Education, p. 101.

⁴⁴Badgett Dillard, "Financial and Physical Asset Management," in The Good Steward, see Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983, p. 105.

⁴⁵Michael Radcock and Harvey K. Jacobson, "Securing Resources," in Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, see Ingram, 1980, p. 265.

resources of the institution are being used to provide the greatest benefit to the institution and to those it serves.

The management of resources and the development of institutional plans must be linked to the purposes and goals of the institution.⁴⁶ Therefore, the trustees must be fully informed because it is not sufficient for the board to simply examine the bottom line of a balance sheet.

The frustration of many trustees is that the window through which they must view the financial operation of their institution is often obscured and sometimes even distorted. That window is the series of reports on the financial affairs of the institution, and it is often obscured both by the accounting technicalities of the presentation and by the omission of indicators as to program relevance and priority.

This matter of visibility is of critical importance to the individual trustee or regent and to the board as a whole.⁴⁷

The technicalities of which Pocock writes often are alien to individual trustees. Trustees are drawn from many walks of life and the fund accounting system, the system used in the majority of American institutions of higher education, is complex and dissimilar to general business accounting practices. Therefore, the governing board must educate itself and its members in the basic principles of fund accounting. Likewise, the chief financial

⁴⁶Charles A. Nelson, Trustees and Resource Management, AGB Pocket Publications, no. 6 (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982), p. 5.

⁴⁷John W. Pocock, "Reporting Finances," in Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, see Ingram, 1980, pp. 304-05.

officer of the institution must be prepared to explain and reconcile financial reports with the programs and activities of the institution.

The concepts of fund accounting are relatively simple. The procedural mechanics are more complex but can be left to the accountant.

The concepts of fund accounting stem directly from the stewardship or fiduciary role of trustees; that is, from their responsibility to hold in trust for the benefit of others those funds and assets that come to the institution. Donors and legislatures specify the uses to which their funds are to be put, and it is the obligation of the trustee to see that these directions (restrictions) are honored.⁴⁸

In order to fulfill this fiduciary role, the governing board must be concerned with the acquisition of, and the expenditure of, the institution's resources. Funds are received through a variety of sources: student tuition and fees, subsidies from sponsoring bodies (i.e., government agencies and religious communities), government entitlement programs, private donors, investment income, and the sale of services.

Each source has its unique opportunities and limitations. This diversity of sources requires a continuing understanding by the board of the mix, trends and causative factors at work, so that financial strategies and policies can be developed.⁴⁹

The generating of income and the underlying policies are often neglected by governing boards. Yet, the financial health of an institution and its ability to support the

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 310.

⁴⁹Ibid., p. 313.

institution's educational activities and programs are dependent on the inflow of resources to the institution. Individual trustees as agents of the governing board can play a significant role in the acquisition of income. Again, this role requires a thorough understanding of the institution and the context within which it operates. Trustees can be of assistance in the budget hearings of governmental funding agencies and state legislatures. They also can be actively involved in the recruitment and retention of students and grants--both of which are important sources of funds for an institution. Some trustees who possess an expertise in the financial world can use their knowledge to oversee and consult on the investment portfolio of the institution. Trustees also can contribute their own funds to the institution and encourage others to do likewise.

Nations appoint ambassadors to represent their political and economic interests. Ambassadors travel with high rank, are given certain privileges by international agreement, and are accorded respect as part of protocol governing such matters.

Trustees, as sponsors, serve primarily in the role of ambassadors of the institution. As ambassador, the trustee represents the institution to important constituencies and to important leaders in those constituencies, works assiduously to have the programs and policies of the institution understood by those constituencies, and works to gain their friendship and support. In addition, the trustee interprets to other members of the board and the management of the institution the attitudes and needs of the consti-

tuencies that must be understood and factored into the making of institutional policy.⁵⁰

As ambassadors, as bridges if you will, the trustee is at the very heart--the very pinnacle--of responsibility for winning sponsorship and support, and trustees should expect to take personal leadership in this responsibility. In this role, they affect the very future of the institution because they are the individuals who deal with the important decision makers, the powerful political figures, the potential major donors, the heads of influential business and industry, and the leaders who wield great social power and influence.⁵¹

Like the ambassadors of nations, trustees cannot act independently of their institutions. The trustee who is representing his or her institution must be involved in an ongoing dialogue with the president and other administrative officials of the institution. This is necessary to insure a coordinated effect in lobbying and fund raising. An uncoordinated or conflicting campaign to gain external support for the institution can be detrimental to the overall efforts and welfare of the institution. Few donors or organizations will want to contribute to the support of an institution that is so poorly organized and managed as to allow conflicting solicitations and presentations to infiltrate and typify its campaign for support.

Success in goals and programs for institutional advancement is neither a natural nor an accidental happening. Success in the ultimate goals of student recruitment and philanthropic asset building

⁵⁰Francis C. Pray, "Trustees Must be Ambassadors," in Trustees Role in Advancement, see Frantzreb, 1981, p. 13.

⁵¹Ibid., pp. 15-16.

must be the result of a studied design. Those organizations that design their destiny will be here to achieve even greater service to mankind. Those who do not will experience increased tribulation.⁵²

As with the acquisition of resources, the governing board must be concerned with setting policies that govern the allocation and expenditure of the institution's resources. The development of a budget is the process where the institution allocates its limited resources to those activities and programs that best fulfill the institution's mission. The trustees are responsible for making certain that these resources are allocated according to the priorities and guidelines that they established.

The board must ask the administration to justify its budget in relation to the board's established goals. This can best be done by asking hard questions in a nonthreatening atmosphere.⁵³ In examining the budget, trustees must always be aware of the implications that a budget has not only on present activities but the future of the institution as well. How will the expenditure of funds this year effect the long-term financial health of the institution? This question is frequently overlooked. Short-sighted financial management may embark an institution on a path

⁵²Arthur C. Frantzreb, "Advancement is Seldom Accidental," in Trustees Role in Advancement, see Frantzreb, 1981, p. 49.

⁵³Joseph P. O'Neill and Samuel Barnett, "Check Your College's Vital Signs," AGB Reports 23 (May-June 1981), pp. 40-41.

to financial disaster from which it may not be able to return. Short-term solutions may be the cause of long-term problems.

Several case studies of colleges which closed during the 1970s indicate that many of the trustees of those institutions were surprised by the colleges' financial crisis. A frequent reaction was to ask, "Why didn't we see it coming? We knew we were in trouble, but not like this . . ."

These trustees did not receive, nor did they demand, trend-line data, financial reports, and general status reports in a readily understandable form. Unfortunately, at too many colleges there is a tendency for trustees to refrain from asking the hard questions.⁵⁴

As mentioned earlier, an important responsibility of the governing board is the overseeing of the physical plant. The board is obligated to ensure that the physical plant is adequate to support the academic and social programs of the institutions. In addition to acquiring and constructing campus facilities, the board is responsible for determining that these facilities are properly maintained.

A trap many institutions have fallen into is that during hard economic times administrators try to defer expenditures for maintenance of the physical plant. Such action results in hidden liabilities that could undermine the financial solvency of the institution at a later date. Trustees have an obligation to be aware of the state of the physical plant and the administration's plan for its maintenance.

⁵⁴Ibid., p. 36.

If no plan exists, then the trustees must question its absence.

An especially heavy responsibility falls on the trustees when new construction is under consideration. An ugly or inefficient or badly sited building is likely to plague the campus for a hundred years or more. Beyond that, there is the problem of unnecessary building; the "edifice complex" is as common an affliction of college presidents as hoarding books is among librarians. A substantial number of institutions are in financial difficulty today because of over-building in the sixties; if these institutions had simply maintained the plant existing in the previous decade, they would have sufficient space for current enrollment and would not be burdened with debt service on buildings now discovered to be unnecessary.

When debt is to be incurred, trustees must always ask: How is it to be serviced? . . . That question should be answered satisfactorily before the building contract is approved.

Caution must also be exercised in the acceptance of gifts or grants for new structures. Frequently the funds offered are not adequate to meet the full cost of construction; rarely do they provide continuing support for maintenance of the building. As energy and personnel costs rise, it becomes more and more evident that there are some gifts an institution simply cannot afford to accept.⁵⁵

A trustee does not have to be an industrial engineer in order to fulfill these responsibilities. He or she only needs to be informed and willing to ask questions of the administrative officers, faculty, students, alumni, and staff of an institution.

Trustees should be involved in decisions relating to new construction at the following points: (1) approval of the program that requires the facility; (2) agreement

⁵⁵Charles A. Nelson, "Managing Resources," in Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, see Ingram 1980, pp. 346-47.

that it needs to be built; (3) selection of the architect; and (4) approval of the plans; . . .⁵⁶

As a part of the proper exercise of its fiduciary responsibilities, the governing board must approve all institutional planning. However, simple approval of a plan in its final form falls short of this responsibility. Since the board has the ability to initiate and improve the planning process, it should take an active role in the development of the plan. As with the fulfillment of other areas of responsibility which trustees are obligated to perform, the planning process must be rooted in the mission of the institution.

Clark Kerr has presented a challenge to trustees--that they assure forward motion for their institutions and not be sidetracked by what he calls the "current survivalist mentality" of many in the academic community.⁵⁷ A plan must account for the future and what is projected to occur. It must be reviewed and updated to remain useful. The future of higher education is not always bright. However, the doom and gloom of difficult times can be lightened by solid and realistic planning.

The lean years that loom ahead suggest that for all institutions, large and small, planning will have to be a regular occupation, not something undertaken

⁵⁶Dillard, "Financial and Physical Asset Management," p. 107.

⁵⁷Clark Kerr, "Trustee Job Assignments," AGB Reports 16 (1974), p. 2.

in a major way once every ten years and then forgotten in between. The plan must set guidelines for all institutional action and, on this ground alone, must be constantly reassessed and altered if necessary. No plan is automatically self-fulfilling, especially when rapidly changing outside conditions can make the best of judgments out of date overnight. Moreover, no plan will be of any help if it is not taken seriously by the institution. Many elaborate plans have been printed up only to be put on a shelf and forgotten. Plans are made to be questioned and revised, but they are also made to be carried out.⁵⁸

The most important responsibility that the board has in regard to planning is to see that it is carried out. This has been an area where many boards have failed in the past. In addition, the board has the responsibility to insist on high quality planning. This can be accomplished partially by providing a sufficient staff and resources needed to carry out the process. A primary ingredient ensuring quality planning is the positive attitude by board members regarding the need for long-range, ongoing planning and their willingness to participate in the process.

The trustees must insist that the plan be realistic and feasible. A false sense of institutional pride or the desire to cling to dated or inappropriate traditions is detrimental to the planning process and to the health of an institution. A candid assessment of institutional strengths and weaknesses

⁵⁸Rhoda M. Dorsey, "Engaging in Institutional Planning," in Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, see Ingram, 1980, p. 147.

must be part of the planning process.⁵⁹ This process should result in a master plan approved by the board and used as a reference for the activities of the institution.⁶⁰

The final responsibility of the board with regard to the planning process is to make certain that the plan works. This may be accomplished by evaluating the outcome of the existing plan. Then, after assessing these outcomes, future planning is possible.

Standing outside the institution and involved in their own business and professional activities, trustees can take a detached view of the academic scene. They are less likely to lose sight of the educational forest by being lost among academic trees. They can ask the tough questions the answer to which may well be the price of survival.⁶¹

Those organizations that recognize the validity of objective, long-range planning based upon forces, issues, trends, market analyses, and comprehensive data and those that recognize the validity of sales management, institutional marketing, cost-effective communications, and publications that promote the entire institution (including fund-raising promotion) have a greater probability for future security than those organizations that ignore reality for the comfortable status quo.⁶²

The board should be the master of the plan--not mastered by it.

⁵⁹Ibid., p. 150.

⁶⁰Dillard, "Financial and Physical Asset Management," p. 107.

⁶¹Nason, The Nature of Trusteeship, p. 35.

⁶²Frantzreb, "Advancement is Seldom Accidental," p. 49.

INSTITUTIONAL MISSION

Every college and university was created to serve one or more specific purposes: to provide an educated ministry in colonial days; to prepare citizens who could cope with the problems and prospects of a new democratic society; to train young people in the arts and skills necessary for an honest living; to safeguard the true faith; to train school teachers; to carry on research in science and technology; or--simply stated but not so simply achieved--to encourage young men and women to explore and develop their inherent potentialities. Over the years and under the pressure of changing circumstances, these original purposes or missions have frequently been modified. Locally centered institutions have become regional or national. Church founded and controlled colleges have sought to break the dominance of the denominations and the limitation in clientele. Normal schools have become full-fledged institutions of arts and sciences. Teaching colleges aspire to become research-oriented universities. Sometimes these changes take place because of a sharp awareness of new social needs, sometimes because of a general institutional urge to improve its position in the academic pecking order.⁶³

Whatever the original mission or the mission that has evolved from societal or institutional influences, the governing board of an institution of higher education has a key role to play in clarifying and articulating the ongoing mission of the institution. An institution's statement of mission sums up the academic identity of the institution. It lays down the foundations of educational philosophy upon which the academic community seeks to build and fulfill the aims and purposes of the educational institution. The statement of institutional mission is

⁶³Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," p. 33.

the pivotal commitment to society around which all the activities of instruction, research, and services of an institution must revolve.

At first glance, the formulation and the articulation of an institutional statement of mission may seem to be a straightforward and uncontroversial exercise. However, the vested interests of the many constituencies which comprise an academic community make this process a complex and extremely vital activity of the institution. Different members of the academic community and different constituencies within the institution understand and express what they believe to be the appropriate mission of the institution. At times, these understandings and expressions are diverse and conflicting.⁶⁴

The formulation of a mission statement must be a joint venture of faculty, staff, students, and other concerned constituencies. However, the trustees must act as the catalyst to coordinate and process the diverse interests and ideas of each of these groups.⁶⁵ The trustees have a responsibility to perceive the differences of each group and to help them to work together to build a mosaic which

⁶⁴Carol J. Guardo, "Defining the Mission of a University," Case Currents (September 1982), pp 24-27.

⁶⁵Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," p. 34.

will give rise to a clear picture of direction and purpose of the institution.⁶⁶

If a school lacks a mission statement, the trustees should initiate a process for creating one; if a statement exists, the trustees should periodically review it. A task force of board, administration, faculty and students should devise the mission statement as a consensus document expressing concisely the school's distinctiveness and charting its course.⁶⁷

The governing board should not write the statement of mission because they may lack the necessary expertise to formulate a comprehensive statement.⁶⁸ However, they possess a certain amount of objectivity by which to promote the marriage of ideas and concerns that may be proposed by the various constituencies of the institution.

Development, renewal, and growth come mainly from uncovering, stimulating, or enticing people within the organization to bring new fervor and imagination to their tasks.⁶⁹

This statement accurately sums up the responsibility of the governing board in regard to mission formation and review. The board must be the agent of change and development. The unplanned change of an institution's mission may lead to dangerous consequences. Without a master plan

⁶⁶Zwingle, Effective Trusteeship, pp. 4-6.

⁶⁷John H. Tietjen, "Planning, Mission Goals, Programs," in The Good Steward, see Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983, p. 67.

⁶⁸Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," p. 34.

⁶⁹George Keller, "A Change in Plans: The View From Four Colleges," Change (March 1983), p. 36.

that is rooted in a sense of mission, an institution may become a collection of individuals, each doing what he or she believes aids the fulfillment of her or his own personally perceived purpose of the institution. This can lead to an uncoordinated and unproductive use of the institution's limited resources. However, planned change grounded in and directed by a set of goals developed from a clear understanding of institutional mission can lead to a vibrant academic community where all members and society as a whole are the beneficiaries of this change.

Closely allied to the mission statement and flowing from it is the statement of institutional goals, usually made in the form of lists of specific goals. Statements of institutional goals tend to be broader than mission statements in that they cover all areas of institutional activity, and more specific in that they attempt to refine the generalized rhetoric that is characteristic of mission statements. Together, mission and goals statements characterize the institution for itself, its students, and the outside world. At their best, they give guidelines for the development of academic and nonacademic institutional programs and a yardstick against which institutional activities may be evaluated. They are, therefore, enormously important to an institution, and trustees must play an important part in their development.⁷⁰

Too often, mission statements are ignored by the institution. They are ceremoniously displayed in catalogues, commencement speeches and fund-raising campaigns. Then, they are quickly returned to the file drawer in the archives from which they are infrequently retrieved. Trustees must

⁷⁰Rhoda M. Dorsey, Institutional Planning, AGB Pocket Publications, no. 11 (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1984), p. 11.

insist that they be kept, not in the archives, but in the active files of every department and office on campus. All institutional activities must flow from and contribute to the fulfillment of the institution's mission. Therefore, the governing board has a moral obligation to clarify and to see to the implementation of the institution's statement of mission.

ACADEMIC RESPONSIBILITIES

The three areas of trustee responsibility that will be considered under the section of academic responsibilities are: (1) overseeing the educational program of the institution; (2) preserving the autonomy of the institution; and (3) serving as a court of appeal.

A. Educational Programming.

The governing board has a moral as well as a legal responsibility to ensure the quality of an institution's educational programs. The extent to which the governing board is involved with the development and implementation of the institution's academic programs is a topic of much debate.

As colleges and universities grew more complex and educational programs burgeoned, trustees turned over their original responsibility for the content of education to the president whom they had chosen for his or her professional competence in this sphere. In this century, pressure from faculty, along with the proliferation of managerial responsibilities, brought about a further transfer of authority for educational programs from president to faculty. At least faculty have felt for a long time that, as experts, they should have the dominant voice in deciding what should

be taught and that trustees should stay clear of what is not properly their business. Conventional practice, at least in this century, has assigned responsibility for finances and physical plant to the trustees and reserved responsibility for the educational program to the president and faculty.⁷¹

By and large, the members of the faculty and the administration feel that they have the expertise necessary to develop and oversee the academic programs.⁷² However, they often neglect the activities required to maintain the institution and provide the resources necessary for the fulfillment of the educational mission of the institution. These activities include fund raising, public relations, and long-range planning. The faculty is often quite willing to relegate these activities to the trustees.

They [the faculty] want only to feel secure about academic programs and their own independence and about other matters in proportion as they reinforce and support those two concerns. On those matters they believe that the first and final word belongs to them--should belong to them, at any rate. They are, after all, the experts.⁷³

To think that the trustees can abdicate or delegate their responsibilities for the academic affairs of an institution is nonsense.⁷⁴ How would a governing board be

⁷¹Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," p. 36.

⁷²Harold C. Martin, "Trustees and Academic Policy," AGB Reports 17 (1974), pp. 10-11.

⁷³Ibid.

⁷⁴Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," p. 36.

able to fulfill its legal or moral obligations if this were the case?

Trustees are expected to remain at a respectful distance from the curriculum. However, they have an important role to play, even though at times this role may not be clearly defined.⁷⁵

After all, colleges and universities exist for little but their academic programs, and most people recognize that American trustees hold supreme authority in the governance of institutions. Trustees tend to be more directly involved in academic programs in schools with strong sectarian missions; with local, teaching faculties rather than more cosmopolitan, research-oriented ones; and during times of unrest rather than times of quiescence. Moderation even in querying educational programs has nonetheless become the norm among trustees.⁷⁶

The governing board must exercise its responsibilities for the formulation of educational policy in conjunction with the academic community.

Nason cautions trustees that, while they have the final authority, they should: (1) "listen very carefully to the recommendations of the president; and (2) should not meddle with [the internal workings of] the curriculum."⁷⁷ This is sound advice. While the trustees have an objective and broad institutional view of the educational program,

⁷⁵Martin Meyerson, "Overseeing Academic Programs," in Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, see Ingram, 1980, pp. 175-78.

⁷⁶Ibid., pp. 173-74.

⁷⁷Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," p. 37.

they clearly are not the experts in the area of curriculum development. Thus, the fundamental virtue of a board's involvement in overseeing the academic program lies not in the board's expertise in academic affairs but in providing a sound and separate perspective. "To be sound, however, the perspective must be an informed perspective, and solid information serves best when it is continuous. . . ."78 Thus, the role which the governing board must assume is that of policy making, setting the policy by which the faculty, in exercising its responsibilities, develop and implement the curriculum in keeping with the policy guidelines established by the board.

In order to fulfill its responsibilities in this matter, the board must rely on the president as well as other administrative and academic officers of the institution. The authority for development and implementation of the curriculum is diffused throughout the organizational structure of the institution. Schools, departments, deans and directors all have varying degrees of authority in the overseeing of the academic programs of an institution.

This diffusion of authority has three implications for the proper role of trustees in academic oversight. First, trustees must be prepared to buttress the authority of the president and other officers when necessary; they must be sensitive to the very great vulnerability of a president, provost, dean, or other officer who is not so backed. Second, trustees must recognize that presidents and other

⁷⁸Martin, "Trustees and Academic Policy," p. 12.

officers can weary of the struggle to exercise even their limited powers and thus may abdicate too much responsibility to schools and departments. Thus, trustees must continue to insist on an accountability from presidents and other officers that they rightfully exercise their central responsibility. Third--a caveat upon the preceding point--trustees must have sufficient understanding of and patience with the canons of collegial governance so that they do not pressure presidents or other officers into needless and potentially destructive confrontations with faculty over questions that involve the fragile balance of academic authority.⁷⁹

Thus, the oversight of educational programs by trustees in reality is oversight of the performance of the president and officials of the institution. In addition to being concerned about the programs that are being offered, the trustees must be concerned with the composition and the support of the faculty.

Trustees also must be attentive to the employment conditions of the faculty in order to ensure a healthy faculty and curriculum. "No board of trustees should permit the administration to be casual about the procedures of employment, continuance, promotion and dismissal."⁸⁰ Martin suggests four considerations that the trustees must take seriously when assessing the health of the faculty. They are: (1) quality--as much as the institution can afford and attract with its limited resources; (2) renewal--to assure a continuous flow of fresh talent into

⁷⁹Meyerson, "Overseeing Academic Programs," p. 176.

⁸⁰Martin, "Trustees and Academic Policy," p. 16.

the institution; (3) flexibility--to ensure that new needs are able to be met as they develop; and (4) economy--that the institution is receiving the greatest value from the resources available.⁸¹

In the minds of many of an institution's constituencies, the quality of an institution often is tied to the quality and reputation of the faculty. Therefore, the policies that the board establishes regarding the management of faculty and the establishment of tenure procedures have a significant effect on the overall institution. The board should have a working knowledge of the following inter-relations in order to set tenure policy: (1) existing bylaws, rules, regulations and relevant statutes that affect tenure procedures; (2) current contract and negotiation agreements, particularly those that directly affect the staffing of programs; (3) the institution's affirmative action program; (4) the institution's budget; (5) the institution's priorities; and (6) a profile of the faculty on staff at the institution.⁸² In addition, it is imperative that the board comprehend the meaning of tenure, the rights and privileges associated with it,

⁸¹Meyerson, "Overseeing Academic Programs," p. 182.

⁸²Richard P. Chait and Andrew T. Ford, The Tenure Issue, AGB Pocket Publications, no. 7 (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1977), pp. 8-9.

and associated controversies.⁸³ A working understanding of the pros and cons of the tenure issue is necessary prior to the establishment or revision of tenure policies.

Once the board has established tenure policies, its role changes. The board does not perform indepth examinations into the character or competencies of an individual faculty member. The procedure and policies approved by the board should be sufficient guidelines for the academic administration to carry out these tasks.

The recruitment and selection of new faculty, along with the review and promotion of existing faculty, are perhaps the most important responsibilities of academic administrators. Undertaken in conjunction with the faculty, these are among the most cherished duties in academic life. There is little role for trustees in evaluating faculty for appointment or promotion, even though in most institutions trustees will be asked formally to approve and legally to bind the institution to these decisions. (In awarding tenure, they may obligate resources and constrain future choices for thirty years or more.) Trustees can and must, however, examine closely the procedures, the criteria, and the rigor of judgment by which these recommendations are brought to them. Trustees must also examine closely the direction, support, and rewards that are given existing faculty to the end of best serving the purposes of the institution.⁸⁴

The board will have to take into account the state of the institution, the needs of the faculty, and the educational programs of the institution when making decisions to grant tenure to an individual. Thus, the board's role should be

⁸³Richard P. Chait, "Setting Tenure and Personnel Policies," in Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, see Ingram, 1980, pp. 210-13.

⁸⁴Meyerson, "Overseeing Academic Programs," pp. 181-82.

to raise questions regarding how the individual faculty member's strengths meet the needs of the institution.⁸⁵

As a rule, if the board feels assured that the prescribed process has been followed and the appropriate criteria applied, there should be little cause to review individual tenure decisions. The board may receive these assurances formally or informally from the president or from its normal review of faculty portfolios.⁸⁶

The board must be careful not to violate its own procedures by interfering with established policies on an individual basis. On the other hand, the board must not abrogate its responsibility to ensure a quality faculty. The tenure issue is a complex responsibility in which the members of the governing board must be well versed and diligent in carrying out.

B. Institutional Autonomy.

The second area of responsibility, examined under the heading of academic affairs, is the preservation of institutional autonomy. The governing board has a duty to defend the institution from interference so that its educational mission is maintained.

The freedom of the university to manage its internal affairs without outside interference has never been absolute, but it has been substantial. The nature of the educational enterprise requires a high degree of autonomy. The capacity for independent thought will not flourish under thought control. The university's function as a critic of society presupposes a certain independence from the society being criticized. With

⁸⁵Chait and Ford, The Tenure Issue, pp. 9-10.

⁸⁶Ibid., p. 9.

the support of understanding trustees, real progress has been made in institutional autonomy.⁸⁷

Academic freedom is the cornerstone of the American higher education system. The board of trustees must guarantee that the free exchange of ideas exists.

Simply put, one of the responsibilities of governing boards is to defend the institution they govern--to defend their existence, their programs and operations, their right to manage their own affairs. One of the great contributions of the modern college or university is its role as a critic of society. It can perform this role only as long as it is protected from those who would silence its criticisms or twist them to serve some ulterior end. This is why academic freedom is so important, why boards of trustees must not permit outside groups or extremists within (such as the radical left during the turbulence of the sixties and early seventies) to muzzle the voices expressing unpopular positions. Colleges and universities pride themselves on teaching students to think for themselves. This cannot be done without a guarantee of academic freedom.⁸⁸

The better the governing board fulfills its responsibilities in the areas of academic programming, faculty-personnel management and articulation of the mission of the institution to its constituencies, the easier it will be to safeguard the autonomy of the institution. In addition, a financially healthy institution will be in a better position to hold off critics who try to pressure the institution and erode its independence. The issue of autonomy, then, is closely tied to the overall functioning of the institution.

C. Academic Board of Review.

⁸⁷Nason, "The Nature of Trusteeship," p. 39.

⁸⁸Nason, "Responsibilities of the Governing Board," p. 41.

The final responsibility to be classified under the general heading of academic affairs is the governing board's ability to act as a final court of appeal. As the legal authority of the institution, the governing board must ensure that policies are established to protect the rights and responsibilities of all members of the academic community. They must also make certain that the policies and procedures are being followed. Trustees also must guarantee that due process--the provisions and procedures--are carried out. However, they should not interfere with the proper exercise of the duties of college officials.

One hopes that, if the procedures are orderly and fair and if the administration acts with intelligence, most cases will be resolved before reaching the board. But when they do come to the board, the trustees must decide on the merits of the case. The president and deans may not always be right. If they are not, the board must be prepared to rule against them. If this happens very often, however, it may indicate that the time has come to look for a new president.⁸⁹

In this age of litigation, a governing board would be irresponsible not to hear cases that are referred to it on appeal. However, trustees can undermine the authority of the president and his or her administration should they too casually overrule decisions that have been properly adjudicated.

⁸⁹Ibid., p. 45.

BOARD MAINTENANCE

The final responsibility of a governing board is that of self-assessment. The board must examine and judge its own performance and contribution to the enhancement of the institution's mission. The board should be receptive to criticism from its members and other constituencies. The credibility of a board would be severely curtailed if its members failed to meet this responsibility.

The board has no more right to be above assessment of its performance than the president or any other part of the organization. If improvement can be made, let it begin with the governing board, which thereby will set an example to the rest of the institution.⁹⁰

To assess their performance, the trustees must have a realistic understanding of their authority, their structure, their responsibilities, and the mission of their institution. The framework by which a board operates is only a tool by which human beings attempt to fulfill a trust that they have accepted on behalf of society and their constituents. Ideally, a governing board should function so that its members need not be concerned with its structure. However, few boards operate in an ideal atmosphere.⁹¹ In order that the governing board use its limited time effectively and efficiently, it occasionally must assess its own performance.

⁹⁰Ibid., p. 46.

⁹¹Cyril O. Houle, The Effective Board (New York: Association Press, 1966), pp. 51-52.

The process by which trustees are selected and prepared for membership on the governing board can either enhance or inhibit the overall effectiveness and efficiency of the board. Suggestions emerge in the literature that governing boards which provide strong leadership, and are viewed by their constituencies as having a realistic understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of their institutions, are those boards which are concerned about trustee selection, orientation, deployment and continuing education. Although not considered major areas of trustee responsibility, these supplemental areas of concern are necessary ingredients for achievement of the primary responsibility of the governing board--that of stewardship.

SELECTION OF BOARD MEMBERS

The process of selecting members of a governing board is unique to each institution. Generally, there are three major processes by which individuals are selected to become members of a governing board: (1) the governing board may extend an invitation to an individual to serve on the board; (2) members may be appointed by an outside authority; or (3) members may be elected by some constituency of the institution.⁹²

The president of the institution has an important role in the selection and appointment of individuals to the

⁹²Ibid, pp. 27-31.

governing board. In the public sector, the president may have the opportunity to recommend to the appointing authority the names and qualifications of individuals whom he or she feels would contribute to the institution. Likewise, in the private sector, the president must be prepared to recommend names of qualified individuals to the board or the sponsoring body.⁹³

A board need not be made up of the president's friends, but it should include the kinds of people who can contribute significantly to the well-being of the institution and are compatible with the chief executive.⁹⁴

Success in building a strong board comes from recruiting and selecting people who will be committed to the institution they are being asked to govern.⁹⁵ Therefore, the institution must know who and what it is in order to ask people to become committed to it. An understanding and realistic appraisal of the mission, direction, needs, strengths, and weaknesses of the institution will assist in the selection of the most appropriate candidates to serve as members of the governing board.

⁹³Burns, Trustees in Higher Education, pp. 63-64.

⁹⁴Robert L. Gale, "Selecting and Deploying Trustees," in Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, see Ingram, 1980, p. 48.

⁹⁵Dayton Hultgren and Mary Bigelow McMillan, "Trustee Selection, Recruitment, Development, and Assessment," in The Good Steward, see Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983, pp. 48-49.

These are concerns that the president and board should examine together. The board and president of a private institution, once they agree on the fundamentals of their joint enterprise, can move to the nominating committee stage, and begin consideration of board composition. In so doing they may proceed in four steps: (1) decide what specific skills are needed on the board, (2) establish a search-and-recruit procedure, (3) establish an orientation procedure, and (4) establish a procedure for terminating service.⁹⁶

Burns enumerates the desired qualifications as he understands them from his reading of the literature.

- (1) A college education
- (2) An active interest in the institution
- (3) A genuine interest in higher education
- (4) Ability to attend meetings and work on behalf of the institution
- (5) Reasonable economic stability
- (6) A good reputation in business or professional life
- (7) A good reputation in the community for sound character and moral judgment.⁹⁷

Often the selection and appointment of trustees in the private sector has been unduly influenced by a candidate's wealth or access to wealth that he or she may steer to the institution. In the public sector, membership in the "right" political party has at times outweighed other more important criteria.⁹⁸ It is shortsighted to select a candidate on the basis of one or two qualities. To fulfill their responsibilities, trustees must have a combination of qualities that will provide depth and breadth to their service on the board. Institutions sponsored by a religious body or

⁹⁶Gale, "Selecting and Deploying Trustees," p. 48.

⁹⁷Burns, Trustees in Higher Education, pp. 65-66.

⁹⁸Ibid.

a special interest group must consider a candidate's qualifications in light of the specialized identity that is inherent in these institutions as a result of the sponsorship of a particular group.⁹⁹

The Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges established the National Commission on College and University Trustee Selection. The Commission studied a variety of institutions and published two reports that make specific recommendations for the improvement of trustee selection in both the private and public sectors. Below is a summary of the recommendation which was published regarding the selection of trustees of private colleges and universities.

They include: each board should have a standing committee on trustees for the maintenance of the quality and appropriateness of the board: the search for trustees should be continuous and broad, with four steps of screening: trustee evaluation should be performed for those seeking reappointment: established procedures should be followed: invitations should be personally extended by the most appropriate trustee and the president, and should include specified information: thorough and systematic orientations should be performed by the board: no trustee should serve more than 12 consecutive years, with a one-year sabbatical between terms: terms should be for three or four years: boards of church-related institutions should include substantial numbers of lay persons: students and faculty should not be voting members of their own institutions' boards: each board should establish procedures for dealing with a trustee's potential conflict of interest: and alumni associations

⁹⁹Thomas Savage, S.J. "The Board's Role in Maintaining Institutional Identity," Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education 4 (Winter 1984), p. 3.

should be encouraged to participate in nomination of a limited number of trustees.¹⁰⁰

ORIENTATION AND CONTINUING EDUCATION OF TRUSTEES

Trustees who possess the qualities needed to govern an institution of higher education need to be educated in their specific responsibilities as members of a governing board. Far too often, qualified people are discouraged in exercising their responsibilities simply because they are unaware of their proper role as members of a governing board of higher education.¹⁰¹

It is erroneous to assume that simply because a trustee sits on a corporate board of directors, or is a brilliant professional man, or is a staff member of another university, he is (upon election) automatically and immediately prepared to serve as an enlightened trustee. Even if he has served as a trustee in another institution, he may not know enough about his new institution to operate at optimum effectiveness. In virtually every instance, it is incumbent upon the trustee to welcome orientation, education and training.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, Recommendations for Improving Trustee Selection in Private Colleges and Universities. A Report from the National Commission on College and University Trustee Selection, (Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 194 028, 1980), p. 1.

¹⁰¹Gale, "Selecting and Deploying Trustees," pp. 57-58.

¹⁰²Burns, Trustees in Higher Education, p. 68.

The orientation and education of new and old trustees is an investment in the future that institutions cannot afford to neglect.¹⁰³ "Whether the board is public or private, a well-conducted orientation process is essential."¹⁰⁴

In the past, this process has been neglected. In a 1977 study, Leonard C. Romney reported that while trustees should be well grounded in the mission and background of their institutions, many of the trustees in his study felt unfamiliar with their institutions and their operations.¹⁰⁵

Although Romney's study cannot be generalized because of the limited scope of his design, it does indicate that attention is needed in the areas of trustee orientation and education.

Trustees are responsible for their own education. They should not delegate this responsibility. On the other hand, they need not conduct the orientation and educational programs themselves. A trustee committee, such as the membership, nomination or orientation committee, should

¹⁰³Richard T. Ingram, Trustee Orientation and Development Programs, AGB Pocket Publications, no. 2 (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1981), p. 1.

¹⁰⁴Gale, "Selecting and Deploying Trustees," p. 57.

¹⁰⁵Leonard C. Romney, "Productivity Assessment: A Study of Faculty, Administrator and Trustee Performances," Paper presented to the American College Personnel Association Convention, Denver, March 27-30, 1977, pp. 8-9.

have the responsibility of planning, overseeing and ensuring that these programs do take place and that they meet the needs of the board.¹⁰⁶ The board must rely on the expertise of the president and officers of the institution to provide much of the information they require to understand the role of the governing board and the nature of the institution.

A grievous error would be made if it was assumed that an individual trustee can receive and process all the information necessary to function efficiently as a member of a governing board simply by exposing herself or himself to an orientation program. Trustee education must be understood as a program for long-range development that will lead to an active and well-informed board.¹⁰⁷

Too often the assumption that trustees are reluctant to set aside additional time for either self-renewal or institutional renewal becomes a convenient excuse for not conducting a retreat--a kind of self-fulfilling prophecy. Trustees will respond to reasonable requests for their time and attention if they have reason to think that they will be rewarded with a first-rate experience.¹⁰⁸

Often the failure of trustee educational programs stems from a failure of those persons who are planning and presenting the program to understand its objectives. The

¹⁰⁶Gale, "Selecting and Deploying Trustees," p. 57.

¹⁰⁷Ingram, Trustee Orientation and Development Programs, pp. 5-9.

¹⁰⁸Richard T. Ingram, "Assuring Trustee Orientation and Development," in Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, see Ingram, 1980, p. 94.

trustee committee which oversees the education of the board, in conjunction with the chief executive and the chair of the board, must clearly define the objectives of the educational process. Long-term and short-term objectives should be established and periodically reviewed to ensure that they are meeting the needs of the board and the institution.¹⁰⁹ The development of these objectives can be assisted by the assessment process through which the board comes to an understanding of its strengths and weaknesses.

TRUSTEE DEVELOPMENT

The excitement and enthusiasm that a trustee gains by participating in a well conceived and executed orientation program can easily be undermined by having nothing to do while serving on the board.¹¹⁰ A way to avoid this deflating experience is to assign new trustees to active committees where they will have the opportunity to put their enthusiasm to good use. Assignments should be made to best fill the needs of the institution and the the board, while considering the talents of the individuals involved. However, care must be taken so that trustees are not pigeonholed on the basis of insufficient information. For example, the talents of a banker might not be best utilized on the Finance

¹⁰⁹Ingram, Trustee Orientation and Development Programs, p. 6.

¹¹⁰Gale, "Selecting and Deploying Trustees," p. 59.

Committee. The Educational Policy Committee might get more work and support from the banker because his or her interests might lie in program development.

Boards which meet infrequently (which is the case with many private institutions) should also make an effort to keep in contact with the new trustee between meetings. Once an individual has become a board member, it is important to extend an effort to encourage and maintain the level of commitment of the individual similar to the effort expended to recruit that individual. Too often, the enthusiasm and commitment of good trustees to an institution has waned because of a failure on the part of the academic community to encourage and involve these individuals in the activities of the institution other than board meetings.

What does one finally look for in a good board member? Perhaps the most important ingredients are intelligence, good judgment, and the ability to ask the right questions. Persons possessing these qualities, fortified with an effective orientation program, will become useful and productive trustees. Also keep in mind that the more experienced trustees can profit from occasional redeployment of their abilities, interest, and energies through new assignments and participation in special activities outside regular board business. An alert chief executive and board chairman, together with the chairman of the nominating committee in the case of an independent institution, can accomplish a great deal. Good strategy coupled with patience and time will build an effective governing board.¹¹¹

¹¹¹Ibid., pp. 61-62.

The role which the governing board plays and the numerous responsibilities which it must fulfill make the job of a good trustee in higher education today a demanding one. The quality of American institutions of higher education will be ensured only if the many thousands of men and women who serve on governing boards understand and take seriously the moral and legal obligations of college and university trusteeship. The model that can be gleaned from the practical experience of successful institutions must be reviewed and refined continuously so that an ever-increasing understanding of the role and responsibility of trusteeship develops and improves.

SUMMARY

The stewardship of trustees of American institutions of higher education must transcend the legal requirement of the office of trustee and embrace the moral obligations of the good steward. The individual trustee must be educated in the performance of his or her responsibilities and must not abdicate nor delegate these responsibilities lightly. The trustee has the ability to objectively challenge, question and suggest alternative courses of action.

Trustees should be chosen for their abilities, not for their wealth. They must take seriously the responsibilities incumbent upon the office of trustee.

THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION

A pamphlet published in 1643 entitled "New England's Finest Fruits" sums up the rationale and the mission for the establishment of the colonial institutions of higher education. According to this pamphlet, after establishing the rudimentary structures necessary for survival and governance of the colony, the people sought to ". . . advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity dreading to leave an illiterate ministry to the churches . . ."112 as their ministers, who were educated in the old world, passed away. Of the colonial colleges and universities, Campbell Stewart stated: "All the American colleges prepared clergy, and the arts training was a necessary preliminary to theology."113

This mission was understood as a necessary service to society. As stated earlier, the diversified society of institutions of higher education evolved and developed structures and missions to meet the changing needs of society. With the assurance of survival and the establish-

112Campbell Stewart, "The Place of Higher Education in a Changing Society," in The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning, see Sanford, 1966, p. 916.

113Ibid., p. 917.

ment and growth of the nation, additional institutions of higher education began to appear on the American scene. Through the passage of time and the development of society, the overriding need to provide an educated clergy diminished. Ministerial preparation and the study of theology no longer was the primary mission of American higher education. Theological education became a specialized discipline and eventually was pursued by specialized schools of theology. The focus of this study was to investigate and describe the governance of these specialized schools of theology as they exist in this country today. In order to understand the nature and the position these institutions hold in society today, it is necessary to review a selection of the literature on theological education from the past several decades.

H. Richard Niebuhr, writing in 1956, reflected on the role of the church and its place within American society. He concluded that the church was an integral part of the American way of life. With this premise in mind, he reflected and reported on the mission and the purpose of the church as it relates to theological education. He concluded that, at the time of his writing, theological education within the framework of American Protestantism was in need of revision. He recommended that theological schools and seminaries be understood as institutions of higher education and be dealt with, except in regard to their

special mission, in the same way that other institutions of higher education are dealt with in American society.

He wrote:

Whatever the function of the ministry is, theologically considered, ministers must preach, organize churches, counsel the distressed, teach the immature, and they need to be trained by practice for the exercise of these functions. Whatever the church ought to be, it is expected of schools that they furnish men well prepared to carry on the kind of work demanded of ministers by churches as they are. Again, it seems clear that many more or less technical questions of education cannot be answered theologically. . . .

When the question is one about the education of the ministry it will not do to ignore either the general--the theological--nor the particular--the educational--approach; the theologian as educator or the educator as theologian cannot carry on his theological and his educational critiques separately and independently, nor can he reduce them to one inquiry with one method in the hope of gaining one single answer.¹¹⁴

Educational and theological issues must be integrated in order to establish a context for theological education. The theological school, because it is the educational center of the church, must be in a position to clearly articulate the aims and purpose of the church and its ministry. The author described the state of Protestant theological schools and seminaries of the 1950s as being places where inertia and conservatism reigned. Although there had been great advances in biblical scholarship in the previous decades and at the time there was a great deal of

¹¹⁴H. Richard Niebuhr, The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry: Reflection on the Aims of Theological Education, (New York: Harper and Row, 1956), pp. 4-5.

publicity about the introduction of new ideas, seminaries of the 1950s were teaching what they had always taught.

Niebuhr wrote:

The adjustments made here and there to meet the demands of changing times and the pressure issuing from alumni and church boards scarcely affect the main tenor of their work.¹¹⁵

Niebuhr argued that many of the subjects being taught were important. However, he contended that these schools did not understand the nature and places of these subjects in an evolving society. He wrote: "The apparent conservatism of the schools is really indicative of uncertainty of aim,"¹¹⁶ and purpose. This lack of purpose led to a curriculum that lacked unity. At that time, requirements for graduation were mathematically distributed among the various departments of the institution rather than being reflective of a purposeful plan of study.

Niebuhr believed this lack of purpose was buried deep within the denominational framework of the Protestant church in America. Additionally, he noted that there existed a rivalry between advocates of an academically-oriented course of theological study and those who espoused a course of study designed for the practical training of ministers. According to Niebuhr, these hidden agenda, floating free within the structures of the seminary and

¹¹⁵Ibid., p. 96.

¹¹⁶Ibid., p. 98.

the church, split faculties, dissipated the curriculum and undermined the purpose and mission of many institutions of theological education. Yet he sensed a new spirit emerging in many institutions--a spirit of ecumenism which was developing in the latter half of the 1950s and the early 1960s. He described it as "the greatness of the common Christian cause."¹¹⁷ Niebuhr hoped this new spirit would give rise to a common understanding of the purpose and character of theological education.

He described theological education as the intellectual activity of the church. As a result, he believed it must be motivated by the church itself. "Its purpose is the purpose of the church--the increase among men of the love of God and companions."¹¹⁸ The theological school, a center for the intellectual activity of the church, is not the intellect of the church, but a part of it.

Wherever and whenever there has been intense intellectual activity in the church, a theological school has arisen, while institutions possessing the external appearance of such schools but devoid of reflective life have quickly revealed themselves as training establishments for the habituation of apprentices in the skills of a clerical trade rather than as theological schools.¹¹⁹

As a center for the church's intellectual activity these schools are charged with two functions: (1) to be a place

¹¹⁷Ibid., p. 102.

¹¹⁸Ibid., p. 108.

¹¹⁹Ibid., p. 108.

where the church exercises its intellectual love of God and neighbor, and (2) to be a place which brings reflection and criticism to bear on the activities of the church, including its own intellectual activities. This reflective process distinguishes church communities which are healthy from those which are in need. As colleges and universities, which may be considered the intellectual centers of society, challenge society to be reflective, theological schools must challenge the whole church to engage in the reflective process that brings about growth and development.

As intellectual center of the church's life it is the place where in specific manner faith seeks understanding. As guide of the immature, it seeks to lead them to a knowledge of the whole complex of action in which they are to act; as illuminator and critic, the school endeavors to aid the church to understand what it is doing and by understanding to modify or redirect these actions.¹²⁰

A decade following Niebuhr's work--in an atmosphere of heightened ecumenism encouraged by the efforts of Pope John XXIII and the Second Vatican Council of the Roman Catholic Church--Walter Wagoner, a Protestant educator who was long associated and committed to theological education, undertook an indepth study of Roman Catholic seminaries of the United States. After extensive research, observation, discussion and study, Wagoner published, in 1966, a volume entitled Seminary: Protestant and Catholic. The author moved freely from Catholic to Protestant

¹²⁰Ibid., p. 125.

situations drawing parallels and contrasts from both traditions. For the purpose of this review, the value of this work lies in the basic dimensions of theological education that are revealed through the critical observations of an objective scholar. The juxtaposition of Catholic and Protestant philosophies of theological education provides a succinct picture of American theological education. To facilitate the development of quality theological education, Wagoner called for an increased dialogue between all theological educators. He wrote:

Name almost any area of theological education--curriculum, field work, identification of potential seminarians, financing, devotional life--and the deficiencies are so challenging that only the most tridentine Catholic or the most doctrinaire Protestant theological educator will wish to avoid taking counsel together.¹²¹

Wagoner criticizes Roman Catholic theological education on educational grounds, not on the differences of church structure or belief. This study provides an insightful and enlightening examination of American theological education in general and the Roman Catholic tradition in particular.

The Decree on Priestly Formation of the Second Vatican Council was promulgated on October 28, 1965. This document is the articulation of the Roman Catholic Church's understanding of the issue surrounding the spiritual and theo-

¹²¹Walter D. Wagoner, The Seminary: Protestant and Catholic (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966), p. XVII.

logical education of her seminarians. Wagoner undertook his study during the transitional period, between the promulgation of this decree and its implementation. However, it should be noted that many of the issues, recommendations and concerns addressed by him have become part of the Roman Catholic theological educational system in this country. This fact alone confirms the insightfulness and the value of Wagoner's presentation.

Wagoner described the basic nature of the hierarchical structure of Catholic theological education. He noted that the Decree on Priestly Formation granted the American episcopacy of the Roman Catholic Church greater latitude in formulating and operating its seminaries. However, he was quick to recognize that the influence of Rome was not entirely removed from the education of the Church's ministers. Catholic seminaries, he noted, are anchored in an "international matrix of common tradition, Roman authority, and local responsibility,"¹²² while there is no comparable structure within all of Protestantism.

It will interest a Protestant seminary administrator to note that his opposite number at a Catholic seminary must be sensitive not only to the wishes of his faculty the criticism of his students, and the quarterbacking of his graduates, but also to the thinking in Rome, directives from S.C.S.U.S., [The Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities of Study], the desires

¹²²Ibid., p. 6.

of his bishop, and that long, long tradition of seminary life which began at Trent.¹²³

In comparison, Wagoner acknowledges that in Protestant traditions graduate theological education takes place with more of an arm's-length association between the church and the seminary.

The predominance of the spiritual life of a Catholic seminarian was examined and its effects on the overall theological educational structures were explored. The integration of theology as a rational science and an expression of one's faith and devotion was identified by Wagoner as a major difference between Catholic and Protestant theological education. The Catholic experience is one of integration with an emphasis on the spiritual formation of the individual, while the Protestant experience is one in which the academic dimension of theological education is emphasized.

Protestant seminaries have their reasons for avoiding the systematic faculty review of each student's character and spiritual stature, the chief of which is probably a seminary job-definition which sees itself more as a graduate school of religion than as Christian community.¹²⁴

Wagoner believed that Protestant and Catholic theological education could learn from these varying points of view. In his presentation of the spiritual formation of

¹²³Ibid., p. 7.

¹²⁴Ibid., pp. 36-37.

theological students, Wagoner oversimplified the Protestant tradition and failed to account for the varied traditions within American Protestantism. It would be an oversimplification to believe divergent views of theological education can be reduced to the statement that Catholic seminaries emphasize spiritual formation and Protestant seminaries have an academic emphasis.

Wagoner proposes eleven areas that he believed needed to be addressed by all theological educators, especially Roman Catholic seminary administrative staffs and faculties, in order to develop a deeper understanding of the principles of professional theological education. The eleven areas are:

- (1) Seminary self-study with the assistance of outside consultants;
- (2) Overall study of the seminary within the system with a concern for cooperation and integration;
- (3) The accreditation of seminaries by regional academic accrediting associations;
- (4) Membership and participation in the American Association of Theological Schools;
- (5) National leadership and support staff to assist in the coordination and development of Catholic theological education;
- (6) A national study authorized and supported by the episcopacy;

- (7) Membership in professional educational associations;
- (8) Faculty members who represent a wide range of outstanding graduate schools;
- (9) Faculty control of basic academic policy and curriculum matters;
- (10) Creative tension to encourage faculty members to publish and participate in scholarship activities; and
- (11) Episcopal commitment to the advancement of the ideals of professional theological education.

To accomplish these goals, he suggested that Protestant and Catholic seminaries be associated with major universities and culture centers. In his opinion, this would give heed to the concerns of laymen and clergy over developing a broader educational experience for seminarians.

Theological education, to an uncomfortable degree within Protestantism and to a shocking degree within Catholicism, is the only major professional field largely separated from an organic and living relationship to the graduate faculties of great universities.¹²⁵

As Wagoner suggested, and has been subsequently proven in practice, the association of theological education with major universities provides an increased possibility for collaboration between theological schools of like and differing traditions. The consortia of theological schools and

¹²⁵Ibid., p. 92.

seminaries that developed during the past two decades are testimony to Wagoner's contention that this type of co-operation and association improves the quality of the academic life within institutions of theological education.

The debate over the primary purpose of theological education was addressed in 1973 by C. Daniel Batson and D. Campbell Wyckoff when they presented "An Alternative for Ministerial Education." They began their arguments by stating that the whole seminary system was in need of re-evaluation and restructuring. They were concerned that much of what was happening in seminaries was a result of the financial crises which many seminaries were then experiencing. In their opinion, administrative solutions were not enough to right the wrong which they identified as existing within American seminaries. They argued that the very nature and purpose of theological education needed to be addressed and reconsidered. Only through the re-examination of the basic purpose and mission of theological education would theology schools be able to fulfill the mandate they received from the churches. Their arguments and suggestions for alternatives were based on the presupposition that the Church is in need of professional ministers whose primary purpose is to facilitate the ministry of all Christians. They introduced the term "ministerial education" and explained the difference between it and the traditional understanding of theological

education. The competency of the minister relies not on his or her ability to master the academic disciplines of theological education, but on the ability of the minister to utilize the resources of the church for the good of the Christian Community, including the utilization of experts to solve and deal with practical problems.

The emphasis of this approach is to develop ministers who are self-directed and self-motivated learners and to provide professional ministers with the tools and the abilities to continue to learn after their initial period of formation. This approach requires an effective integration and utilization of the disciplines of theology and practical ministry.

This alternative approach is one way of dealing with the concerns of many regarding the competencies of ministers in the active ministry. This may be the solution to one-half of the debate over the balance of academic and practical theological education.

Were the proposed model for ministerial education to be adopted, it would seem to imply a major revision of seminary graduate programs. Rather than the research orientation of academic doctorates, it suggests graduate study toward specialized competence in a particular academic area and its relation to professional ministry. Seminary graduate programs might be geared to training persons for two types of institutional roles: First, to serve as resource persons or resource coordinators to the ministers in a given region in the area of the graduate student's specialization. Such positions would be under the auspices of national church structures (either conciliar or denominational structures). Second, the seminary graduate student would be well qualified to participate in teaching at the M. Div.

(perhaps soon to the D. Min.) level in seminaries, particularly in the first-year program.¹²⁶

However, this method of theological education does not consider the churches' need for research and scholarship.

A continuation of this debate was presented by James I. McCord in 1978. He warned against mistakenly trying to formulate only one purpose for theological education. To do this, he cautioned, would be to ignore the rich and varied religious heritage that has existed in the theological institutions of this country.

The fundamental purpose of theological schools has been, and continues to be, the preparation of ministers, scholars, and church leaders. McCord suggested four goals that must be pursued in this process of preparation. These goals are: (1) to assist the theological student to think and live theologically; (2) to assist the student in acquiring a broad theological perspective; (3) to assist the student in becoming a participant in an ongoing theological inquiry (scholarship); and (4) to provide the student with the necessary skills for ministry. Emphasis of these goals will vary depending on the needs of the churches. The degree of emphasis that is placed on one or more of these goals will help determine the curriculum and the nature of the seminary experience.

¹²⁶C. Daniel Batson and D. Campbell Wyckoff, "An Alternative Model for Ministerial Education," Theological Education 9 (Winter 1973), p. 111.

McCord recognized that preparation for ministry is never completed, and he suggested that a major thrust of the curriculum be one that provides an appreciation for ongoing learning. He contended that institutions have no choice but to provide opportunities for continuing education for their constituencies. This concept of the purpose of the theological school has a profound influence on its structure and curriculum. According to McCord, a seminary with the expressed purpose of continuing education will operate in an atmosphere of tension.

A seminary is a graduate professional school, and it must live within the tension of this description. It cannot be a graduate school exclusively, nor should it be a professional school exclusively. The seminary must live creatively within this tension and seek to maintain a balance between the two legitimate emphases. The tension may be greater in this country because of the character of American religion. It has always carried a strong anti-intellectual bias, and it is surprising how little knowledge is needed to "get by." One can develop a religious pattern and remain at a superficial level throughout a career.¹²⁷

The theological seminary must provide the environment and the opportunity for the development of the intellectual and spiritual lives of its students. The governing board can play an important role by assuring that the appropriate structures and curriculum are in place to encourage this development within the seminary students. McCord is of the opinion that there must be a reconciliation of these

¹²⁷James I. McCord, "The Understanding of Purpose in a Seminary Closely Related to the Church," Theological Education 14 (Spring 1978), p. 63.

two viewpoints so that these institutions may fulfill their mission of preparing church leaders.

Lawrence N. Jones, a contemporary of McCord's, broadened the discussion of the mission of theological schools and seminaries when he wrote: "No theological school can be true to its calling as servant of the church which does not acknowledge the presence of the claims of all groups which are constituents of the whole church."¹²⁸ The basic trend of the author's argument was that theological schools as agents of their respective churches must not discriminate against any particular group or social class, in any respect, through their formal or informal curriculum. The curriculum, according to Jones, must reflect the specialized needs of the persons who make up the church. "Even schools which have no minority student(s) . . . are not absolved from the responsibility of taking into account the reality of the church and the implicit claims its pluralistic constituency imposes upon it."¹²⁹ Theological schools should, according to Jones, adapt their offerings and focus to meet the needs of a changing society.

Edward L. Hayes wrote:

Theological education in the final quarter of the twentieth century is typified by both growth and

¹²⁸Lawrence N. Jones, "A Reflection on Theological Education for the Whole Church," Theological Education 14 (Spring 1978), p. 94.

¹²⁹Ibid.

decline, stodgy tradition and diversity by design. Factors are at work forcing curricular and institutional revision and reform. To the degree that professional theological schools respond to developments in contemporary higher education, they will be able to navigate well the closing decades of this century. Revitalization of theological schools will in large measure depend upon how successfully administrators, faculties, boards of control, and the various constituencies respond to new developments in non-traditional education.¹³⁰

Hayes recognized that the issues facing theological education were not unique. He listed a number of issues confronting professional education, specifically theological education. Among them were: (1) reform in graduate and professional education was affecting most major professions; (2) education had expanded to a mood of education for all rather than a few; (3) the issues of decline/retrenchment, high costs, loss of mission, and polarized ideologies were forging a future for graduate schools, including graduate theological education; (4) enrollments in schools with a visible evangelical commitment had risen; (5) faculties and administrators of theological education were unprepared to address these issues; and (6) higher education was forcing a reform of graduate education.

Hayes argued that there have been three institutional patterns within theological education: (1) multi-purpose colleges and universities developed seminaries as specialized schools and departments; (2) seminaries have expanded to

¹³⁰Edward L. Hayes, "Educational Strategies in Theological Education," Theological Education 15 (Autumn 1978), p. 33.

include a liberal arts curriculum; and (3) separate institutions for theological study have been founded and remain detached from other institutions. In addition, Hayes suggested that there has been further development in this area of institutional structure and purpose. Those institutions that traditionally have been separated and independent institutions in recent years have sought to develop ties with other universities. This type of relationship has opened the door to alternate strategies for theological education.

Non-traditional approaches to education have become part of the American higher education system. These new approaches, in some instances, have been assimilated into the structure and curriculum of theological schools and seminaries. Hayes outlined how some of these ideas have influenced the course of study at some of this country's theological schools. As a result of this development in non-traditional education, there has been a movement toward reform in theological education. However, Hayes stated that, "There is no common theory of curriculum nor any generally accepted model for theological education reform."¹³¹ He argued that there must be a renewed effort to conceptualize the course of study appropriate for

¹³¹Ibid., p. 41.

theological schools and seminaries. This conceptualization may, according to the Hayes, bring about the needed reforms.

Hayes outlined six principles upon which the curriculum of a theological school should be based. They are:

(1) content should reflect the aims and progress of professional education; (2) explicit provisions should be provided for the development of social understanding, ethical behavior, and scholarly endeavors; (3) the professional sciences and their application should be formed together to provide a comprehensive curriculum; (4) a theory for the practice of the profession must be developed; (5) professional education should provide a foundation which an individual may use his or her own style and talents to build upon; (6) the content to which a student is exposed should be limited in order that the student is not overwhelmed.

Seminaries, like universities, have become specialized and departmentalized in order to provide a holistic curriculum. Interdisciplinary studies and integrated field education programs must be part of the required curriculum, according to Hayes. He hoped that this would provide the basis for the integration of scholarship and functional competence. In addition, curriculum reform must also consider the changing nature of the current theological student. New theological students are forcing subtle changes in theological education. At the time of Hayes'

writing, there was little understanding about the effect these new students were having on theological education and the institutions which provide this education.

In response to the ever-increasing emphasis on professional preparation influencing the curriculum and the structures of American seminarians, McCord articulated what he believed to be the basic requirements for theological inquiry. He acknowledged that current theology students were better prepared professionally than at any other time in the history of theological education. However, he was concerned over the apparent lack of basic theological scholarship.

At least in the United States, there has prevailed for the past two decades a mood of anti-intellectualism. The churches do not, as a whole, look to their theologians for counsel . . . and little provision is made to further the task of fundamental inquiry.¹³²

McCord suggested that an Institute for Theological Inquiry be established. Unlike other disciplines, he argued, there is little support or encouragement for the pursuit of basic theological research and scholarship. As a scholarly discipline, he contended, theology lacked the institutional endorsement necessary for fundamental research and advancement of an academic discipline. McCord chided the churches for this lack of support and

¹³²James I. McCord, "The Seminary Enterprise: An Appraisal," Theological Education 17 (Autumn 1980), p. 55.

encouragement. He suggested that, as in the past, the four marks of the Church--one, holy, catholic and apostolic--should be the guiding principles of theological inquiry. Theologians must be challenged to integrate their inquiry with the "heritage of faith" that has and continues to light the way for the community of believers. The continuing articulation of the community's faith must account for past experiences, present realities and future visions. Traditionally, this has been the guiding principle of the Church's theologians.

Those who would argue that scholarly inquiry by seminary faculties undermines the basic mission of ministerial preparation are, in McCord's words, "short-sighted."¹³³ He believed a faculty involved in fundamental theological inquiry would be better prepared to instruct seminary students regarding the issues challenging them in practical settings of their ministry.

McCord stated:

At the present moment in history, our perception of the tradition in its essential dimensions is so dwarfed that it has less and less to say to the human condition. The rectification of this situation is the scholarly task upon which we should be launched, and it could be as well the greatest contribution we can make to our professional programs and to the church."¹³⁴

¹³³Ibid., p. 57.

¹³⁴Ibid., pp. 57-58.

Leon Pacala, Executive Director of the Association of Theological Schools, in a recent article, reflected upon the state of theological education in the 1980s. He recognized the pressures and the circumstances of the past two decades that forced institutions of theological education to become introspective. This introspection, according to the author, has been detrimental to the advancement of theological education in general. He noted that there have been no comprehensive studies conducted in the past decade concerning the general state of theological education. After conducting an inquiry of the chief executive administrators of 124 institutions, Pacala concluded that, as a group, these administrators worked within the "orbit of the church,"¹³⁵ and that there is an indication of stability of leadership in the near future. In support of his claim for future stability in leadership, Pacala indicated that there is a movement toward extended terms of office for the chief executive of these institutions. The leader, according to the author, reported a need for specialized and more professionally prepared and oriented leadership within theological education. As theological schools and seminaries became more complex educational institutions, a need arose for educational administrators who are versed

¹³⁵Leon Pacala, "Reflection on the State of Theological Education in the 1980s," Theological Education 18 (Autumn 1981), p. 11.

in the art of planning and who have a willingness to participate in a collaborative style of decision-making.

Theological schools and seminaries simultaneously belong to the world of the church and the world of higher education. Each of these spheres of influence helps to shape the structure and the purpose of theological education.

There is a remarkable consensus shared by the leadership of theological schools in both national communities [the United States and Canada], that the renewed ecclesiastical identity of theological schools is the single most significant development of the past decade.¹³⁶

The renewal of ecclesiastical identity has brought about a restoration of church-seminary relations, which suffered during the campus unrest of the 1960s. As a result of this restored relationship, theological schools understand themselves as "instruments of the Church." The renewal of ecclesiastical identity has provided these institutions with the means by which to restate their institutional mission. Thus, it has given them the ability to reshape their curriculum, programs, composition of faculty and staff, and direction in building a relationship with higher education.

A concurrent development that has taken place over the past decade has been the increased professionalization of the theological curriculum. Professional competence has become the dominant model for theological education.

¹³⁶Ibid., pp. 13-14.

Although this is not a new development in the history of theological education, it is a renewal of a persistent concern of the churches.

According to Pacala, these two developments have encouraged theological schools to expand their purpose and their constituencies. No longer are theological schools viewed as single-purpose institutions. The introduction of continuing education programs helped to increase the enrollment of these schools in the 1970s by 49 per cent. The number of women enrolled increased from less than 10 per cent in 1970 to more than 21 per cent in 1979. There also was a gain in the median age of theological students and an increase in the number of minority students.¹³⁷

The developments of the past decade have underscored the need for the administration of theological schools and seminaries to understand the process of long-range planning, to possess the ability to discern the needs of the times, and to anticipate the needs of the future.

The major challenge of the years ahead is to discern ways whereby the identity of theological schools as instruments of the church can be more effectively implemented.¹³⁸

This will have a considerable amount of influence on the developing nature and structure of theological education.

¹³⁷Ibid., p. 16.

¹³⁸Ibid., p. 17.

A commitment to render closer accountability to the churches will necessitate a rethinking of many of the traditional structures of authority and institutional autonomy. The challenge will be to respond to the needs of the churches without jeopardizing the educational integrity of the institutions. The emerging identity of theological schools as instruments of churches brings with it the threat of growing sectarianism. The cooperative ventures of the past aided the development of ecumenism and enriched theological education. Accountability to a church is concrete and specific. Denominationalism, which has been understood as accountability to a church of a particular denomination, can be a positive dimension of theological education. Denominationalism, however, should not be confused with the fragmentation and isolation of the churches under sectarianism.

Theological schools must resist any attempt to isolate theological education from the other components of higher education or from other theological traditions. Pacala warns there is evidence of "growing isolation of theological education from the rest of higher education."¹³⁹

Pacala outlined the challenges which, he believed, are facing administrators of these institutions. These challenges include financial considerations, faculty and

¹³⁹Ibid., p. 23.

student recruitment, expansion of programs and long range-planning. He concluded his reflections by stating:

. . . The future will not be resolved without the total investment of those who constitute the community of theological schools in an enterprise sustained by compelling visions of the purposes to which it is called in service to the churches, the world and the future. To discern that future and to enliven it with compelling visions will be the responsibility of every office and station which make up the corporate enterprise.¹⁴⁰

According to Pacala, this demands effective leadership of extraordinary ability and wisdom. However, at no time did the author deal with the role of the governing board in providing the wisdom, insight, and moral view that he claimed an administrator must possess.

Another author to recognize and comment on in the debate over the purpose of theological schools and seminaries is Joseph C. Hough, Jr., who described theological education in this way:

. . . All theological education is practical in practical theological education, and practical theological education is the task of the whole church.
. . . Theological education is thus the ongoing recollection of the memory of Jesus Christ by which the practice of the church in this world comes to express those virtues which define Christian holiness.¹⁴¹

He understands the purpose of theological education to be the preparation of church leaders, including, but not exclu-

¹⁴⁰Ibid., p. 42.

¹⁴¹Joseph C. Hough, Jr., "The Education of Practical Theologians," Theological Education 20 (Spring 1984), pp. 63-64.

sively, those leaders who must be ordained. Theological schools are professional schools and, as such, it is crucial that they prepare leaders to meet the needs of the churches. In the past, only those preparing for a professional life as ordained ministers studied theology. As others have joined the ranks of theological students, confusion developed regarding what is meant today in the church by the term "professional minister".

Today, according to Hough, the professional minister must be a "practical theologian," a person whose primary task is to provide reflective leadership to the members of the church. The practical theologian must respond to four leadership tasks: (1) provide leadership for the continuing renewal of the memory of Jesus and the identity of the Christian community; (2) provide leadership for the reflective practice of the community; (3) provide for institutional management in order to utilize the community's resources in a ministry which is theologically sound; and (4) provide spiritual and personal counseling.¹⁴²

Therefore, the preparation of the practical theologian must be grounded not only in the biblical and historical foundations of the community but in the practical aspects of ministry. The theological school cannot be a place where theory and practice are taught separately. It

¹⁴²Ibid.

must provide an opportunity for the development of theory and practice as integrated and coherent elements of the whole process of ministerial preparation.

Debate over the purpose, nature, structure and relationship to church institutions of theological education continues. The governing boards of these institutions have the opportunity to actively participate in this debate. The board should provide the theological school with guidance and leadership, should not take a back seat in the rethinking of the institution's mission, structure, curriculum or relationship to the sponsoring church. The role of the governing board has been notably absent from the discussions presented in the literature concerning the changing nature and purpose of theological schools and seminaries.

TRUSTEESHIP OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES

The literature regarding the trusteeship of institutions of theological education available to this investigator is limited. An extensive literature search has been undertaken. Works that were discovered through this process are reviewed below.

Robert K. Greenleaf has written a series of essays on trusteeship entitled Seminary as Servant: Essays on Trusteeship. He introduced the idea that there exists a hierarchy of institutions. Seminaries and foundations are at the pinnacle of this hierarchy. Because of their stature, he said, foundations can serve as overseers

that can provide conceptual leadership to colleges and universities. The seminary, in Greenleaf's view, is in a strategic position to provide similar support to the church. Churches and universities are in a position to nurture and guide individuals and the whole range of operating institutions, including governments and the faculty. Meanwhile, seminaries are in the role of servants to society.

The three chapters of this work, which are discussions written over a three-year period, show a development in Greenleaf's thinking on the subject of seminary trusteeship.

Caring for persons, the more able and the less able serving each other, is, in my judgment, what makes a good society. Of all the institutions I know about, I would put the most stringent test of caring on seminaries because I believe that they hold, potentially through the churches, the greatest leverage to influence the caring, serving quality of the whole society.¹⁴³

Seminaries must be more than institutions which train pastors. Rather, they must be a constant source of intellectual activity and prophetic vision, spiritual leadership and inspiration for society-shaping influences in the churches, according to Greenleaf. He believes that seminaries have the opportunity for strong leadership because of their place at the top of the hierarchy of

¹⁴³Robert K. Greenleaf, Seminary as Servant: Essays On Trusteeship (Center for Applied Studies, Petersborough, N.H.: Windy Row Press, 1983), p. 5.

institutions. Therefore, they must muster their resources and exploit this opportunity.

Seminaries today are marginal institutions because in this country's highly institutionalized society they are judged as not carrying much weight. Greenleaf believed this to be true because seminaries have a marginal self-image, especially in the view of their principal constituencies. Seminaries do provide training for pastors; however, "they do not generally provide the sustaining support and prophetic leadership for churches, for which they are correctly positioned and . . . they are potentially capable."¹⁴⁴ He concluded that the initiative for changing this situation rests with the seminaries and their governing boards.

Greenleaf believes all seminaries have within their nature the potential to attain a position of leadership. He encouraged all involved in the operation of seminaries to gather the resources necessary to move from a marginal position in society to "a central and crucial role"¹⁴⁵ within society. His basic premise was that ordinary good people serving as trustees, who are sustained and directed by strong and great goals, can provide the direction necessary to move these institutions into positions of

¹⁴⁴Ibid., p. 10.

¹⁴⁵Ibid., p. 13.

leadership. The goal that must lead and motivate the seminary trustee is to be a servant to society by providing leadership for society through service to the churches.

The role of servant which was once lived out in a person-to-person relationship must now be assumed by institutions. If only a few seminaries take on this role, they may act as the catalyst encouraging others to join them. To do this, the seminary must regenerate itself because no other institution exists in this process as an available resource for the seminary.

Each seminary has a unique history and character. Therefore, the trustees of each seminary will have to come to an appreciation of the special nature and traditions of their institution. Greenleaf warned that the trustee must understand the institution before moving it forward. Trustees who attempt to move a seminary to a place of leadership might be at risk, because there may be resistance from its faculty and administration. Leadership must be a subtle process; it can never be coercive.

Evidence of the effectiveness of new constructive leadership by trustees may be the emergence of new transforming leadership among faculty and administrators, and this is the leadership that will move the seminary from marginal to a central or crucial role.¹⁴⁶

Trustees must begin the process of leadership by asking questions, not by providing answers. They must encourage

¹⁴⁶Ibid., p. 13.

an ongoing search for identity and questioning of purpose. The trustees must excite the faculty and administration to seek answers to important questions that will give direction to the search for meaning. The chair of the governing board must assume this role with the other trustees. According to Greenleaf the greatest asset that a governing board has is not its legal authority, but the board's ability to influence growth and development of the institution. This influence stems from respect for the board's decisions and judgments. Therefore, an atmosphere of respect is a vital prerequisite for leadership. Strong leadership can bring about unity and clarity of purpose.

The statement of mission must provide a clarity and power by which the institution operates. Every member of the institution, faculty, staff and students, in Greenleaf's words, must be "a servant to the mission."¹⁴⁷ The mission statement is the governing idea by which the institution functions. A serious breach of trust exists when those who hold the position of trustee "acquiesce in an inadequate statement of mission."¹⁴⁸ Once the statement of mission is published, the governing board must support the president in its implementation. No matter how strong and charismatic a president may be, a weak mission statement will create

¹⁴⁷Ibid., p. 29.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., p. 31.

difficulty for the president in leading the institution. If the mission statement does not have power, it will not give guidance to the institution. The trustee of a seminary must be a person of faith. Greenleaf believed that many trustees are lacking a faith in the principle for which they should stand. The trust which is incumbent upon the trustee must be faith- fully fulfilled. So the author called upon all seminary trustees to recommit themselves to the mission of their institutions.

The underlying premise of Greenleaf's work is servant to society through service to the church. He provides a thought-provoking presentation from which to examine the proper role of the trustee of institutions of theological education.

William Baumgaertner stated: "Governing boards are . . . one of the most substantial and, until recently, hidden resources of church schools."¹⁴⁹ The trustees must interpret the seminary to the church and, at times, the church to the seminary. Too often, graduate faculties are entrenched in the educational establishment rather than being on the cutting edge of the church and society. The trustee has an important role to play in encouraging faculty members to stretch their minds and open their eyes.

¹⁴⁹William L. Baumgaertner, "The Role of Trustees in Seminaries," AGB Reports (May-June 1983), p. 17.

The trustees must ask what the church expects of the seminary and what the seminary must do to fulfill its mission. The governing board can help in maintaining relations between the church and the school. In order to accomplish these tasks, Baumgaertner believed that trustees must first train themselves to listen.

To listen to the president. Insist that the president share his vision of the school at least once a year.
 To listen to the faculty. What are their hopes, not just their complaints? To listen to the students. What kind of service of church do they anticipate?
 To listen to the denomination. What shifts in expectations are taking place?¹⁵⁰

Trustees must have a sound foundation in the creedal statements, the directives on theological education and the history of the sponsoring denomination or church. If, as Baumgaertner suggested, the trustee has a role in interpreting the seminary to the church and the church to the seminary, then the trustee must have a detailed understanding of both institutions and the atmosphere in which they exist. Additionally, the trustee must take time to know the faculty and alumni of the institution. Only then can the trustee adequately represent the seminary. The trustee also has the role of soliciting financial support of the seminary. This, again, requires an understanding of the seminary including its resources and needs.

¹⁵⁰Ibid., pp. 18-19.

In 1983, the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities published The Good Steward. Robert Lynn, a contributor to this volume, wrote:

This book represents an historic "first." There is nothing quite like it in the literature of American theological education. Of the thousands of volumes written about theological schools, there are only a few that even treat the work of the seminary trustee in a cursory fashion.¹⁵¹

In the opening chapter of The Good Steward, Lynn addressed the issue of the trustee as the steward of the resources and mission of these institutions. He tied together the biblical understanding of stewardship and the commonly held notion of the role of the trustee.

The larger significance of trusteeship cannot be understood apart from the rich overtones of such enduring notions as "ministry" and "vocation."¹⁵²

This stewardship, this ministry, of which Lynn wrote, cannot be limited to the health of the institution's balance sheet. Instead, it must transcend institutional constraints and be a ministry of vision and of service to the church and to society. Lynn's review of the basic function of the trustees of theological schools or seminaries is not dissimilar to the descriptions of trustees of other institutions of higher education which were reviewed earlier. However, like trustees of other institutions, trustees of institutions

¹⁵¹Robert W. Lynn, "The Responsibilities of Stewardship," in The Good Steward, see Association of Governing Boards, 1983, p. 1.

¹⁵²Lynn, "The Responsibilities of Stewardship, p. 3.

of theological education must exercise their trusteeship within the context of their institution's specialized mission.

To lead in such a mission, seminary trustees must have competence, tenacity, fortitude and spirit. Most boards are too involved in overseeing administration and in money raising to assure a genuine leadership role in moving a seminary towards its greatest potential.¹⁵³

The trustees must take on the role of creative leadership. They cannot settle for presiding over a maintenance role. Greenleaf restated his contention that there exists a hierarchy of institutions of which seminaries are of the highest order.

A seminary has the potential to be not merely a school for training clergy and a field for scholarship in support, but a germinating ground for seminal ideas, for the over arching views that give unity of vision in a chaotic world.¹⁵⁴

Greenleaf argued that this role, for which the seminary has been called, is yet to be fulfilled. This failure is not the seminaries alone, it belongs to the churches. Two critical areas which have contributed to this situation are: (1) the lack of understanding of the theology of these institutions and how the church's ministry could be greatly supported by this understanding, and (2) the lack of prophetic vision that will allow the churches to take a leadership role in society. These elements must be tied

¹⁵³Robert K. Greenleaf, "Trustee Traditions and Expectations," p. 129.

¹⁵⁴Ibid.

to the mission of the institution and form a partnership of theological schools and churches.

The source of the seminary's complexity can be traced back to its character as a hybrid institution. It belongs simultaneously to two worlds, the spheres of the church and of higher education in the United States. Very few colleges or universities attempt to maintain this kind of dual citizenship. . . . This peculiar institution has always been something more than a professional school, akin to the medical or law schools . . . the crucial margin of difference between the American seminary and its sister institutions lies in its nature as a form of the church . . . (it) has become a significant extra-congregational ecclesiastical form. Indeed, of all these extra-congregational manifestations of the church's life, the seminary may well be the one with the most in common with the congregation.¹⁵⁵

Donald W. Shriver, Jr., suggested that theological education can take place in seminaries only if the seminary provides a sense of church, the living reality of a people's faith. In Shriver's view, there must be an integration of scholarship and the life experience of a faithful people. This relationship between institutions of theological education and the church is critical to the fulfillment of the mission of these institutions.

SUMMARY

Governing boards have an obligation to work with and through national and local church bodies to insure that the students of their institutions not only have the

¹⁵⁵Donald W. Shriver, Jr., "The Accountability of Theological Education to the Mission of the Church," Theological Education 17 (Autumn 1980), p. 59.

academic and practical tools they will need for service to the church, but that they also have a vision of the church through a relationship with a community of faith. The responsibilities incumbent upon a governing board of a theological school or seminary are all those incumbent upon any governing board of an institution of higher education and more. The unique mission of these institutions of theological education transcends the concerns of the academic community and rests within the context of faith. The governing boards of these institutions would be remiss in fulfilling their legal and moral obligations if they did not execute their responsibilities as guardians of institutions of theological education with a commitment to the principles and faith of the ecclesiastical traditions and communities upon which these institutions were built.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate and describe trusteeship as it is exercised by the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries in the United States. This chapter contains a description of the population studied; the research methodology, including the assignment of the institutions under study to subgroups; the construction and pretesting of the data-collection instrument; data coding; and the statistical and descriptive treatment of the study.

POPULATION OF THE STUDY

The institutions of theological education chosen for this study are a representative sample of the theological schools and seminaries in the United States. These institutions were selected because of their membership in the Association of Theological Schools of the United States and Canada, which is the primary--but not the sole--accrediting agency of institutions of theological education. The institutions selected for this study were assumed to be a representative sample of all theological schools

and seminaries in the United States. This study is concerned only with those institutions of theological education that fall within the geographical boundaries of the United States and its territories. Therefore, Canadian institutions were eliminated from the population.

Since this study was designed to investigate the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries, theological departments or schools of a college or university have been eliminated. Under the stated limitations, the institutions to be examined were selected from the 1984 ATS Bulletin published by the Association of Theological Schools of the United States and Canada.

As a result of this selection, the population for this study contains all the post-baccalaureate institutions of theological education as defined, representing forty-three separate denominations. Of these institutions, 134 are operated or sponsored by a specific denomination and fifteen are described as interdenominational or nondenominational. The total number of institutions surveyed was 149.

The chief executive officers of these institutions were chosen to participate in this study because they were expected to readily possess the requested information. Since these individuals were assumed to be employed on campus, they should have been able to respond to the survey instrument with little inconvenience, thus contributing to an increased response rate.

ASSIGNMENT TO SUBGROUPS

Each institution under consideration was assigned to one of twelve subgroups as determined by the institution's denominational affiliation. The denominational classification is contained in the 1984 ATS Bulletin. For the purpose of this study, subdenominations were classified under the heading of the principal denomination. For example, the American Baptist Convention, the Baptist General Conference and the Southern Baptist Convention are all classified under the heading: Baptist. (See Appendix E.)

Furthermore, denominations with three or fewer theological schools or seminaries have been combined into Groups One and Two in order to facilitate data analysis. Group One contains those institutions that are the sole institutions of theological education for their respective denominations. Group Two consists of those denominations that have two or three theological schools or seminaries. Groups Three through Eleven comprise those principal denominations that sponsor or operate four or more institutions of theological education. Institutions that are classified as interdenominational or nondenominational were placed together in Group Twelve. (See Appendix E for a complete listing of subgroups.)

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Due to the lack of documentation about the characteristics, composition, and role of the governing boards of institutions of theological education in the United States, a descriptive methodology was employed for this study.

Descriptive Survey Research is a recognized methodology

. . . for the purpose of making descriptive assertions about some population: discovering the distribution of certain traits or attributes. In this regard, the researcher is not concerned with why the observed distribution exists, but merely what that distribution is.¹

As a foundational study, the methodology must document and describe the existing characteristics, composition, and role of the governing boards of these institutions. It is expected that once an understanding of these attributes exists, hypotheses may be formulated that may lead to a more indepth study of the characteristics, compositions, and roles of these boards.

SURVEY INSTRUMENT CONSTRUCTION AND DATA COLLECTION

Information for this study has been gathered by use of a thirty-five item questionnaire (see Appendix D) that was developed as a result of an extensive review of the literature, as reported in Chapter II, and consultation

¹Earl R. Babbie, Survey Research Methods (Belmont, Ca.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973), pp. 57-58.

with individuals who are familiar with the various areas of interest represented by this study. In addition, the survey instruments of two previously conducted studies were reviewed, and portions were adapted to the needs and purpose of this study. This study employed an instrument used by the Council of American Higher Education in 1976 for its study entitled, "Composition of College and University Governing Boards".² This was done to permit comparisons to be made between the demographic characteristics of American colleges and universities as compared with those of theological schools and seminaries. In addition, an unpublished study entitled, "Trustee Educational Development," recently conducted by Research Associates and sponsored by the Lilly Endowment, was helpful in drafting the survey instrument used in this study because it sought to measure the ongoing educational activities of the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries. Because of the information gathered by the Research Associates study, the questionnaire developed for the use in this study contained only three questions concerning orientation, ongoing education and self-evaluation of the governing boards under consideration.

²Irene L. Gomberg and Frank J. Atelsek, "Composition of College and University Governing Boards," Higher Education Panel Reports, no. 35. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., August 1977, p. 17-18.

An initial draft of the questionnaire and prospectus of this study were sent to a test/review group, which included the following individuals who were asked to review the survey instrument for clarity and accuracy:

- (1) Two former chief executive officers of theological schools, who represent two different denominations;
- (2) A chief executive officer of a private college with a religious affiliation; (The chief executive officers were chosen because of their experience with governing boards and because of the parallel positions they held with chief executive officers of institutions that were under consideration and who would be the respondents in this study.)
- (3) A faculty member of the Department of Educational Administration of Michigan State University;
- (4) The Executive Vice President of the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, because of his expertise in the area of governing boards;
- (5) The Senior Vice President of the Religion Division and a Senior Program Officer of the Lilly Endowment, because of their interest and expertise in the area of theological education;
- (6) The vice-chair of the governing board of a private college, who also is the director of a graduate

theology program, because of his expertise in theological education and experience on a governing board;

(7) A bishop of a large metropolitan Roman Catholic diocese who serves on the governing boards of several institutions of higher education, including a diocesan seminary;

(8) A research consultant at Michigan State University, because of his expertise in the development of survey instruments.

Excluding (3) and (8) above, the listed members of the review group were selected because of their experience and knowledge of governing boards of higher education and/or the organization and governance of the institutions of theological education in the United States.

The comments and suggestions of this group were received and incorporated in the revisions of the instrument. A final draft of the survey instruments was prepared and presented to the dissertation committee overseeing the design and execution of this study. With minor revisions, the proposed survey instrument was approved by the dissertation committee.

The survey instrument was typeset and printed by a professional printer, with the expectation that a neat, professionally-printed questionnaire would increase the response rate.

On November 20, 1984, a packet containing a letter of transmittal (see Appendix D), a copy of the survey instrument, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope was sent to the chief executive officers of each of the 149 institutions under consideration. (See Appendix E.) From this initial mailing, forty-nine responses were received, which represented a 32.88 per cent response rate. A follow-up letter (see Appendix C), which contained an additional copy of the survey instrument and a self-addressed stamped, envelope was sent to the 100 non-respondents on December 3, 1984. This second mailing produced an additional sixty-three respondents. Because of the holiday mail and intervening term break, all questionnaires postmarked before January 11, 1985 were accepted as respondents.

As a result of these procedures and activities and the generosity of the chief executive officers of the institutions being examined, 112 of the 149 survey instruments initially mailed were returned constituting a 75.16 per cent response rate. According to Babbie:

. . . a response rate of at least 50 percent is adequate for analysis and reporting. A response rate of at least 60 percent is good. And a response rate of 70 percent or more is very good. The reader should bear in mind, however, that these are only rough guides, they have no statistical basis, and a demonstrated lack of response bias is far more important than a high response rate.³

³Babbie, Survey Research Methods, p. 165.

Therefore, the response rate of 75.16 per cent for this study was judged to be sufficient for analysis.

DATA CODING

The information collected from the 112 survey instruments was transferred to "mark sense" data forms. Each item of the survey instrument was translated into a code that would permit computer analysis of the data.

To quantitatively format the information collected from the survey instruments, a codebook was developed. A codebook, according to Babbie, is the document that describes the location of variables in the survey data file. The codebook serves two functions: (1) it is the primary guide to coders as they prepare the data for analysis; and (2) it is the researcher's guide to locating variables in the data file during analysis.⁴ The codebook developed for this study was constructed by this investigator with the assistance of a research consultant.

To achieve a high degree of consistency and reliability, the coding was done by the principal investigator. The coded data reflected the frequency of occurrence of each response. A copy of the codebook is located in Appendix F.

⁴Ibid., p. 195.

DATA ANALYSIS

Quantitative analysis of the coded data was done on the Michigan State University Cyber 170/750 computer using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences.⁵

Frequency distributions were computed for each coded response for the total sample. The frequency distributions were checked and compared with the "mark sense" forms and the original questionnaires. Misscans and miscoded information were corrected.

Following an examination of the frequency distributions for each of the responses, cross-tabulation analyses were undertaken to examine the responses by denominational classification. No tests to determine statistical significance were considered in the cross-tabulation due to the descriptive nature of the data and the original purpose of this study.

Responses for denominational groups for each of the items in the research instrument were computed into percentages and organized into tables. These tables are presented in Chapter IV of this study and comprise the major results of the data analysis.

In addition, the coded data were organized into three subgroups for special analysis. These subgroups are:

⁵Norman E. Nie, et al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2d ed. (New York: McGraw Hill, 1975).

Catholic; Denominations other than Catholic; and Inter/non-denominational. These subgroups were organized and analyzed to determine whether the governing boards of Catholic, inter/nondenominational and/or denominations other than Catholic institutions differ in their characteristics, composition and role.

Analysis of variance was used to analyze those questions that could be interpreted as having interval-level data for their responses. Analysis of variance is a statistical tool used to test for significance of differences between several means. When the probability of the obtained F ratio is equal to or less than the determined significance level, it can be concluded that the obtained differences between the sample means was not due to chance at the established significance level.⁶ Differences which have a statistical significance must be examined to determine whether practical differences exist.

The analysis of variance for this study was conducted at the .05 level of significance. The .05 level of significance, a commonly accepted level,⁷ was chosen because of the foundational nature of this study.

⁶Walter R. Borg and Meredith Damien Gall, Educational Research: An Introduction, 3d ed. (New York: Longman, 1979), pp.426-30.

⁷Ibid., pp. 424-25.

The chi-square test also was employed in the data analyses of this study, and was performed on those items measured at a nominal level. This test is used to determine whether the distribution of frequencies in a crosstabulation of two variables differs significantly from that expected by chance. "The chi-square test is commonly used when the research data are in the form of frequency counts rather than interval scores."⁸ The chi-square tests were performed at the .05 level of statistical significance.

Statistical significance at the .01 level as well as at the .05 level was reported in order that subsequent investigators would have this additional information available to them.

SUMMARY

The purpose of this study was to investigate and describe trusteeship as it is exercised by the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries in the United States. The research methodology was chosen to provide a foundational base by which the governing boards of these institutions could be examined. It is expected that a replication of this study will track any trends that may develop in the evolution and development of the governing boards of these institutions as a group and will highlight

⁸Ibid., p. 429.

denominational differences. A detailed presentation of the data obtained by this study is presented in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

This chapter contains a detailed presentation of the data obtained for this study through the use of a survey instrument and is organized and presented through the use of tables. The narrative that accompanies these tables will highlight and profile the characteristics, composition and activities of the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries in the United States.

SURVEY RESPONSE RATE

The overall response rate of this study was 75.16 per cent. Table 1 is a presentation of the response rate by denominational groups. Upon examination of the 112 survey instruments that were returned, 104 were determined to possess sufficient information for analysis. Therefore, the overall net response rate was 69.8 per cent. Several of the respondents failed to complete the entire questionnaire. As a result, the response rate for the individual items of the survey instrument of this study range from 66.44 per cent to 69.80 per cent.

TABLE 1
SURVEY INSTRUMENT RESPONSE RATE BY DENOMINATIONAL GROUPS
FOR THE GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL
SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES

Denominational Groups	Number of Institutions Surveyed	Number of Institutions Responding	Gross Response Rate (in percentages)	Valid Responses	Net Response Rate (in percentages)
Total	149	112	75.16	104	69.8
Single School Denominations	8	6	75.0	6	75.0
Two or Three School Denominations	11	6	54.5	6	54.5
Baptist	17	11	64.7	11	64.7
Christian Church	5	3	60.0	3	60.0
Lutheran	11	10	90.9	9	81.8
Mennonite	4	3	75.0	2	50.0
Methodist	10	6	60.0	6	60.0
Presbyterian	12	11	91.6	11	91.6
Episcopal	10	7	70.0	5	50.0
Catholic	41	32	78.0	29	70.7
United Church	5	4	80.0	4	80.0
Inter/Nondenominational	15	13	86.6	12	80.0
Catholic	41	32	78.0	29	70.0
Denominations other than Catholic	93	67	72.0	63	67.7
Inter/Nondenominational	15	13	86.6	12	80.0

Examination of Table 1 will disclose a denominational response rate ranging from a low of 50.0 per cent to a high of 91.6 per cent. However, the three subgroups that have been established for analysis of variance reflect a much tighter spread. The overall range between these three denominational subgroups was only 12.3 percentage points.

Individually, all denominational groups had a response rate of 50 per cent or more. As indicated in Chapter III of this study, a 50 per cent response rate is adequate for analysis and reporting. The response rate for the three subgroups established for variance analysis ranged between 67.7 per cent and 80.0 per cent. According to Babbie, ". . . a response rate of at least 60 per cent is good. And a response rate of 70 per cent or more is very good."¹ Therefore, the investigator considered the sample to be representative of the population.

SIZE AND OCCUPANCY LEVEL OF THE GOVERNING BOARDS

Table 2 is a presentation of the current size and occupancy level of the governing boards of this study (104 boards are represented). There were 2,838 trustee seats available on these 104 boards. The mean size of these boards was 27.2 available positions. The smallest board

¹Earl R. Babbie, Survey Research Methods (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973), p. 165.

TABLE 2
THE SIZE AND THE OCCUPANCY LEVEL OF GOVERNING
BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES

	Number of Boards Reporting	Number of Trustee Seats Available	Mean Number of Trustee Seats Available	Range of the Number of Available Seats	Number of Seats Occupied	Mean Number Seats Occupied	Range of Occupied Seats	Percentage of Trustee Seats Occupied
Total	104	2838	27.2	7-98	2533	24.3	7-72	89.5
Single School Denominations	6	142	23.6	13-43	129	21.4	12-34	90.8
Two or Three School Denominations	6	193	32.2	11-61	189	31.5	11-61	97.9
Baptist	11	377	34.3	15-60	340	30.9	15-52	90.2
Christian Church	3	65	21.6	15-25	62	20.6	15-25	95.4
Lutheran	9	186	20.6	7-36	186	20.6	7-36	100.0
Mennonite	2	22	11.0	10-12	22	11.0	10-12	100.0
Methodist	6	217	36.1	25-45	202	33.6	24-40	93.1
Presbyterian	11	371	33.7	24-45	326	29.6	22-39	87.8
Episcopal	5	184	36.8	21-51	147	29.4	19-41	79.9
Catholic	29	530	18.3	7-98	430	14.8	7-29	81.1
United Church	4	122	30.5	24-36	111	27.7	17-35	91.0
Inter/Nondenominational	12	429	35.7	21-72	189	31.7	9-72	44.0
Catholic	29	530 *	18.3	7-98	430 *	14.8	7-29	81.1
Denominations other than Catholic	63	1879 *	29.8	7-61	1714 *	27.2	7-61	91.2
Inter/Nondenominational	12	429 *	35.7	21-72	189 *	31.7	9-72	44.0

Note: * F-Ratio, $p \leq .01$

contained seven positions while the largest board had ninety-eight available positions. Of the 2,838 positions available, 89.5 per cent or 2,533 were occupied. The mean size of sitting boards was 24.3 members, with a range of seven to seventy-two members.

Table 2 illustrates the size and occupancy levels of the sample by denomination. The three subgroups are listed and statistical significance is indicated.

Catholic institutions had 530 trustee seats available with 430 of those positions presently occupied, resulting in a 81.1 per cent occupancy rate. The mean size of the governing boards of Catholic institutions was 18.3 members, while the mean size of the sitting Catholic boards was 14.8 members. The range of available seats was from seven to ninety-eight, and the mean size of sitting boards was much tighter--only seven to twenty-nine.

Denominations other than Catholic had 1,879 trustee positions available. Of these 1,714 were occupied, resulting in a 91.2 per cent occupancy rate. The mean size of this group was 29.8 available positions and 27.2 positions which were occupied. The range for available and occupied positions in this group was seven to sixty-one.

The governing boards of interdenominational and/or nondenominational institutions had 429 trustee seats available. At the time of the study, 189 positions were occupied, which resulted in a 44.0 per cent occupancy

rate. The mean size of available positions was 35.7 and the mean size of occupied positions was 31.7. The range of positions allowed on the governing boards of these institutions was from twenty-one to seventy-two, while the range for occupied positions stood at nine to seventy-two.

An analysis of variance was performed on this data to determine whether any statistical significance existed between the subgroups. There was statistical significance at the .01 level for both the variables of size and occupation level. For size $F = 8.4860$ with degrees of freedom of 2 and 101 and a significance level of .0004 and for occupancy level $F = 17.4530$ with degrees of freedom of 2 and 101 and a significance level of .0000.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

Table 3 contains the demographic characteristics of the voting members of the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries examined in this study. The data is presented in percentages of the current voting members of these governing boards. The characteristics of sex, religious status, race, educational level and age are presented for the total group and by denominational groups as listed in Appendix E.

Of the 2,533 voting members represented in this study, 84.7 per cent were men, 14.2 per cent were women, 89.4 per cent were white and only 7.8 per cent were listed as racial minorities. Of these voting members, 89.6 per

cent had received a baccalaureate degree and 67.3 per cent had post-baccalaureate degrees. Over 75 per cent of the voting members were over the age of forty, with the largest single group (34.0 per cent) being between fifty to fifty-nine years old.

The religious status of the voting members of these boards could not be determined with any level of confidence, because 31.7 per cent of the data was missing; that is, the respondents failed to complete this section of the survey questionnaire. Such failure may have resulted because of the ambiguous nature of this item in the survey instrument.

The voting members of Catholic governing boards (430) were 90.0 per cent male and 96.7 per cent white, 96.3 per cent held at least a bachelor's degree with 85.4 per cent having received a post-baccalaureate degree. In the age category, 94.0 per cent were over forty years of age, with 42.8 per cent between the ages of fifty and fifty-nine years.

Characteristics of voting members of denominations other than Catholic indicated that 82.7 per cent of the 1,714 voting members were male and 92.7 per cent were white. The level of education was high, with 88.5 per cent being college educated and 61.3 per cent of the voting members having some type of graduate degree. Of these individuals 76.3 were over forty years old and 34.8 per cent were between

fifty and fifty-nine years old. However, it must be noted that the age of 17.7 per cent of the voting members of this group was unknown.

Interdenominational and nondenominational boards were comprised of 87.4 per cent men and 66.3 per cent were white. Racial information for 11.2 per cent of this group was unreported. Also absent was the educational data of 35.2 per cent of this group. However, it was known that 64.2 per cent of these individuals had baccalaureate degrees and that 51 per cent had post-baccalaureate degrees. Of the voting members of the group, 54.8 per cent of them were over forty years old and, as in the case of the other groups, the largest known age group was fifty to fifty-nine years old (21.0 per cent). Care must be exercised in interpreting the age of this group because 41.6 per cent of the individuals in this group were unclassified in respect to age.

The data found in Table 3 was analyzed for variance and the results of this analysis are presented in Table 3A. The analysis of variance of the three subgroups indicated that statistical significance existed in a number of areas as indicated in Table 3A.

The relationship between sex and denominational subgroups was found to be significant, (men: $F = 12.9780$, $df = 2, 100$, $p \leq .0000$; and women, $F = 9.3283$, $df = 2, 99$, $p \leq .0002$) at $p \leq .01$. The missing data was relatively

TABLE 3A
DENOMINATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE
CHARACTERISTICS OF VOTING MEMBERS OF GOVERNING BOARDS
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
 (in percentages)

Characteristics	Total	Denominations other than			Inter/Non-denominational
		Catholic	Catholic	Catholic	
Voting Members	2533	430	1714	389	
Sex:					
Men	84.7	90.0	82.7	87.4 **	
Women	14.2	10.0	15.5	12.6 **	
Missing	1.1	0.0	1.8	0.0	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Religious Status:					
Clergy	33.6	39.5	36.3	14.9 *	
Laiity	34.7	25.5	38.8	30.3 **	
Missing	31.7	38.0	24.9	54.8	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Race:					
White	89.4	96.7	92.7	66.3 **	
Black	5.2	0.9	4.3	13.8 **	
Hispanic	2.0	2.1	0.7	7.7 **	
Other Minority	0.6	0.3	0.6	1.0	
Missing	2.8	0.0	1.7	11.2	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Education:					
< High school	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	
High school diploma	2.7	0.7	3.6	0.5 **	
A.A., A.S.	0.9	0.0	1.2	0.2	
B.A., B.S.	22.3	10.9	27.2	13.2 **	
M.A., M.S., M.Div.	36.6	38.4	31.3	28.9	
Ph.D., S.T.D., Ed.D.	18.1	35.4	17.4	8.7	
Professional Degree	12.6	11.6	12.6	13.4 **	
Missing	6.8	3.0	6.8	35.2	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
Age:					
< 30 years old	0.9	0.2	0.1	0.8	
30-39 years old	5.4	5.8	5.9	2.8 *	
40-49 years old	20.7	27.2	20.4	15.0 *	
50-59 years old	34.0	42.8	34.8	21.0 **	
60-69 years old	17.4	21.0	17.1	15.0 *	
70 years old or older	3.8	3.0	4.0	3.8	
Missing	17.8	0.0	17.7	41.6	
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	

Note: * F-Ratio, $p \leq .05$;

** F-Ratio, $p \leq .01$

small (only 1.1 per cent). Therefore, it was reasonable to conclude that this analysis is valid.

The missing data for the determination of religious status was 31.7 per cent overall and was as high as 54.8 per cent for the inter/nondenominational subgroup. The statistical significance for clergy and laity status must be questioned. The clergy classification for the three subgroups was significant at the .05 level ($F = 4.6603$, $df = 2.93$, $p \leq .0118$) and at the .01 level for the laity classification ($F = 13.1434$, $df = 2.92$, $p \leq .0000$).

The racial classifications by subgroups shows statistical significance at the .01 level for the variables of white ($F = 11.0060$, $df = 2.99$, $p \leq .0000$); black ($F = 9.6644$, $df = 2.99$, $p \leq .0001$); and Hispanic ($F = 6.2035$, $df = 2.98$, $p \leq .0029$). The overall percentage of missing information about the racial background of the governing board members was 2.8 per cent; however, the information on 11.2 per cent of the members of the inter/nondenominational group was missing.

The relationship of education level and denominational affiliation also indicated statistical significance at the .01 level for the variables. High school diploma ($F = 6.3444$, $df = 2.92$, $p \leq .0026$); baccalaureate degrees ($F = 13.0574$, $df = 2.92$, $p \leq .0000$); and professional degrees ($F = 6.77371$, $df = 2.92$, $p \leq .0019$).

The age of the voting members of the subgroups, when analyzed for variance, showed statistical significance for several age groups. The accuracy of this information must be questioned because 41.6 per cent of the members of the inter/nondenominational subgroups were not classified by age due to missing information.

THE PRIMARY OCCUPATION

The primary occupation of the voting members of governing boards of theological schools and seminaries was determined and catalogued in one of six major occupation classifications (see Table 4). The largest single occupation classification was church occupations. The primary occupation of 41.8 per cent of the voting members of the governing boards reporting was church related. This percentage ranged from a low of 28.5 per cent for the trustees of institutions of the two or three school denominational subgroups to a high of 51.1 per cent for the members of Catholic institutions. When organized into the three subgroups of Catholic, denominations other than Catholic, and inter/nondenominational, the range was from a low of 34.8 per cent to a high of 51.1 per cent (see Table 4A). There was statistical significance at the .05 level. Analysis variance performed on the data of the three subgroups for this occupation classification resulted in the following data: $F = 3.1364$, $df = 2.109$, $p \leq .0474$.

TABLE 4
PRIMARY OCCUPATION OF THE VOTING MEMBERS
OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
 (in percentages)

TABLE 4													
PRIMARY OCCUPATION OF THE VOTING MEMBERS OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES (in percentages)													
Primary Occupation	Total	Chris- tian Church											
		Single School denomi- nations	Two or Three School Denomi- nations	Baptist	Men- nonite	Meth- odist	Presby- terian	Epis- copal	Catholic	United Church	Inter- denom- inal		
Number of voting members	2533	129	189	340	62	186	22	202	326	147	430	111	389
Church:													
Denominational or Church Executive	15.3	19.3	5.8	5.2	4.8	22.4	9.0	12.8	5.2	21.7	31.8	13.5	13.6
Pastoral minister	22.2	20.2	18.5	38.2	27.5	23.4	22.8	19.3	27.6	25.3	10.2	15.3	17.2
Special ministry	3.1	3.9	4.2	3.0	4.8	2.2	0.0	1.5	0.6	3.4	6.3	0.9	2.8
Other Church	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	2.7	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.6	2.8	0.9	1.5
Total Church	41.8	43.4	28.5	46.4	38.7	50.7	31.8	34.1	34.0	51.0	51.1	30.6	34.8
Business:													
Executive officer-business	8.2	5.4	11.6	5.9	9.7	9.7	13.6	10.4	11.3	8.2	6.2	6.3	7.4
Executive officer-finance	4.8	6.2	5.3	2.3	3.2	3.2	0.0	13.4	5.5	6.1	1.2	6.3	5.4
Proprietor of small company	6.0	6.2	5.8	8.8	8.0	2.7	4.6	7.0	6.4	4.0	2.0	13.5	7.2
Other Business	1.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.6	0.5	0.0	1.0	1.2	0.0	0.6	0.9	4.4
Total Business	20.2	17.8	22.7	17.0	22.5	16.1	18.2	31.8	24.4	18.3	10.0	27.0	24.4
Education:													
Administrator of seminary	2.7	6.2	2.1	0.9	1.6	0.5	4.5	1.5	1.5	0.7	8.4	0.9	1.5
Administrator of college/university	2.8	0.0	2.6	2.0	0.0	2.7	9.0	1.0	1.2	4.7	5.6	3.6	2.8
Faculty-seminary	1.7	1.5	2.6	0.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.0	1.2	1.3	4.4	1.8	0.7
Faculty-college/university	3.1	2.3	7.9	2.3	0.0	6.4	4.5	1.0	2.7	0.7	4.6	0.0	2.3
Full-time student	1.3	2.3	3.2	1.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.0	1.0	0.0	0.7	1.8	1.3
Educator primary/secondary school	1.5	0.7	4.2	2.0	0.0	6.4	4.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.9	1.8	0.2
Other Education	0.5	0.7	1.0	0.6	1.6	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0
Total Education	13.6	13.7	23.6	10.2	3.2	17.0	22.5	8.5	9.2	7.4	25.3	9.9	8.8
Professional Services:													
Accountant	1.0	1.5	2.1	1.5	1.6	0.5	4.5	0.0	0.3	0.7	1.1	2.7	0.5
Lawyer/partner in law firm	4.8	2.3	4.2	2.3	6.4	4.8	4.5	4.9	5.5	10.2	5.5	4.5	5.4
Physician/Dentist	2.1	2.3	3.7	2.9	1.6	1.0	4.5	1.0	2.7	1.4	0.9	3.6	2.3
Psychologist/social worker	0.3	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	0.0	0.5	0.0	0.0
Other Professional Services	0.7	2.3	0.0	0.3	1.6	0.0	0.0	2.0	0.6	2.0	0.2	0.0	0.7
Total Professional Services	8.9	8.4	11.0	7.0	11.2	7.3	13.5	7.9	9.7	14.3	8.2	10.8	8.9

The second largest occupation category is the business classification. This classification accounted for 20.2 per cent of the voting members of the entire sample, which is less than half of the church occupation classification of 41.8 per cent.

The institutions of the United Church had the largest percentage (27.0) of any denomination in this study of voting members whose primary occupation was in the field of business. The Catholic institutions had the smallest percentage (10.0) of business people on their boards. The subgroups Catholic, denominations other than Catholic, and inter/nondenominational revealed a significant difference in the level of representation by the business community on the governing boards of their perspective institutions ($F = 12.6579$, $df = 2.109$, $p \leq .0000$).

The field of education accounted for 13.6 per cent of the members of governing boards membership's primary occupation. The largest single occupation in this general classification was faculty member of a college or university (3.1 per cent). Catholic institutions had more voting members on their governing boards involved in education as their primary occupation (25.3 per cent) than any other single denomination. Even when denominations were combined to form the three subgroups for analysis, Catholic institutions had more than twice the percentage of either of the other two groups involved in education (Catholic--

25.3 per cent, other denominations--11.8 per cent, and inter/nondenominational--8.8 per cent). There was no significant statistical difference at the .05 level for this variable.

The percentage of voting members of the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries listed as being members of the professional services occupation classification was 8.9 per cent. Lawyers constituted the profession with the largest single percentage of representation (4.8 per cent). There was no statistical significance in the relationship between denominational subgroups and membership in the professional services.

Other primary occupations were grouped for analysis and constituted 7.6 per cent of the total sample. The occupation of homemaker comprised 3.5 per cent of the total number of voting members in the sample. Of the thirty-two occupations listed in this study, the homemaker ranked as the eighth most represented occupation on the governing boards of these institutions. Catholic institutions had fewer members involved in occupations in this classification (3.4 per cent) than denominations other than Catholic (8.5 per cent) or inter/nondenominational institutions (6.8 per cent). There was a statistical difference in the relationship of denominational affiliation and having a primary occupation in this category, ($F = 9.6756$, $df = 2.109$, $p \leq .0001$).

TABLE 4A
DENOMINATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE
PRIMARY OCCUPATION OF THE VOTING MEMBERS
OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
(in percentages)

Primary Occupation	Total Catholic		Denominations other than Catholic	Inter/non- Denominational
Number of voting members	2533	430	1714	389
Church:				
Denominational or Church Executive	15.3	31.8	11.6	13.6
Pastoral minister	22.2	10.2	26.3	17.2
Special ministry	3.1	6.3	2.4	2.8
Other Church	1.1	2.8	0.6	1.5
Total Church	41.8	51.1	40.9	34.9 *
Business:				
Executive officer-business	8.2	6.2	8.9	7.4
Executive officer-finance	4.8	1.2	5.5	5.4
Proprietor of small company	6.0	2.0	6.7	7.2
Other Business	1.1	0.6	0.5	4.4
Total Business	20.2	10.0	21.7	24.4 **
Education:				
Administrator of seminary	2.7	8.4	1.6	1.5
Administrator of college/university	2.8	5.6	2.1	2.8
Faculty-seminary	1.7	4.4	1.3	0.7
Faculty-college/university	3.1	4.6	2.9	2.3
Full-time student	1.3	0.7	1.4	1.3
Educator primary/secondary school	1.5	0.9	2.0	0.2
Other Education	0.5	0.7	0.5	0.0
Total Education	13.6	25.3	11.8	8.8
Professional Services:				
Accountant	1.0	1.1	1.1	0.5
Lawyer/partner in law firm	4.8	5.5	4.7	5.4
Physician/Dentist	2.1	0.9	2.4	2.3
Psychologist/social worker	0.3	0.5	0.3	0.0
Other Professional Services	0.7	0.2	0.8	0.7
Total Professional Services	8.9	8.2	9.3	8.9
Other:				
Nonprofit executive	1.4	0.9	1.3	2.3
Elected official	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2
Rancher/farmer	0.8	0.2	1.1	0.0
Journalist	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2
Artist/writer/musician	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0
Government official	0.4	0.2	0.2	1.3
Homemaker	3.5	1.1	4.4	1.8
Judge	0.4	0.2	0.4	0.2
Other	0.7	0.2	0.8	0.8
Total Other	7.6	3.4	8.5	6.8 **
Retired:				
Minister	1.6	0.2	1.5	2.8
Professional Services	1.3	0.2	1.7	0.7
Corporate financial	1.8	1.1	1.9	2.0
Other	1.1	0.5	1.2	1.2
Total Retired	5.8	2.0	6.3	6.7 **
Missing Data:	2.1	0.0	1.5	9.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0 *
Note: * F-Ratio, $p \leq .05$; ** F-Ratio, $p \leq .01$				

Of the voting members of these institutions, 5.8 per cent were retired. Catholic institutions had fewer retired members than other denominational institutions or inter/non-denominational institutions. There was statistical significance in this relationship at the .05 level, ($F = 5.6414$, $df = 2.109$, $p \leq .0047$).

Church occupations accounted for 41.8 per cent or 1,059 individual members of the governing boards represented in this study. This was a substantially higher percentage than any combination of any other two occupation classifications. For all classifications, only 2.1 per cent of the total number of voting members were unclassified.

MULTIPLE BOARD MEMBERSHIP

The expertise of the individuals who comprised the voting members of the boards of these institutions appeared to be in demand. The data revealed that a number of these individuals served on more than one governing board (see Tables 5 and 5A). Nine per cent of the voting members of Catholic governing boards served on more than one governing board of a theological school or seminary. The members of inter/ nondenominational boards (2.6 per cent) and other denominations (1.8 per cent) had a smaller number of individuals serving on more than one theological school and/or seminary governing board than did the members of Catholic boards (see Table 5A). However, upon analysis of

TABLE 5
MULTIPLE BOARD MEMBERSHIP OF BOARD MEMBERS
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
 (Percentage of Board Members)

Membership	Total	Single School- Denomi- nation	Two or Three School- Denomi- nation	Baptist	Chris- tian Church	Lutheran	Men- nonite	Meth- odist	Presby- terian	Epis- copal	Catholic	United Church	Inter- denomi- national
Number of voting members	2533	129	189	340	62	186	22	202	326	147	430	111	389
Membership on the board of another theological school	3.1	4.6	0.5	1.4	3.2	1.0	9.0	1.0	0.3	4.7	9.0	2.7	2.6
Membership on the board of a college or university	12.3	11.6	27.5	8.2	9.7	9.1	0.0	6.9	18.7	1.3	19.5	7.2	6.4
Membership on the board of a corporation	12.7	7.7	15.8	5.3	8.0	10.7	18.1	8.9	23.9	6.1	19.7	10.8	8.7
A Chair, Chief Executive Officer or Chief Operating Officer of a corporation	7.5	4.6	11.1	5.6	1.6	2.7	9.0	7.4	11.9	3.4	10.2	4.5	6.9

TABLE 5A DENOMINATION ANALYSIS OF THE MULTIPLE BOARD MEMBERSHIP OF THE MEMBERS OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES (in percentages)			
Membership	Catholic	Denomi- national other than Catholic	Inter/ non- Denomi- national
Number of voting members	430	1714	389
Membership on the board of another theological school	9.0	1.8	2.6
Membership on the board of a college or university	19.5	11.8	6.4
Membership on the board of a corporation	19.7	11.9	8.7
A Chair, Chief Executive Officer or Chief Operating Officer of a corporation	10.2	6.9	6.9

variance no statistical significance was found at the .05 level.

An examination of Table 5 reveals that 12.3 per cent of the members of these governing boards also served as members of the governing boards of a college or university and 12.7 per cent served as members on the board of a corporation. Seven and one-half per cent of the individuals who were voting members of theological schools and/or serve on governing boards were the chief executive officer, chief executive operating officer or chairman of the board of a corporation. Catholic boards had a larger percentage of their members in each of the above categories than institutions of other denominations or inter/nondenominational institutions. However, no statistical significance existed at the .05 level.

DENOMINATIONAL FUNDING AND FUND-RAISING ACTIVITIES

The fund-raising activities of governing boards of theological schools and seminaries were related to the percentage of funding provided to these institutions from denominational sources. Comparisons reported in Table 6 are the average percentage of funding from denominational sources and the percentage of boards that have a history of being involved with fund-raising activities. The data is presented for each of the denominational groups of the study as well as for the three subgroups used for the analysis of variance.

TABLE 6
DENOMINATIONAL FUNDING AND FUND RAISING ACTIVITIES
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
 (percentage of support)

	Number of Boards Reporting	Average Percentage of funding from Denominational Sources	Percentage of Boards with History of Fund-Raising Activities
Total	101	28.0	68.9
Single School Denomination	6	25.1	83.3
Two or Three School Denomination	5	26.8	100.0
Baptist	11	37.8	81.8
Christian Church	3	3.3	66.6
Lutheran	8	26.7	77.7
Mennonite	2	35.0	100.0
Methodist	6	25.6	100.0
Presbyterian	11	17.1	90.9
Episcopal	5	2.2	40.0
Catholic	29	47.5	31.0
United Church	4	20.7	50.0
Inter/Nondenominational	11	1.9	100.0
Catholic	29	47.5	31.0
Denominational other than Catholic	61	23.4	83.6
Inter/Nondenominational	11	1.9 *	100.0 **

Note: * F-Ratio, $p \leq .05$; ** Chi-Square, $p \leq .01$

The Catholic institutions received a larger percentage of their funds from denominational sources (47.5 per cent) than any other single denominations or for the subgroups or denominations other than Catholic (23.4 per cent) and inter/nondenominational (1.9 per cent). A significant relationship existed at the .05 level between denominational affiliation and the percentage of denominational funding ($F = 3.7267$, $df = 2.97$, $p \leq .0276$).

Inter/nondenominational institutions reported a 100.0 per cent involvement by their governing boards in fund-raising activities. Catholic boards were the least active of all denominations in fund-raising activities. Overall, 68.9 per cent of the 101 boards reporting indicated participation in the fund-raising activities of the institution. The range was from a low of 31.0 per cent for Catholics to 100.0 per cent for the institutions in four of the twelve denominational groups.

Analysis of the relationship between denominational affiliation and participation in fund raising activities was significant at the .01 level (chi-square = 28.6567, $df = 2$, $p \leq .0000$).

ELECTION AND SELECTION OF BOARD MEMBERS

Three basic processes for election and/or selection of board members of theological schools and seminaries are presented in Tables 7 and 7A.

TABLE 7A
DENOMINATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE ELECTION/SELECTION OF BOARD
MEMBERS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
 (percentage of Boards Reporting)

Selection/Election Process	Total	Catholic	Denominations other than Catholic	Inter/Non-denominational
Number of boards reporting	102	29	62	11
Self-perpetuating body	33.3	24.0	29.0	81.8 *
Selection of board membership by a combination of election and appointment	27.5	38.0	25.8	9.1
Selection of board membership by appointment	39.2	38.0	45.2	9.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Appointing Agent (percentage of boards with appointing agent)				
Number of boards reporting	68	22	24	2
Administrative head of sponsoring denomination	12.5	27.3	8.3	50.0
Administrative head of sponsoring religious body	7.8	27.3	0.0	0.0 *
National or regional synod or convention	56.2	9.1	58.5	50.0 *
Separate "corporate" body - (two-tiered board)	12.5	22.7	16.6	0.0
Other	11.0	13.6	16.6	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note: * Chi-square, $p \leq .01$

One-third of the governing boards reported that they were self-perpetuating bodies. The range was from no single school denominations having self-perpetuating boards to 81.8 per cent of the inter/nondenominational boards being self-perpetuating. The chi-square test performed to test the significance of the relationship between affiliation and self-perpetuating boards revealed significance at the .01 level (chi-square = 13.256, df = 2, $p \leq .0013$).

Of the reporting boards, 27.5 per cent indicated that individuals became members of their boards through a combination of appointment of some individuals to the board by an appointing agent and election of some members to the board by the board itself. The most common process by which an individual became a member of the governing board of a theological school or seminary was through appointment (39.2 per cent) by an appointing agent or agency.

Two-thirds of the boards had appointed members. Of the individuals appointed by a governing board, more than half of them (56.2 per cent) were appointed by a national or regional synod or convention. For Catholics, only 9.1 per cent were appointed by a synod or convention, while other denominations reported that 58.5 per cent of those appointed to the position of trustee were appointed by a synod or convention (see Table 7A). There was a significant relationship between the denominational

affiliation and appointment to a governing board by a national or regional synod or convention (chi-square = 27.954, $df = 2$, $p \leq .0000$). The appointment of a member to a board by the administrative level of the sponsoring religious body also was sensitive to denominational affiliation and was likewise significant at the .01 level (chi-square = 13.234, $df = 2$, $p \leq .0013$). However, it should be noted that this appointing agency was only reported by Catholic boards. Catholics also have the highest percentage of two-tiered governance structures (22.7 per cent) as appointing agents.

The administrative head of the sponsoring denomination, --the president or bishop of the convention or diocese--was the appointing agent for 12.5 per cent of the boards that have appointing agents. Again, the appointment of a member by the administrative head of the denomination was more frequently found in Catholic institutions than in institutions of other affiliations.

LENGTH AND LIMITATION OF BOARD TERMS

A term of three years was the norm for 58.4 per cent of the governing boards represented in this study (see Table 8). Terms of one or two years represented a combined total of 0.3 per cent of the boards. Fifteen point eight per cent of the boards had terms of four years and 22.8 per cent of the boards had terms of five or more years in length. Table 8 also contains a breakdown of the length

TABLE 8
LENGTH AND LIMITATIONS OF THE TERMS OF SERVICE
OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
(percentage of Boards Reporting)

TABLE 8												
LENGTH AND LIMITATIONS OF THE TERMS OF SERVICE OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES (percentage of Boards Reporting)												
Number of Boards Reporting	Length of a Single Term					Consecutive Term Limits						
	1 year	2 years	3 years	4 years	5 or more years	No limit	1 term	2 terms	3 terms	4 terms	5 or more years	
Total	101	0.1	0.2	58.4	15.8	22.8	43.5	3.0	31.7	18.8	3.0	1.0
Single School Denominations	6	0.0	16.6	50.0	33.3	0.0	66.6	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
Two or Three School Denomi- nations	5	0.0	20.0	80.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	0.0
Baptist	11	0.0	0.0	45.5	0.0	54.5	36.4	9.1	45.4	9.1	0.0	0.0
Christian Church	3	0.0	0.0	66.6	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0
Lutheran	9	0.0	0.0	44.4	11.2	44.4	11.1	0.0	88.9	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mennonite	2	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Methodist	6	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	16.6	0.0	33.3	33.3	16.6	0.0
Presbyterian	11	0.0	0.0	63.6	27.3	9.1	18.2	0.0	27.3	45.4	9.1	0.0
Episcopal	4	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	50.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	0.0
Catholic	29	3.4	0.0	65.6	10.3	20.7	55.3	6.9	17.2	13.8	3.4	3.4
United Church	4	0.0	0.0	75.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Inter/Non- denominational	11	0.0	0.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	72.7	0.0	9.1	18.2	0.0	0.0
Catholic	29	3.4	0.0	65.6	10.3	20.7	55.3	6.9	17.2	13.8	3.4	3.4
Denominations other than Catholic	61	0.0	3.3	54.1	18.0	24.6	31.2	1.6	42.6	21.3	3.3	0.0
Inter/Non- Denominational	11	0.0	0.0	63.6	18.2	18.2	72.7	0.0	9.1	18.2	0.0	0.0 *
Note: * F-Ratio, $p \leq .05$												

Note: * F-Ratio, $p \leq .05$

of the term of the governing boards by denominational grouping and by the three subgroups. No statistical significance was found for a relationship between length of term and denominational affiliation.

As shown in Table 8, 43.5 per cent of the boards did not have a limit on the number of consecutive terms an individual could serve as a voting member of the governing board. Two consecutive terms was the limit imposed by 31.7 per cent of the boards. Of the remaining 24.8 per cent, 18.8 per cent had a three-term limit, a restriction of four consecutive terms were requirements of 3.0 per cent of the boards, and 1.0 per cent of the boards allowed five or more consecutive terms. Statistical significance was found at the .05 level for the relationship between denominational affiliation and the limitation on the number of consecutive terms allowed ($F = 3.348$, $df = 2.95$, $p \leq .0393$).

Institutional requirements for the chief executive officer and the chair of the governing board are summarized in Table 9. Slightly less than half (49.5 per cent) of all the theological schools and seminaries in this study required that the chief executive officer of the institution be a member of the clergy of the sponsoring denomination. The majority of Catholic institutions (89.6 per cent) had this requirement as compared with only 39.3 per cent of other denominational schools. A significant difference at the

TABLE 9
BOARD CHAIR - CEO REQUIREMENTS FOR THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS
AND SEMINARIES
 (percentage of Boards Reporting)

	Number of Boards reporting	Chief Executive Officer required to be a member of the clergy of the sponsoring denomination	Chief Executive Officer required to be a full voting member of the governing board	Board Chair required to be a member of the clergy of the spon- soring denomination	Board Chair required to be an officer of the sponsoring denomination
Total	101	49.5	54.4	26.7	24.7
Single School Denomination	6	66.6	100.0	33.3	16.6
Two or Three School Denominations	5	20.0	40.0	20.0	0.0
Baptist	11	27.2	54.5	9.0	0.0
Christian Church	3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0
Lutheran	9	44.4	11.1	0.0	0.0
Mennonite	2	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0
Methodist	6	33.3	66.6	0.0	0.0
Presbyterian	11	45.4	27.2	0.0	9.0
Episcopal	4	75.0	75.0	25.0	25.0
Catholic	29	89.6	72.4	72.4	75.8
United Church	4	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0
Inter/Non- denominational	11	N/A	45.4	N/A	N/A
Catholic	29	89.6	72.4	72.4	75.8
Denominations other than Catholic	61	39.3	47.5	9.8	4.9
Inter/Non- denominational	11	N/A *	45.4	N/A *	N/A *
Note: * Chi-square, $p \leq .01$					

.01 level was determined (chi-square = 32.005, df = 2, $p \leq .0000$). This requirement, however, was not applicable to the inter/nondenominational subgroup of institutions.

No statistical significance at the .05 level was determined for the relationship between affiliation and the requirement of the chief executive officer to be a full voting member of the governing board. Catholics had this requirement in 72.4 per cent of their institutions while denominations other than Catholic (47.5 per cent) and inter/nondenominational institutions (45.4 per cent) required this in less than half of their institutions. (See Table 9.)

Approximately one-quarter of the governing boards had requirements concerning the status of the board chair. The responses indicated that 26.7 per cent of the boards prescribed that the chair be a member of the clergy of the sponsoring denomination and 24.7 per cent required the chair to be an officer of the sponsoring denomination or religious body. Catholic institutions maintained these requirements in about three-quarters of the institutions. The majority (72.4 per cent) of the Catholic institutions required the chair to be a clergyman of the sponsoring denomination as compared with 9.8 per cent of other denominations. A statistical difference existed at the .01 level (chi-square = 43.802, df = 2, $p \leq .0000$). Likewise, 75.8 per cent of the Catholic institutions required that the chair of the governing board be an officer of the

sponsoring religious body or denomination, with statistical significance at the .01 level (chi-square = 57.174, df = 2, $p \leq .0000$). Denominational requirements were not applicable to the nondenominational-inter/nondenominational institutions.

STANDING COMMITTEES

Ninety-nine chief executive officers responded to the question about the presence of standing committees in the structure of their governing boards. Of the fourteen committees listed, the Executive Committee (86.9 per cent), and the Budget/Finance Committee (85.8 per cent), were the two most frequently found committees on the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries. A Committee on Denomination/Church Relations was the least frequently found committee (4.0 per cent).

Table 10 is a presentation by denominational groups of the presence of these standing committees on the governing boards of the institutions in this study. The committees were tested for denominational-affiliation sensitivity. A presentation of the percentages of institutions in each of the three subgroups (Catholic, denominations other than Catholic, and inter/nondenominational) and the statistical significance are found in Table 10A.

Seven of the fourteen committees listed showed some level of statistical significance at the .05 or .01 levels.

TABLE 10
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE GOVERNING BOARDS
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
 (percentage of boards reporting committee structure)

TABLE 10													
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES (percentage of boards reporting committee structure)													
Committees	Total	Single School Denomi- nation	Two or Three School Denomi- nation	Baptist	Chris- tian Church	Luth- eran	Men- nonite	Meth- odist	Presby- terian	Epis- copal	Catholic	United Church	Inter- denomi- national
Number of boards Reporting	99	5	6	11	3	8	2	6	11	4	28	4	11
Budget/Finance Committee	85.8	80.0	100.0	100.0	66.6	75.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	64.3	100.0	100.0
Student Policy Committee	44.4	60.0	33.3	45.4	33.3	50.0	50.0	50.0	36.4	75.0	35.7	50.0	54.5
Planning Committee	22.2	0.0	33.3	27.3	0.0	0.0	50.0	16.6	72.7	50.0	10.7	0.0	19.2
Fundraising Committee	63.6	60.0	83.3	72.7	33.3	37.5	50.0	100.0	72.7	75.0	42.8	100.0	81.8
Denomination/Church Relations Committee	4.0	0.0	0.0	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.6	9.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.1
Audit Committee	19.2	20.0	50.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	18.2	50.0	3.5	0.0	45.4
Nominations Committee	45.5	20.0	50.0	36.4	33.3	0.0	0.0	83.3	72.7	100.0	21.4	100.0	81.8
Honors Committee	8.1	0.0	33.3	9.1	33.3	12.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	9.1
Bylaws Committee	12.1	0.0	16.6	9.1	33.3	12.5	0.0	66.6	0.0	0.0	7.1	0.0	18.2
Education Policy Committee	69.7	60.0	66.6	90.1	66.6	62.5	100.0	83.3	100.0	25.0	46.4	75.0	90.1
Personnel (Faculty/ Staff) Committee	29.3	0.0	33.3	18.2	33.3	37.5	50.0	50.0	45.4	50.0	10.7	75.0	16.4
Trustee Orientation Committee	16.2	20.0	33.3	36.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	18.2	25.0	3.5	0.0	18.2
Physical plant Management Committee	46.5	80.0	50.0	63.6	66.6	37.5	50.0	100.0	45.4	50.0	14.3	50.0	63.6
Executive Committee	86.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	87.5	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	60.7	100.0	100.0
Other Committees	15.2	0.0	16.6	36.4	0.0	12.5	0.0	16.6	0.0	25.0	14.3	25.0	18.2

TABLE 10A
DEMOMINATIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEES
OF GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
 (in percentages)

Committees	Total	Catholic	Denominational other than Catholic	Inter/Non- Denominational
Number of boards Reporting	99	28	60	11
Budget/Finance Committee	85.8	64.3	93.3	100.0 **
Student Policy Committee	44.4	35.7	46.6	54.5
Planning Committee	22.2	10.7	28.3	18.2
Fundraising Committee	63.6	42.8	70.0	81.8
Denomination/Church Relations Committee	4.0	0.0	0.5	9.1
Audit Committee	19.2	3.5	21.6	45.4 **
Nominations Committee	45.5	21.4	50.0	81.8 **
Honors Committee	8.1	0.0	11.6	9.1
Bylaws Committee	12.1	7.1	13.3	18.2
Education Policy Committee	69.7	46.4	76.6	90.1 **
Personnel (Faculty/ Staff) Committee	29.3	10.7	36.6	36.4 *
Trustee Orientation Committee	16.2	3.5	21.6	18.2
Physical Plant Management Committee	46.5	14.3	58.3	61.6 **
Executive Committee	86.9	60.7	96.6	100.0 **
Other Committees	15.2	14.3	15.0	18.2

Note: * Chi-Square, $p \leq .05$;

** Chi-square, $p < .01$

The chi-square for the seven committees having statistical significance are:

- (1) Budget/Finance (chi-square = 15.305, df = 2,
p $\leq$.0005)
- (2) Adult (chi-square = 9.534, df = 2, p < .0085)
- (3) Nominations (chi-square = 12.885, df = 2,
p $\leq$.0016)
- (4) Education Policy (chi-square = 10.901, df = 2,
p $\leq$.0043)
- (5) Personnel (chi-square = 6.506, df = 2, p $\leq$.0386)
- (6) Physical Plant (chi-square = 16.257, df = 2,
p $\leq$.0003)
- (7) Executive (chi-square = 23.503, df = 2, p $\leq$.0000)

It is interesting to note that of all the committees which have a significant statistical sensitivity to denominational affiliation, the Catholic subgroup consistently had the smallest percentage of institutions with these committees in their governance structure.

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Catholic institutions had fewer governing boards with Executive Committees than other denominational institutions or institutions which were inter/nondenominational in nature (see Table 10A). Catholic institutions with Executive Committees tended to have a smaller committee than institutions of other denominations (see Table 11). The size of the Executive Committee appeared to be sensitive to

TABLE 11

CHARACTERISTICS OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEES
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES

Number of Boards Reporting	Exec. Comm. Mean Size	Election--Selection (percentage of boards reporting)					Frequency of Executive Committee Meetings (percentage of boards reporting)				
		Elected	Ex Officio	Appointed	Combination Appt. & Elected	Other	Bi-monthly	Monthly	Quarterly	Semi-annually	Other
Total	86	28.8	16.1	6.9	45.9	2.3	2.3	11.6	18.6	23.2	41.8
Single School Denominations	5	40.0	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	60.0
Two or Three School Denominations	6	16.6	0.0	0.0	66.6	16.6	0.0	50.0	0.0	33.3	16.6
Baptist	11	27.2	27.2	0.0	36.4	9.1	9.1	0.0	9.1	27.3	45.4
Christian Church	3	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.6
Lutheran	7	28.5	28.5	0.0	42.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	42.8	28.5	28.5
Mennonite	1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Methodist	6	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.6	0.0	0.0	16.6	33.3	0.0	50.0
Presbyterian	11	45.5	9.0	0.0	45.5	0.0	0.0	9.1	27.3	36.3	27.3
Episcopal	4	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0
Catholic	17	22.3	16.6	22.3	38.8	0.0	0.0	5.8	17.6	29.4	41.4
United Church	4	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	50.0
Inter/Non- denominational	11	27.3	9.1	9.1	54.5	0.0	9.1	18.2	9.1	18.2	45.4
Catholic	17	22.3	16.6	22.3	38.8	0.0	0.0	5.8	17.6	29.4	41.4
Denominations other than Catholic	58	31.0	17.3	1.7	46.6	3.4	1.7	12.0	20.7	22.4	41.5
Inter/Non- denominational	11	27.3	9.1	9.1	54.5	0.0	9.1	18.2	9.1	18.2	45.4

Note: Chi-square, $p \leq .01$

denominational affiliation ($F = 11.917$, $df = 2.83$, $p \leq .0000$) at the .01 level. The overall mean size of an Executive Committee for theological schools and seminaries was 7.5 members; for Catholic institutions, 4.8 members; 8.1 members for Executive Committees of institutions of denominations other than Catholic and 9.4 members for inter/nondenominational institutions.

There was no significant difference in the process of selection or election to an Executive Committee nor the frequency of Executive Committee meetings among the institutions of the three subgroups (see Table 11).

COMMITTEE AND BOARD ACTIVITIES

The frequency of board meetings, the average length of a board meeting, committee meetings outside of board meetings, continuing education and orientation of trustees are the activities presented in Table 12.

The information that is noteworthy in this table is found in the section of subgroup analyses. The Catholic institutions on the average tended to meet for a shorter period of time than the institutions of the other subgroups ($F = 15.655$, $df = 2.96$, $p \leq .0000$). This difference was significant at the .01 level.

There also was a statistically significant difference by denomination for the activities of Continuing Education and Trustee Orientation. (Continuing Education--

TABLE 12 COMMITTEE AND BOARD ACTIVITIES OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES (percentage of boards reporting)											
	Number of Boards Reporting	Frequency of Board Meetings					Average Length of Board Meetings				
		6 Times A Year	Quarterly	3 Times A Year	Semi- annually	Annually	1/2 Day	1 Day	1-1/2 Days	2 Days	Other
Total	99	2.0	22.2	19.2	50.5	6.0	26.3	23.2	22.2	23.2	4.1 1.0
Single School Denominations	5	0.0	0.0	40.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
Two or Three School Denominations	6	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	16.6	16.6	50.0	16.6 0.0
Baptist	11	0.0	9.1	9.1	81.8	0.0	9.1	27.3	36.4	18.2	9.1 0.0
Christian Church	3	0.0	0.0	66.6	33.3	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0 0.0
Lutheran	8	12.5	25.0	0.0	62.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	62.5	12.5 0.0
Mennonite	2	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0 0.0
Methodist	6	0.0	33.3	16.6	50.0	0.0	16.6	50.0	33.3	0.0	0.0 0.0
Presbyterian	11	0.0	9.1	9.1	72.7	9.1	0.0	18.2	16.4	45.4	0.0 0.0
Episcopal	4	0.0	25.0	50.0	25.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	0.0 0.0
Catholic	28	0.6	35.7	17.8	28.6	14.3	64.3	21.4	10.7	0.0	0.0 3.6
United Church	4	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0	25.0	25.0	50.0	0.0	0.0 0.0
Inter/Non- denominational	11	0.0	18.2	36.4	36.4	9.1	18.2	36.4	9.1	16.4	0.0 0.0
Catholic	28	3.6	35.7	17.8	28.6	14.3	64.3	21.4	10.7	0.0	0.0 3.6
Denominations other than Catholic	60	1.6	16.6	16.6	63.3	1.6	1.0 **	21.6	30.0	31.6	6.0 0.0
Inter/Non- denominational	11	0.0	18.2	36.4	36.4	9.1	18.2	36.4	9.1	16.4	0.0 0.0

Note: ** F-Ratio, $p \leq .01$

TABLE 12 (continued)
COMMITTEE AND BOARD ACTIVITIES
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
(Percentage of boards reporting)

	Number of Boards Reporting	Committee Meetings at times other than at Board Meetings	Trustee Education	Trustee Orientation	Board Self-evaluation				No Eval- uation
					Annually	Every 2 years	Every 3 years	Other	
Total	99	49.4	52.5	62.6	20.0	1.0	8.1	14.0	56.6
Single School Denominations	5	33.3	33.3	33.3	16.6	0.0	16.6	0.0	66.6
Two or Three School Denominations	6	0.0	50.0	66.6	16.6	0.0	16.6	0.0	66.6
Baptist	11	36.3	81.8	100.0	27.3	0.0	18.2	18.2	16.4
Christian Church	3	0.0	33.3	66.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Lutheran	8	12.5	75.0	87.5	50.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	37.5
Mennonite	2	100.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
Methodist	6	83.3	83.3	83.3	16.6	0.0	0.0	50.0	33.3
Presbyterian	11	63.6	72.7	72.7	0.0	0.0	9.1	27.3	63.6
Episcopal	4	50.0	50.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0
Catholic	28	64.0	20.7	31.0	13.8	0.0	6.9	10.3	68.9
United Church	4	75.0	75.0	75.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	25.0
Inter/Non- denominational	11	50.0	70.0	80.0	40.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	50.0
Catholic	28	64.0	20.7	31.0	13.8	0.0	6.9	10.3	68.9
Denominations other than Catholic	60	43.3	65.0	75.0	20.0	0.0	1.0	18.3	51.6
Inter/Non- denominational	11	50.0	70.0 *	80.0 *	40.0	10.0	0.0	0.0	50.0

Note: * Chi-Square, $p \leq .01$

chi-square = 16.755, df = 2, $p \leq .0002$ and Orientation--
chi-square = 17.580, df = 2, $p \leq .0002$).

Overall, about half (50.5 per cent) of the governing boards met semiannually. There seemed to be a fairly even split over the average length of a board meeting with about one-quarter of the boards averaging each of one-half day meetings (26.3 per cent), one day meetings (23.2 per cent), one and one-half day meetings (22.2 per cent), and two day meetings (23.2 per cent). Almost half (49.4 per cent) of the boards had committee meetings at times other than when the full board is scheduled to meet. Of all boards of theological schools, 52.5 per cent were engaged in some form of continuing education program for trustees, while 62.6 per cent had special orientation programs for new board members. Catholic institutions had fewer boards that provide continuing education and orientation programs for their board members than the institutions in the other two subgroups.

It should be noted that more than half (56.6 per cent) of all boards did not engage in self-evaluation. This was a variable that was not sensitive to denominational affiliation.

BOARD PARTICIPATION

The survey instrument listed thirty-one activities, and the respondents were asked to check those activities for which their governing boards had a history of active

TABLE 13

**THE HISTORY OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY THE GOVERNING BOARDS
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES**
(percentage of boards reporting)

Activities in which governing boards have a record of active participation	Total	Single School Denomination		Two or Three School Denomination		Chris- tian Church	Luth- eran	Men- nonite	Meth- odist	Presby- terian	Epis- copal	Catholic	United Church	Inter- Non- denomi- national
		6	6	11	11	3	9	2	6	11	5	29	4	11
Number of Boards Reporting	103													
Budget/Financial Affairs:														
Review of budget	94.2	100.0	83.3	90.9	90.9	100.0	100.0	100.0	83.3	90.9	100.0	96.5	75.0	100.0
Approval of budget	99.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	96.5	100.0	100.0
Review of investment policies	69.9	83.3	66.6	90.9	90.9	66.6	77.7	100.0	83.3	81.8	100.0	34.5	100.0	81.8
Approval of investment policies	66.0	66.0	83.3	81.8	81.8	66.6	77.7	50.0	100.0	81.8	80.0	27.6	100.0	81.8
Physical plant renovations	84.4	100.0	66.6	72.7	72.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	81.8	100.0	68.9	100.0	100.0
Approve acquisition or sale of property	85.4	100.0	100.0	90.9	90.9	100.0	77.7	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	65.5	100.0	81.8
Review fundraising programs	89.3	83.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	88.8	100.0	83.3	100.0	80.0	79.3	75.0	100.0
Approve fundraising programs	83.5	83.3	100.0	90.9	90.9	100.0	88.8	50.0	83.3	100.0	80.0	62.0	100.0	100.0
Fundraising activities	68.9	83.3	100.0	90.9	90.9	66.6	77.7	100.0	100.0	90.9	40.0	31.0	50.0	100.0
Academic Affairs:														
Review of the curriculum	70.9	83.3	50.0	63.6	63.6	66.6	100.0	50.0	83.3	72.7	80.0	55.2	75.0	90.9
Approval of the curriculum	65.0	83.3	33.3	90.9	90.9	66.6	66.6	100.0	50.0	81.8	80.0	44.8	50.0	81.8
Review guidelines for degrees	48.5	50.0	50.0	54.5	54.5	33.3	77.7	50.0	16.6	36.4	80.0	37.9	25.0	72.7

TABLE 13 (continued)
THE HISTORY OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY THE GOVERNING BOARDS
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
 (percentage of boards reporting)

TABLE 13 (continued)													
THE HISTORY OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY THE GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES (percentage of boards reporting)													
		Single School Denomi- nation	Two or Three School Denomi- nation	Baptist	Chris- tian Church	Luth- eran	Men- nonite	Meth- odist	Presby- terian	Epis- copal	Catholic	United Church	Inter- Non- denomi- national
Activities in which governing boards have a record of active Participation	Total	6	6	11	3	9	2	6	11	5	29	4	11
Number of Boards Reporting	103												
Academic Affairs: (continued)													
Approval of guide- lines for degrees	58.3	66.6	33.3	54.5	100.0	66.6	100.0	66.6	63.6	60.0	48.3	50.0	63.6
Participation in the process for accredi- tation	83.5	83.3	100.0	81.8	66.6	88.8	50.0	83.3	81.8	60.0	86.1	75.0	90.9
Student Affairs:													
Review student policies	66.9	83.3	100.0	54.5	33.3	77.7	50.0	66.6	63.6	80.0	62.0	25.0	81.8
Approve student policies	59.2	100.0	50.0	27.3	33.3	77.7	100.0	33.3	72.7	60.0	55.1	50.0	72.7
Review candidates for orientation	5.8	16.6	16.6	9.1	0.0	18.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	0.0
Approve candidates for ordination	4.8	16.6	0.0	9.1	0.0	11.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.9	0.0	0.0
Review candidates for graduation	23.3	50.0	66.6	36.4	0.0	33.3	0.0	16.6	18.2	0.0	13.8	25.0	18.2
Approve candidates for graduation	72.8	83.3	50.0	90.9	100.0	55.5	50.0	100.0	90.9	80.0	48.2	100.0	90.9

TABLE 13 (continued)

THE HISTORY OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY THE GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
(percentage of boards reporting)

Activities in which governing boards have a record of active Participation	Total	Single School Denom-ination	Two or Three School Denom-ination	Baptist	Chris-tian Church	Luth-eran	Men-nonite	Meth-odist	Presby-terian	Epis-copal	Catholic	United Church	Non-denomi-national
Number of Boards Reporting	103	6	6	11	3	9	2	6	11	5	29	4	11
Personnel Affairs:													
Review faculty appointments	67.9	66.6	100.0	72.7	66.6	100.0	50.0	50.0	63.6	80.0	51.7	25.0	90.9
Approve faculty appointments	83.5	100.0	83.6	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	44.8	100.0	100.0
Review faculty promotions	63.1	66.6	100.0	72.7	66.6	100.0	50.0	50.0	63.6	80.0	41.3	75.0	54.5
Approve faculty promotions	74.8	83.3	100.0	81.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	37.9	75.0	63.6
Review faculty handbook	55.3	50.0	50.0	54.5	66.6	66.6	50.0	33.3	45.4	60.0	58.6	50.0	63.6
Approve faculty handbook	65.0	66.6	33.3	63.6	66.6	55.5	100.0	83.3	54.5	80.0	65.5	100.0	63.6
Selection and appointment of Chief Executive Officer	94.2	83.3	100.0	90.9	100.0	88.8	50.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	93.1	100.0	100.0
Assessment of the Chief Executive Officer's Performance	73.8	83.3	50.0	90.9	33.3	100.0	100.0	100.0	63.6	100.0	48.3	100.0	90.9
Negotiation and approval of Chief Executive Officer's contract	52.4	66.6	83.3	63.6	66.6	66.6	50.0	33.3	81.8	100.0	13.8	50.0	63.6
Elect Board Chair	73.8	83.3	83.3	100.0	100.0	88.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	80.0	20.7	100.0	100.0

TABLE 13 (continued)
THE HISTORY OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY THE GOVERNING BOARDS
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
 (percentage of boards reporting)

Activities in which governing boards have a record of active participation	Total	Single or Two or Three School Denominations										Inter-Non-denominational	
		6	6	11	3	9	2	6	11	5	29	4	11
Number of Boards Reporting	103												
Governance:													
Approve changes in bylaws of the board and the institution	91.3	66.6	100.0	90.9	100.0	88.8	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	86.2	100.0	90.9
Review of mission and goals	81.6	83.3	83.3	90.9	0.0	88.8	50.0	83.3	72.7	100.0	79.3	75.0	100.0
Approve mission and goals	91.3	83.3	66.6	100.0	100.0	88.8	100.0	83.3	100.0	80.0	89.6	100.0	100.0
Review long-range plans	84.5	100.0	100.0	90.9	33.3	100.0	50.0	83.3	81.8	100.0	72.4	75.0	100.0
Approve long-range plans	94.2	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	90.9	100.0	82.7	100.0	100.0
Trustee recruitment	71.8	50.0	83.3	54.5	33.3	22.2	50.0	100.0	90.9	100.0	75.8	75.0	90.9

participation. One hundred and three boards responded to this question and the results of their responses have been organized into five categories, which are presented in Tables 13 and 13A. The categories are: Budget/Financial Affairs, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Personnel Affairs and Governance. Seventeen of the activities listed were sensitive to denominational affiliation at the .05 or .01 level of statistical significance (see Table 13a).

Overall, the percentage of boards involved in budgetary or financial affairs was higher than for any of the other five categories. The activities listed under the category of Student Affairs seemed to have a smaller percentage of boards actively participating. The governing boards of theological schools and seminaries had a history of fairly active involvement in the governance of the institution and the development of the institutional mission and goals. The activities listed in the Governance category had a 94.2 per cent to a 71.8 per cent rate of participation. This was the second most active category in the list of activities.

Of the seventeen activities listed as being sensitive to denominational affiliation (see Table 13A), six of these activities were found in the Budget/Financial Affairs listing.

TABLE 13A
DENOMINATIONAL ANALYSIS OF
THE HISTORY OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY THE GOVERNING BOARDS
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
 (percentage of boards reporting)

Activities in which governing boards have a record of active Participation	Total	Catholic	Denominations other than Catholic	Inter/Non-denominational
Number of Boards Reporting	103	29	63	11
Budget/Financial Affairs:				
Review of budget	94.2	96.5	92.0	100.0
Approval of budget	99.0	96.5	100.0	100.0
Review of investment policies	69.9	34.5	84.1	81.8 **
Approval of investment policies	66.0	27.6	80.9	81.8 **
Physical plant renovations	84.4	68.9	88.8	100.0 *
Approve acquisition or sale of property	85.4	65.5	95.2	81.8 **
Review fundraising programs	89.3	79.3	92.0	100.0
Approve fundraising programs	83.5	62.0	90.5	100.0
Fundraising activities	68.9	31.0	80.9	100.0 **
Academic Affairs:				
Review of the curriculum	70.9	55.2	74.6	90.9 *
Approval of the curriculum	65.0	44.8	71.4	81.8 *
Review guidelines for degrees	48.5	37.9	49.2	72.7

Note: * Chi-Square, $p \leq .05$;

** Chi-Square, $p \leq .01$

TABLE 13A (continued)

**THE HISTORY OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY THE GOVERNING BOARDS
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES**
(percentage of boards reporting)

Activities in which governing boards have a record of active Participation	Total	Catholic	Denominations other than Catholic	Inter 'Non-denominational
Number of Boards Reporting	103	29	63	11
Academic Affairs: (continued)				
Approval of guidelines for degrees	58.3	48.3	61.9	63.6
Participation in the process for accreditation	83.5	86.2	80.9	90.9
Student Affairs:				
Review student policies	66.9	62.0	66.6	81.8
Approve student policies	59.2	55.1	58.7	72.7
Review candidates for ordination	5.8	3.4	7.9	0.0
Approve candidates for ordination	4.8	6.9	4.7	0.0
Review candidates for graduation	23.3	13.8	28.5	18.2
Approve candidates for graduation	72.8	48.2	80.9	90.9

Note: * Chi-Square, $p \leq .05$;** Chi-Square, $p \leq .01$

TABLE 13A (continued)

**THE HISTORY OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY THE GOVERNING BOARDS
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES**
(percentage of boards reporting)

Activities in which governing boards have a record of active Participation	Total	Catholic	Denominations other than Catholic	Inter/Non-denominational
Number of Boards Reporting	103	29	63	11
Personnel Affairs:				
Review faculty appointments	67.9	51.7	71.4	90.9 *
Approve faculty appointments	83.5	44.8	98.4	100.0 **
Review faculty promotions	63.1	41.3	74.6	54.5 **
Approve faculty promotions	74.8	37.9	93.6	63.6 **
Review faculty handbook	55.3	58.6	52.3	63.6
Approve faculty handbook	65.0	65.5	65.0	63.6
Selection and appointment of Chief Executive Officer	94.2	93.1	93.6	100.0
Assessment of the Chief Executive Officer's Performance	73.8	48.3	82.5	90.9 **
Negotiation and approval of Chief Executive Officer's contract	52.4	13.8	68.2	63.6 **
Elect Board Chair	73.8	20.7	93.6	100.0 **

Note: * Chi-Square, $p \leq .05$;** Chi-Square, $p \leq .01$

TABLE 13A (continued)
THE HISTORY OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY THE GOVERNING BOARDS
OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES
 (percentage of boards reporting)

Activities in which governing boards have a record of active participation	Total	Denominations other than Catholic		Inter/Non-denominational
		Catholic	other than Catholic	
Number of Boards Reporting	103	29	63	11
Governance:				
Approve changes in bylaws of the board and the institution	91.3	86.2	93.6	90.9
Review of mission and goals	81.6	79.3	79.3	100.0
Approve mission and goals	91.3	89.6	90.4	100.0
Review long-range plans	84.5	72.4	87.3	100.0
Approve long-range plans	94.2	82.7	98.4	100.0 **
Trustee recruitment	71.8	75.8	66.6	90.9

Note: * Chi-Square, $p \leq .05$;

** Chi-Square, $p \leq .01$

They are:

- (1) Review of investment policies (chi-square = 24.094, df = 2, $p \leq .0000$)
- (2) Approval of investment policies (chi-square = 26.580, df = 2, $p \leq .0000$)
- (3) Physical plant renovation (chi-square = 8.272, df = 2, $p \leq .0160$)
- (4) Acquisition or sale of property (chi-square = 14.063, df = 2, $p \leq .0008$)
- (5) Approve fund raising programs (chi-square = 14.063, df = 2, $p \leq .0009$)
- (6) Fund-raising activities (chi-square = 28.656, df = 2, $p \leq .0000$)

Seven of the seventeen were found in the Personnel category:

- (1) Review faculty appointments (chi-square = 6.519, df = 2, $p \leq .0384$)
- (2) Approve faculty appointments (chi-square = 43.812, df = 2, $p \leq .0000$)
- (3) Review faculty promotions (chi-square = 9.802, df 2, $p \leq .0074$)
- (4) Approve faculty promotions (chi-square = 33.479, df = 2, $p \leq .0000$)
- (5) Assessment of the Chief Executive Officer (chi-square = 13.920, df = 2, $p \leq .0009$)

- (6) Negotiation and approval of Chief Executive Officer's Contract (chi-square = 24.236, df = 2, $p \leq .0000$)
- (7) Elect the Board Chair (chi-square = 59.030, df = 2, $p \leq .0000$)

The remaining activities are scattered among the other three categories--two in Academic Affairs and one in both Student Affairs and Governance.

- (1) Review curriculum (chi-square = 6.026, df = 2, $p \leq .0491$)
- (2) Approve curriculum (chi-square = 7.704, df = 2, $p \leq .0212$)
- (3) Approve candidate for graduation (chi-square = 12.748, df = 2, $p \leq .0017$)
- (4) Approve long-range plans (chi-square = 9.632, df = 2, $p \leq .0081$)

It is important to note that of all the activities listed in Table 13a that are sensitive to denominational affiliation, the governing boards of Catholic institutions report a smaller proportion of their boards actively involved in these activities than either the institutions of denominations other than Catholic or of institutions which are interdenominational or nondenominational.

SUMMARY

The data, which was collected through a survey instrument specifically designed for this study (see Appendix D),

was organized and presented in the form of tables. The narrative which accompanied these tables highlighted the significant findings of this study.

The overall survey response rate was 75.16 per cent while the net response rate was 69.80 per cent. This rate was judged adequate for analysis. The responses to the survey instrument were reported for individual denominational groups and for three denominational subgroups, Catholic, denominations other than Catholic and inter/nondenominational institutions.

The size and occupancy level of the institutions were noted for each denomination and for the three subgroups. Statistical significance for the size and occupancy level of the governing board was reported.

The demographic characteristics of the voting members of the governing boards of these institutions were organized to profile a typical member of one of these boards. Likewise, a demographic profile was developed for each of the subgroups and differences were noted.

Tables 4, 4A and the accompanying narrative contained data concerning the primary occupations of the voting members of the governing boards. The narrative highlighted the significant findings of the study with regard to this variable as well as denominational differences.

It was noted that some of the voting members of these governing boards served on the governing boards of other

institutions and on the boards of corporations. A presentation regarding multiple board membership was made in Tables 5 and 5A.

The relationship between denominational funding and fund-raising activities was the subject of Table 6 and its accompanying narrative. In addition, the election and selection process of board members was presented and discussed, with denominational differences being noted. No statistically significant differences were found to exist between denominational subgroups for neither the length nor the limitations of board membership.

The board committee structure, the activities of these committees and the board itself were presented and illustrated in a number of tables, (see Tables 10-13A).

Throughout this chapter, the investigator presented detailed tables containing the data collected for this investigation and highlighted the significant findings of this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

This study was designed and executed to investigate and characterize trusteeship as it is exercised by the governing boards of accredited theological schools and seminaries in the United States.

An extensive review of literature pertinent to the topic was conducted and presented in Chapter II of this study. The review of the literature provided the framework around which the study was developed. Three major topical areas were covered in this review: the governance of institutions of American higher education; theological education; and the trusteeship of theological schools and seminaries in the United States.

From the review of the literature emerged evidence that there was a noticeable lack of documentation of the existing characteristics, structures and activities of the governing boards of these institutions. As a result, this study was designed to be foundational and descriptive. Specifically, this study was aimed at developing a representative profile of governing boards of accredited institutions

of theological education in this country. The data obtained through the use of a survey instrument was organized by denominational groups so that comparisons could be made by denominational affiliation. The chief executive officers of these institutions reported on the characteristics, structures and actions of their governing boards.

Prior to this investigation, several specialized and limited studies had been conducted; however, none of them provided the foundational information that is contained in this study.

Thus, the significance of this study lies in that it was foundational in nature and provided the basic information necessary for future research.

A survey methodology was chosen to collect the information needed to provide the necessary documentation of the characteristics, structures and activities of the governing boards of institutions of theological education (see Chapter III for complete details).

The survey instrument was developed to investigate the following research questions:

- (1) Is the institution free standing; does it have an independent governing board?
- (2) What is the relationship of the institution to the sponsoring body/denomination?
- (3) What is the composition of the membership of

the governing board of theological education
(occupation, level of education, etc.)?

- (4) Who are the trustees; how are they chosen; and how long may they serve as members of the board?
- (5) What is the size of the governing board, and how often does it meet?
- (6) What structures exist to facilitate the governing board's trusteeship, (i.e., does the board employ a committee system)?
- (7) In what activities does the governing board participate, (i.e., policy formation, election of board members, appointment of the president, etc.)?

The chief executive officers from 134 post-baccalaureate theological schools and seminaries, representing forty-three denominations, plus the chief executive officers of fifteen inter/nondenominational institutions constituted the population of this study. The institutions in the population of this study were selected from the 1984 ATS Bulletin, which is the directory of theological institutions accredited by the Association of Theological Schools in the United States and Canada.

The survey instrument was mailed on November 20, 1984, to the chief executive officers of the institutions included in this study. All survey instruments that were returned

to the investigator on or before January 11, 1985, constituted the total response group.

Of the 149 institutions contained in the study's population, 112 chief executive officers of these institutions responded to the survey instrument. Of the 112 instruments returned, 104 (69.8 per cent) contained sufficient information for analysis.

The data was organized according to denominational groups and three denominational subgroups: Catholic, denominations other than Catholic and inter/nondenominational institutions. The responses were analyzed on the Michigan State University Cyber 170/750 computer using the Statistical Package for the Social Science.¹

The study was conducted under the following limitations:

- (1) The investigation was designed as a study of the issues of educational governance in institutions of theological education and not as a study of theological issues;
- (2) The study was concerned with the characteristics, structures and activities of the governing board of theological schools and seminaries and, therefore, was limited in its ability to report on the rationale and theology that underpins the mission of these institutions.

¹Norman E. Nie, et. al., Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2d ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975).

(3) The study was a descriptive study and not designed to report on the quality or efficiency of the boards of the stated institutions.

Noted in this study, however, is the influence that the traditions and practices of individual denominations may have on the characteristics, structures and activities of the theological institutions of a particular denomination.

The data collected from the survey instrument was presented in Chapter IV through the use of tables and discussion. The significant findings were highlighted by the narrative that accompanied each of the tables. The major findings, conclusions and implications of this study are discussed in the following section.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this investigation are discussed below under the headings of the research questions which were used to develop this study.

Question 1: Is the institution free standing; does it have an independent governing board?

The survey instrument, designed for this study, included an item that requested the respondents to indicate whether or not their institutions were governed by either a Board of Trustees or a Board of Directors. Of the 112 institutions responding, 105 answered this item in the affirmative, seven failed to respond, and none of the respondents answered negatively to this question. Given that there

were no exceptions and that the response rate for this question was relatively high (70.5 per cent), a conclusion can be reached that the theological schools and seminaries of this study are free-standing institutions and are governed by an independent governing board as defined in Chapter I of this study. Furthermore, if one accepts that the population of this study was a representative sample of the accredited theological schools and seminaries of this country, then one can conclude that the majority of accredited free-standing institutions of theological education in this country are governed by independent governing boards.

Question 2: What is the relationship of the institution to the sponsoring body/denomination?

A number of items included in the survey instrument were designed to elicit information to answer this question. In Tables 4 and 4A of Chapter IV, the primary occupation of 41.8 per cent of the voting members of the governing boards of these institutions was reported to be church-related. This is an indication of denominational involvement in these institutions. However, there is insufficient data to conclude that a direct relationship existed between a voting member of the governing board having a primary occupation in church-related work and a denominational/institutional relationship. A board member who was reported as having a primary occupation in church work could be

employed by one denomination and serve on the board of a theological school or seminary for another denomination.

The election/selection process by which an individual becomes a member of a governing board of a theological school or seminary was reported in Chapter IV in Tables 7 and 7A. Two-thirds of the governing boards reported that some, if not all of their members, were appointed to the governing boards by an appointing agent from outside the institution.

An indication of denominational influence and control of theological schools and seminaries was evident in the data collected regarding this process of election/selection. The majority of Catholic governing boards, surveyed in this study, contained members who were appointed to serve on the board by an agent from outside the institution, rather than by the board itself. The predominant appointing agent for Catholic boards was either the bishop of the diocese or the religious superior of the sponsoring community. A real difference existed in this regard between Catholic institutions and inter/nondenominational institutions which reported that 81.8 per cent of their institutional governing boards were self-perpetuating.

The national or regional synod or convention played an important role in appointing individuals to serve as members of the governing boards of institutions in the subgroup of denominations other than Catholic. The regional

or national synod or convention was not reported as an important element in the election/selection process of board members for either of the other two groups.

The reported requirements for the chief executive officers and the board chairs gave additional information regarding the relationship of denominations to the institutions in question. The majority of Catholic institutions had requirements mandating that the chief executive officer and the chair of the board be members of the clergy of the sponsoring denomination or officers of the denomination (see Table 9 in Chapter IV).

Another indication of denominational influence and control is manifested in the findings on the funding of these institutions. In general, Catholic institutions had a greater reliance on denominational subsidies than did other institutions in this study. As presented in Table 6 of Chapter IV, Catholic institutions received 47.5 per cent of their funds from denominational sources while institutions of denominations other than Catholic received 23.4 per cent and inter/denominational institutions received 1.9 per cent of funds from denominational subsidies. This is one more indicator of the type of relationship that exists between denominations and the institutions they sponsor.

There are a number of indications in the findings of this study that lead to the conclusion that despite the

fact that the majority of the institutions in this study are governed by independent boards, the relationship that exists between an institution of theological education and its sponsoring denomination is one of influence and control. The denominations influence the boards by having as members on the board those who work for the church or are officers of the church and by requiring that the board chair or chief executive officer be a member of the clergy and/or an officer of the sponsoring denomination. Denominations also exercise control over the institutions by the process of selection/election of new board members and by determining the amount of denominational subsidy that an institution will receive.

Therefore, a conclusion can be drawn that the Catholic Church exercises a greater degree of control and influence over its seminaries and theological schools than did other denominations over their institutions of theological education. This conclusion can be supported by the fact that the Catholic Church controls a greater amount of the financial resources of its institutions, appointed members of the governing boards of these institutions, had more institutions with denominational requirements for their board chairs and chief executive officers, and had more board members working for the church than did other denominations.

Question 3: What is the current composition of the governing boards of theological education?

Through the findings of this study, a profile was determined of a typical member of the governing boards of the theological schools and seminaries surveyed in this study. General characteristics include: white, male, college educated and over forty years old.

This trustee profile is similar to the general trustee profile that was reported in 1977 by Irene Gomberg and Frank Astelsek for members of the governing boards of American colleges and universities. Gomberg and Atelsek found that 85 per cent of the trustees of American institutions of higher education were male, 93 per cent were white, 90 per cent were over forty years old, and 90 per cent of all trustees were reported to hold at least a baccalaureate degree.²

In general, the composition of governing boards for inter/nondenominational institutions contained more females and minorities than could be found on governing boards of either Catholic institutions or institutions with other denominational affiliations. Real differences, as well as differences with statistical significance, existed in the

²Irene L. Gomberg and Frank J. Atelsek, Composition of College and University Governing Boards, Higher Education Panel Reports, no. 35 (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1977), p. 4.

racial composition of the governing boards of the institutions in this study when compared by denominational affiliation. For example, Catholic boards reported that 96.7 per cent of their members were white compared with 66.3 per cent for inter/nondenominational boards, and 92.7 per cent for institutions of denominations other than Catholic.

Only 14.2 per cent of the members of the governing boards examined in this study were female. Lutheran institutions had the highest percentage of women serving on their boards (22.0 per cent) and institutions of the Christian Church had the smallest percentage of women serving (6.5 per cent). Overall, Catholic institutions tended to have a smaller percentage of women serving as governing board members than did institutions of denominations other than Catholic or inter/nondenominational institutions. While a statistical significance was reported, and it seems unlikely that the reported difference was by chance, there did not seem to be a real difference in the number of females serving as board members among the three denominational subgroups. The level of participation by females in the board structures of these institutions was low for all the institutions included in this study.

As a whole, the educational level of the governing board members for all institutions surveyed in this study was found to be high, yet there were several notable exceptions: institutions which were the sole theological school

or seminary for a denomination reported that 15.6 per cent of their members possessed only a high school diploma, compared with an overall rate of 2.7 per cent for all the governing board members of this study. Also, a statistical significance existed in the percentage of board members who held a baccalaureate degree. There was a real difference in the number of board members from denominations other than Catholic who were reported as having obtained a bachelor of arts or bachelor of science degree than for the number reported for either Catholic or inter/nondenominational institutions. Denominations other than Catholic indicated that 27.2 per cent of their members earned degrees no higher than the baccalaureate level as compared with 10.9 per cent for Catholic boards and 13.2 per cent for boards of inter/nondenominational institutions. Statistical significance also was noted for board members who were reported as having professional degrees; however, upon examination, no real difference existed (see Table 3A, Chapter IV).

Overall, 67.3 per cent of the voting members of these boards had post-baccalaureate degrees. The survey responses indicated that 85.4 per cent of the members of Catholic boards had post-baccalaureate degrees compared with 61.3 per cent for the members of the governing boards of institutions of denominations other than Catholic and 51.0 per cent for members of the governing boards of inter/nondenomi-

national institutions. This level of post-graduate education was substantially higher than the rate of 32 per cent that was reported by Gomberg and Atelsek in 1977 for the members of the governing boards of American colleges and universities.³

As was noted in Chapter IV, the educational level for 35.2 per cent of the members of inter/nondenominational boards was not reported. Therefore, no conclusions about the educational level of board members by the comparison of denominational subgroups are possible.

Statistical significance also was found when the members of the governing boards were compared by age. However, upon examination of the data, no real difference existed. Each of the subgroups used for comparison (see Table 3A, Chapter IV) reported relatively the same age distribution. The average age of a member of the governing boards was reported to be forty years and above. The largest age group was found to be fifty to fifty-nine years old for each of the subgroups. Again, no possible conclusions can be drawn from this data because of the high rate of incomplete data for the inter/nondenominational subgroup.

Examination of the demographic findings of this investigation indicated that at the time that this study was conducted, the composition of the governing boards of

³Ibid.

these institutions was very homogeneous in regard to race, sex, age and educational level.

This finding was contrary to the ideal regarding the composition of the governing board advocated by Robert Gale in his work, "Selecting and Deploying Trustees" in the Handbook of College and University Trusteeship (1980), and by Dayton Hultgren and Mary Bigelow McMillan in their chapter contained in The Good Steward: A Guide to Theological School Trusteeship (1983). The implications of these findings are discussed in the next section of this chapter.

The primary occupation of board members was presented in Tables 4 and 4A of Chapter IV. Catholic institutions had more board members whose primary occupations were classified as church-related than any other denomination. When the three subgroups were compared on the number of members whose primary occupation was reported as church-related, statistical significance was noted. This statistical significance was an indication of a real difference in the percentage of board members who work for the church in the Catholic subgroup as compared with those in the inter/nondenominational subgroups.

The institutions of denominations other than Catholic and the inter/nondenominational institutions reported twice as large a percentage of their board members having primary occupations described as being in the business field than those of the Catholic subgroup. This finding

could be related to the role that the governing board plays in securing finances from sources other than from the sponsoring denomination.

From these findings, it can be concluded that the overall composition of the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries was homogeneous in regard to race, age, gender and level of education; and nearly identical to the profile of trustees of American colleges and universities as reported by Gomberg and Atelsek. No conclusions are posited regarding the primary occupation of the governing board members.

Question 4: Who are the trustees; how are they chosen; and how long may they serve as members of the board?

The trustees of the governing boards of these institutions are chosen to serve in a variety of ways. The data regarding the process of election/selection was presented in Chapter IV, Tables 7 and 7A and was discussed earlier in Question 2 regarding the relationship of the denomination to theological schools and seminaries.

Table 8 in Chapter IV was a presentation of the length and limitations of the term of service of governing boards of theological schools and seminaries. There were no significant findings in this area and no conclusions to be drawn. The data gathered to respond to this question is a simple matter of reporting the facts, which are: that the average length of a single term was three or more

years; and that a two-term limit was the most common limitation reported for those boards indicating limiting restrictions on the number of consecutive terms allowed.

Question 5: What is the size of the governing board; and how often does it meet?

The governing boards of Catholic institutions have smaller memberships (average of 14.8 members) than the boards of institutions with either no denominational affiliation (average of 27.2 members) or a denominational affiliation other than Catholic. The institutions which have either no denominational or multid denominational affiliations reported the largest boards (average of 31.7 members).

No conclusions can be drawn about the size of the governing board from these facts alone; however, compiled with several other findings, a conclusion may be suggested.

As reported in the discussion of Question 2, Catholic institutions have a greater reliance on denominational subsidies than do institutions which have either no denominational or multid denominational affiliations. In Question 3, the findings of this study regarding the primary occupation of board members was discussed. It was noted that inter/nondenominational institutions had more board members who were from the field of business than Catholic institutions, and Catholic institutions had more members whose primary occupation was church related. Also it

should be noted that 100 per cent of the boards of inter/nondenominational institutions were active in fund-raising activities compared with 31 per cent of Catholic boards, (see Table 6, Chapter IV).

All these findings together begin to suggest the conclusion that the size of the governing board of an institution of theological education is related to the board's responsibilities for securing financial resources from sources outside the institution and/or the denomination.

As Francis Pray noted in "Trustees Must be Ambassadors,"⁴ the members of a governing board of any institution of higher education has an important role to play in the institution's ability to attract financial support from a variety of sources which are outside the institution or sponsoring agency. Therefore, institutions with limited denominational subsidies have no alternative but to mount a substantial fund-raising effort. This takes manpower and expertise. These institutions need larger governing boards and boards which have a strong representation of the business community among their membership. Therefore, it may be reasonably concluded that size of the governing board was related to sources of funding.

There are no great differences in the frequency of board meetings when compared by denominational subgroups.

⁴Francis C. Pray, "Trustees Must be Ambassadors," in Trustees Role in Advancement, see Frantzreb 1981, pp. 13-16.

Catholic boards, however, meet for shorter periods of time than the boards of the other two subgroups. Of Catholic boards, 64.3 per cent have meetings that last on an average of one-half day.

Question 6: What structures exist to facilitate the governing board's trusteeship, (i.e., does the board employ a committee system)?

All of the governing boards under examination in this study reported the existence of a committee structure. The results of the information gathered regarding committee structures and activities are reported in Chapter IV, in Tables 10 through 12 and the accompanying narrative.

Interestingly, in every category listed in Table 10A of Chapter IV, Catholic institutions reported fewer committees than did the institutions of either of the other two subgroups. For instance, only 64.3 per cent of the Catholic institutions that provided information about their committee structure reported the presence of a budget/finance committee on their board as compared with 93.3 per cent of the institutions of denominations other than Catholic, and 100 per cent of the boards of inter/non-denominational institutions. Also, the mean size of the executive committees on Catholic boards was smaller than for that of the other two subgroups.

About half (52.5 per cent) of all boards reported having continuing education programs for their board

members, and 56.6 per cent of all boards reported they did not participate in self-evaluation programs. Catholic boards had a lower percentage of boards with trustee continuing education programs (20.7 per cent) and a higher percentage of boards reporting that they did not participate in any self-evaluation programs (68.9 per cent) than either of the other two subgroups. Again, the findings indicate that Catholic boards differ in aspects of their operations and structures from those of other denominations.

The presence, or lack of, the presence of a committee within the structure of the governing boards of these institutions may be related to the institution's and/or to the sponsoring denomination's understanding of the role of the governing board. However, the data collected through this investigation only allows for speculation in this matter; no conclusions can be drawn from the findings about committee structures.

However, the lack of trustee continuing education and board self-evaluation programs is a matter of a different sort. These findings clearly indicate that there was a lack in this formative process of trustee and board development.

The lack of a strong commitment to continuing education and board self-evaluation programs by institutions of theological education is similar to the situation that exists in other types of institutions of American

higher education. This fact was noted in the literature and a discussion of this topic was presented in Chapter II of this study.

Question 7: In what activities does the governing board participate, (i.e., policy formation, election of members, appointment of the president, etc.)?

The history of active participation in the activities of governance by these boards was presented in Chapter IV in Tables 13 and 13A.

The role of the governing boards of the three denominational subgroups was investigated and differences of statistical significance were found for seventeen out of thirty-six board activities. In all but one activity, the boards of Catholic institutions vary in their level of reported involvement when compared with the governing boards of the institutions in the other subgroups. For example, only 65.5 per cent of the Catholic institutions reported that their boards have had an active role in the process of the acquisition or the sale of property as compared with 95.2 per cent for the institutions of denominations other than Catholic and 81.8 per cent for inter/nondenominational institutions. The reason for the lack of involvement by Catholic boards in this example could be due to the Catholic Church's ownership of seminary property. However, this type of speculation regarding the causes for involvement, or lack of, involvement by the governing boards of the

institutions of this study goes beyond the intent and scope of the investigation.

All denominations reported a relatively high level of participation by their governing boards in financial and personnel activities of the institutions, but a lower level of participation in the areas of academics and student affairs. For example, overall, 99 per cent of the boards of this study indicated their active involvement in the approval of the institution's budget compared with 65 per cent of the institutions reporting that they approved the curriculum of the institution, and 59.2 per cent of the boards of the institutions approved student life policies. This pattern of participation may be an indication that the members of the governing boards view their principal roles as being trustees of the financial resources of an institution, rather than serving as the stewards of the mission of the institution.

The findings of this study suggest that the activities, structure, characteristics, and role of the governing boards of Catholic institutions of theological education are unlike those of other theological schools and seminaries. Furthermore, the understanding and exercising of the role of the governing board in the life of theological schools and seminaries in this country has not yet achieved the level of sophistication and complexity that was outlined and advocated in the literature reviewed in Chapter II of

this study. An indication that this trend will continue was found in the fact, as discussed in Question 6, that a small percentage of boards reported active involvement in evaluation and continuing education programs.

To summarize, the conclusions that can be drawn from the major findings of this study are:

- (1) The relationship that exists between denominations and institutions of theological education is one of influence and control and that Catholic institutions were subject to a greater degree of denominational control and influence than institutions of other denominations;
- (2) The composition of the governing boards of the theological schools and seminaries in this study were found to be demographically homogeneous and were similar to the characteristics of the governing boards of American colleges and universities as reported by Gomberg and Atelsek in 1977.
- (3) That the primary occupation of the members of the governing boards was found to be related to how the principle role of the governing board was understood by the institution and the sponsoring denomination. Institutions with sponsoring denominations exercising a high degree of denominational influence and control tend to have more

board members with primary occupations that are church-related than institutions with an alternate view of the primary role of the governing board. Therefore, the governing boards of these institutions are different than the governing boards of institutions of other denominations.

- (4) The activities of the governing boards of these institutions reflected an understanding of the role of trusteeship that was inconsistent with the understandings that were advocated by the authors of the literature reviewed and reported in Chapter II of this study.

IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The composition of the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries was found to be inconsistent with the composition of society in general and of the churches that sponsor these institutions in particular. The homogeneous nature of the governing boards of these institutions, it could be argued, biases the decisions and activities of these boards.

John W. Nason, a noted author on the subject of institutional trusteeship contends that:

A truly effective board is more likely to be composed of individuals who bring diverse experiences, talents, and attitudes to the resolution of institutional problems.

Colleges and universities need trustees with different professional skills to advise administrative officers where to turn for sound advice. They need

trustees with different experiences and different backgrounds to hammer out a sensible meeting of minds. The more complex the institution, the more important it becomes to distill a collective decision from the views of people familiar with different phases of its many operations and understanding of its different constituencies.⁵

If one were to agree with Nason, the goal of interested parties should be to bring about a diversification of the composition of the governing boards of this country's theological schools and seminaries. The governing boards of these institutions should examine their composition and develop ways by which a more representative body may be formed.

If one accepts the argument posited by Robert K. Greenleaf in Seminary as Servant: Essays on Trusteeship (1983), that theological schools and seminaries have a role to play in leading and shaping society, and that at the present time these institutions are failing in their mission because of a marginal self-image, and that the initiative for changing this situation rests with the governing boards of these institutions, then one would advocate that society must be concerned about the effectiveness and efficiency of the governing boards of these

⁵John W. Nason, The Nature of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibilities of College and University Boards (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982), p. 57.

institutions. One way that has been suggested to improve the effectiveness of these boards is to improve the diversification of the membership of these boards. However, diversification alone is no guarantee for improved effectiveness. Coupled with a diverse viewpoint, commitment plus an informed understanding of the role of the trustee in the governance of educational institutions and the unique mission of theological schools and seminaries are characteristics necessary for the board members to be effective in the governance of these institutions.

No judgment is being made concerning the quality of stewardship that is presently being exercised by these boards. However, a board which is comprised of like-minded individuals may not be as sensitive to the needs of the people the institution should be serving nor be the dynamic force for leadership that is needed to help these institutions fulfill their missions.

The primary occupation of the majority of Catholic board members was, as noted earlier, church-related. While this arrangement helps to maintain denominational influence and control, it may not be the best environment for the development of theological schools and seminaries as educational institutions. It is recommended that Catholic boards should not only diversify their membership by racial and gender characteristics but also accommodate

for a variety of occupational backgrounds on their institutional boards. This could be done relatively easily by the expansion of the size of the governing boards of Catholic institutions which, as reported earlier, are relatively small. This expansion could provide an opportunity for diversification.

Evidence has been presented in this study that indicates that the understanding of the role of the governing board in the life of the institutions of theological education by members of the boards and the administration of these institutions is not always consistent with the understanding advocated in the literature reported in Chapter II of this study. This coupled with the reported lack of continuing education and board self-evaluation programs should be of great concern to both church leaders and theological educators. Left unattended, this condition will hamper the development of these institutions, the fulfillment of the institutions' missions, and manifestation of the kind of stewardship required of these governing boards.

There seems to have exist a relationship between the size of the governing board and the amount of finances that the institution receives from outside sources. The size of the governing boards of institutions of theological education maybe influenced by the institution's dependency

on the ability of its board members to attract finances from sources other than the sponsoring denomination.

As was noted earlier, a prevailing view of the primary role of the governing board is to serve as the trustees of the financial resources of these institutions. While the role of the governing board in assuming the financial health and stability of an institution should not be minimized, it should not become an all-consuming role. Robert Lynn, a noted author in the area of religious education and vice president of the religious division of the Lilly Endowment, has written:

Any negligence in attending to these matters [that is, financial matters] could eventually undermine even the finest work of a board in meeting other challenges.⁶

However, other authors warn of the consequences of becoming overly concerned with the financial affairs of the institution to the neglect of the other duties and responsibilities that are incumbent upon governing boards. An informed and clear understanding of the nature and duties of trusteeship in theological schools and seminaries is needed by those who serve as members of the governing boards of these institutions.

⁶Robert Wood Lynn, "The Responsibilities of Stewardship," in The Good Steward: A Guide to Theological School Trusteeship by the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983).

The role of the trustee is of paramount importance in these institutions and in society. Robert K. Greenleaf expressed this view when he wrote:

As I see it, there is no other way that as few people can raise the quality of the whole American society as far and as fast as can trustees and directors of our voluntary institutions, using the strength they now have in the positions they now hold.⁷

In 1982, the Carnegie Commission called for a renewal of leadership in our institutions of higher education. This renewal is impossible unless those in positions of leadership understand their role, the missions of their institutions, and the challenges that serve them.

Therefore, each governing board should develop ongoing educational and self-evaluation programs. This should be done with the aid of professional consultants, educators and theologians.

Furthermore, each board must examine its bylaws and board structures to determine what changes, if any, are needed to fulfill the role of the governing board as advocated in the literature concerning the trusteeship of higher educational institutions. In addition, a determination must be made by each institution as to what constitutes denominational requirements, what are outmoded traditions and structures, and what ways can further improvements in the structures and responsibilities of these

⁷Nason, The Nature of Trusteeship, p. 12.

boards be fostered. For example, Catholic institutions must conform to The Code of Canon Law which is an international body of directives. Therefore, an institution within the Catholic structure cannot develop a governing board based simply on the principles that are advocated by educators. However, church leaders should have an appreciation of the workings of the governing boards of higher education, and they should develop accordingly the denominational requirements for institutions of theological education.

The substance of the recommendations of this study can be distilled into the following three statements:

- (1) The composition of the governing boards should be diversified to insure a broader representation of all constituencies perspective on the issues and a broader ;
- (2) The education of governing board members and church leaders regarding the role of trustees in institutions of higher education and the unique nature and mission of theological schools and seminaries is essential for the continuing evolution of these boards;
- (3) A critical self-evaluation of the characteristics, structures and activities of the governing boards of these institutions and their relationship to their sponsoring denominations should be under-

taken to further the development of these institutions.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The purpose of this study was to form a foundation upon which further research could be conducted. To that end, the following recommendations are made to serve as a basis for future research that:

- (1) A replication of this study be conducted in five years in order to document changes and trends that may have developed in the evolution of the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries. It is further recommended that the survey instrument be redesigned to clarify some of the ambiguous items, specifically the items designed to elicit information regarding the religious status of the members of the governing boards.
- (2) A cross validation of this study be done through an investigation that would seek the same information from a random sample of the members of the governing boards of institutions that were used in this study.
- (3) A study be designed and executed to determine the attitudes and commitment of the individual board members of these institutions. Do the members of these governing boards have the

expertise and commitment necessary to fulfill the obligations and duties incumbent upon the stewardship of theological education? If not, why not, and how could this be changed?

- (6) The findings presented in this study be compared and contrasted with the findings of an updated study version of Gomberg's and Atelsek's 1977 study. (Anticipate the completion of an updated study to be presented in the Fall of 1985.)

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

This study was the initial step in documentation of the characteristics, structures and activities of the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries in the United States. Continued research is needed to examine trusteeship of accredited theological schools and seminaries in the United States--an area of higher education that deserves further exploration. This was a beginning.

The role of the trustee in institutions of theological education is one of stewardship. To fulfill the obligations of this stewardship, trustees, the institutions they serve, and the churches they represent must work together to understand and promote the unique mission and nature of theological institutions of higher education. Although denominational concerns must, at times, give way to educational matters, trustees should not lose sight of their responsibilities to foster educational development. In

the same vein, financial concerns cannot be the primary consumer of a governing board's time. Passive trusteeship of a seminary or theological school must give way to the active stewardship, institutional mission and denominational character.

The survival of an institution and the fulfillment of its mission will be determined by the collective decisions and activities of the trustees. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the members of the governing boards of these institutions to be adequately prepared and enthusiastic in the fulfillment of duties of trusteeship. It is hoped that this presentation will be of assistance in developing and encouraging trusteeship in the institutions of theological education in this country.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, S.J., Walter M. The Documents of Vatican II. n.p.: America Press, 1966.
- Allen, Elliott B. "Divinity School Governance Within University Structures: A Private Canadian Perspective." Theological Education 12 (Fall 1975): 36-39.
- Altbach, Philip G. and Berdahl, Robert O., eds. Higher Education in American Society. Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus Books, 1981.
- American Association of University Personnel. "College and University Government." AAUP (September 1968): 325-56.
- Anderson, Charles J. Census of Governing Boards of Four-Year Colleges and Universities. U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1969. Microfilm.
- Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Model Bylaws for Independent Colleges. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1977. Microfilm.
- _____. Recommendations for Improving Trustee Selection in Private Colleges and Universities. A Report from the National Commission on College and University Trustee Selection. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1980. Microfilm.
- _____. The Board's Role in Accreditation. AGB Pocket Publications, no. 14. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982.
- _____. The Good Steward: A Guide to Theological School Trusteeship. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.
- _____. Presidents Make a Difference. Strengthening Leadership in Colleges and Universities. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1984.
- Axelrod, Nancy R. A Guide for New Trustees. AGB Pocket Publications, no. 9. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982.

- Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, Ca: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1973.
- Bailey, Stephen K. "What Price Survival?" AGB Reports. (November-December 1980): 6-12.
- Batson, C. Daniel and Wyckoff, D. Campbell. "An Alternative Model for Ministerial Education. Theological Education 9 (Winter 1973): 100-111.
- Baumgaertner, William L. "Accountability to Church and State." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 111-119. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.
- _____. "The Role of Trustees in Seminaries." AGB Reports (May-June, 1983): 16-19.
- Bean, Altherton. "The Liberal Arts College Trustee's Next 20 Years." AGB Reports 17 (May-June, 1975): 34-43.
- Bell, Laird. "From the Trustees' Corner." Association of American Colleges Bulletin 42 (1956): 353-61.
- Borg, Walter R. and Gall, Meredith Damien. Educational Research: An Introduction, 3d ed. New York: Longman, 1979.
- Bottoms, Robert G. "The Seminary Board and Fund Raising." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 77-84. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges 1983.
- Brealey, Richard and Myers, Stewart. Principles of Corporate Finance, 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984.
- Burns, Gerald P., ed. Administrators in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- _____. Trustees in Higher Education: Their Functions and Coordination. n.p.: Independent College Funds of America, 1966.
- Cameron, Kim. "Strategic Responses to Conditions of Decline: Higher Education and the Private Sector." Journal of Higher Education 54 (July-August, 1983): 359-80.

- Canon Law Society of America. Code of Canon Law. Latin-English Edition. Washington, D.C.: Canon Law Society of America, 1983.
- Carman, Harry J. "Boards of Trustees and Regents." In Administrators in Higher Education, edited by Gerald P. Burns, 79-98. New York: Harper and Row, 1962.
- Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. The Control of the Campus: A Report on the Governance of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1982.
- Chait, Richard P. "Setting Tenure and Personnel Policies." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard T. Ingram et al., 210-244. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Chait, Richard P. and Ford, Andrew T. The Tenure Issue. AGB Pocket Publications, no. 7. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1977.
- Cleary, Robert E. "Institutional Factors Affecting Trustee-President Authority Relations." Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Study of Higher Education, Washington, D.C., March 1980.
- Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960 .
- Cowley, W. H. Presidents, Professors and Trustees. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Deem, Warren H. "Evaluation Criteria for Seminary Governing Boards." Theological Education 10 (Winter 1974): 73-78.
- Delworth, Ursula; Hanson, Gary R. and Assoc. Student Services: A Handbook for the Profession. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Dillard, Badgett. "Financial and Physical Asset Management." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 101-108. Washington D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.
- Dorsey, Rhoda M. "Engaging in Institutional Planning." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard T. Ingram et al., 145-72. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.

- _____. Institutional Planning. AGB Pocket Publications, no. 11. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1984.
- Duke University. The Board of Trustees Interim Report of the Commission on University Governance. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 040 655, 1970.
- Ebben, James A. "Institutional Vitality: Up Against the Eighties." Occasional Papers 5 (Summer 1979): 30-32.
- Fisher, Ben C. "Summary of Findings on Organization of Boards of Trustees of Accredited Theological Seminaries in the United States and Canada." Wake Forest, N.C.: Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1981.
- Fox, Sr. Marie. Changes in Relationships Between Governing Boards of Catholic Colleges and Universities and Their Sponsoring Religious Bodies. Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 1974.
- Frantzreb, Arthur C. "Secret Ingredients of a Chairperson." AGB Reports 18 (September-October 1976): 48.
- _____. "Advancement is Seldom Accidental." In Trustees Role in Advancement, by Arthur C. Frantzreb, ed., 49-60. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- _____, ed. Trustee's Role in Advancement. New Directions for Institutional Advancement Series, no. 14. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Froyd, Milton C. "What's Happening Among Governing Boards of Theological Schools." Theological Education 9 (Winter 1972): 137-45.
- Gale, Robert L. Building a More Effective Board. AGB Pocket Publications, no. 10. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1980.
- _____. "Selecting and Deploying Trustees." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard Ingram et al., 47-62. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1980.
- Gomberg, Irene L. and Atelsek, Frank J. Composition of College and University Governing Boards. Higher Education Panel Reports, no. 35. American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., August 1977. Microfilm.

Greenfield, Larry L. "Trusteeship and Administration." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 11-29. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.

Greenleaf, Robert K. Seminary as Servant: Essays on Trusteeship. Petersborough, N.H.: Windy Row Press, 1983.

_____. "Trustee Traditions and Expectations." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 129-35. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.

Grindel, John A. "Purpose in Roman Catholic Seminaries: In a Diocesan Seminary." Theological Education (Spring 1978): 74-78.

Guardo, Carol J. "Defining the Mission of a University." Case Currents (September 1982): 24-27.

Gummere, John F. "Tasks of Today's Trustees." Independent School Bulletin 32 (October 1972): 57-60.

Hayes, Edward L. "Educational Strategies in Theological Education." Theological Education 15 (Autumn 1978): 33-47.

Hesburgh, C.S.C., Theodore. "Preparing for the Millennium." Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education 3 (Winter 1983): 10-14.

Hough, Joseph C., Jr. "The Education of Practical Theologians." Theological Education 20 (Spring 1984): 55-84.

Houle, Cyril O. The Effective Board. New York: Association Press, 1966.

Hofstadter, Richard and Smith, Wilson, eds. American Higher Education: A Documentary History. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Hruby, Norbert J. "What You Need to Know About Public Relations." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 121-26. Washington D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.

- Hultgren, Dayton and McMillan, Mary Bigelow. "Trustee Selection, Recruitment, Development and Assessment." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 47-56. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.
- Ingram, Richard T. "Assuring Trustee Orientation and Development." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard T. Ingram, et al., 87-100. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- _____. "Toward Effective Trusteeship for the Eighties." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard T. Ingram, et al., 1-13. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- _____. "Ahead for the Church-Related College." AGB Reports 23 (July-August 1981): 33-36.
- _____. Trustee Orientation and Development Programs. AGB Pocket Publications, no. 2. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1981.
- _____. "Trusteeship in the Church-Related College in the 80's." Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education 2 (Summer 1981): 32-37.
- Ingram, Richard T., et al. Handbook of College and University Trusteeship. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Jones, Lawrence N. "A Reflection on Theological Education for the Whole Church." Theological Education 14 (Spring 1978): 93-99.
- Keller, George. "A Change in Plans: The View From Four Colleges." Change (March 1983): 34-43.
- Kerr, Clark. "Trustee Job Assignments." AGB Reports 16 (1974): 2.
- Lynn, Robert W. "The Responsibilities of Stewardship." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1-9. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.
- McCord, James I. "The Understanding of Purpose in a Seminary Closely Related to the Church." Theological Education 14 (Spring 1978): 59-66.

- _____. "The Seminary Enterprise: An Appraisal." Theological Education 17 (Autumn 1980): 53-58.
- McElvaney, William K. "Multilateral Brokerage in Governance." Theological Education 12 (Fall 1975): 7-13.
- Martin, Harold C. "Trustees and Academic Policy." AGB Reports 17 (1974): 10-20.
- Meyerson, Martin. "Overseeing Academic Programs." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard T. Ingram et al., 173-88. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Miller, William Charles. The Governance of Theological Education: A Case Study of Nazarene Theological Seminary, 1945-1976. Ph.D. diss., Kent State University, 1983.
- Mortimer, Kenneth P. and McConnell, T. R. Sharing Authority Effectively. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Muller, Steven. "The Purposes of the Independent Institution." Educational Record 56 (Summer 1975): 145-48.
- Munitz, Barry. "Measuring a President's Performance." AGB Reports 18 (January-February 1976): 36-40.
- _____. "Strengthening Institutional Leadership." New Directions for Higher Education 22 (1978): 11-21.
- Nason, John W. "Responsibilities of the Governing Board." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard T. Ingram et al., 27-46. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- _____. "Selecting the Chief Executive." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard T. Ingram et al., 118-144. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- _____. The Nature of Trusteeship: The Role and Responsibilities of College and University Boards. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982.
- _____. Trustee Responsibilities. AGB Pocket Publications, no. 1. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1984.

- Nelson, Charles A. "Managing Resources." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard T. Ingram et al., 330-62. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- _____. Trustees and Resource Management. AGB Pocket Publications, no. 6. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982.
- Nelson, Charles A. and Turk, Frederick J. "Some Facts About Trustees." AGB Reports 16 (April 1974): 3-9.
- Newman, Mary Elizabeth. Trustee-Corporation Colloquium: A Communication Model. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 180 478, 1979.
- Nie, Norman E., et al. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, 2d ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.
- Niebuhr, H. Richard. The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry: Reflection on the Aims of Theological Education. New York: Harper and Row, 1956.
- O'Neill, Joseph P. and Barnett, Samuel. Colleges and Corporate Change: Merger, Bankruptcy, and Closure. Princeton, N.J.: Conference-University Press, 1980.
- _____. "Check Your College's Vital Signs." AGB Reports 23 (May-June 1981): 36-41.
- Pacala, Leon. "Reflection on the State of Theological Education in the 1980s." Theological Education 18 (Autumn 1981): 9-42.
- _____. "ATS and the Corporate Imperatives of Theological Education." Theological Education 19 (Autumn 1982): 62-72.
- Painter, Gerald L. and Brown, Raymond Bryan. "Student Power and Governance." Theological Education 12 (Autumn 1970): 47-48.
- Palmer, Parker J. To Know We Are Known: A Spirituality of Education. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1983.
- Paltridge, James Gilbert. "Studying Board Effectiveness." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard T. Ingram et al., 363-76. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Parks, Sharon. "Contemporary Challenges to Issues of Vocational Preparation." Theological Education 19 (Autumn 1982): 99-107.

- Perlman, Daniel H. College and University Governing Boards in the United States. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 067 063, 1972.
- Peterson, Walter F. "Effects of Faculty Unionization on Seminary Governance as Seen by a President." Theological Education 12 (Fall 1975): 24-27.
- Pocock, John W. "Reporting Finances." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard T. Ingram et al., 304-29. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- _____. The Board Chairperson and the President. AGB Pocket Publications, no. 8. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1981.
- Potter, Robert E. The University of Hawaii Board of Regents, 1907-1982: Its Composition and Roles Compared With Other Boards Governing Public Universities. Bethesda, Md.: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 227 811, 1982.
- Pray, Francis C. "Trustees Must be Ambassadors." In Trustees Role in Advancement, edited by Arthur C. Frantzreb, 13-20. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.
- Radcock, Michael and Jacobson, Harvey K. "Securing Resources." In Handbook of College and University Trusteeship, by Richard T. Ingram et al., 264-303. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1980.
- Ringenberg, William C. The Christian College: A History of Protestant Higher Education in America. St. Paul, MN: Christian College Consortium, 1984.
- Rohlf, Carl W. "Reflections on Student Participation in Governance." Theological Education 12 (Fall 1975): 14-17.
- Romney, Leonard C. "Productivity Assessment: A Study of Faculty, Administrator and Trustee Performances." Paper presented to the American College Personnel Association Convention, Denver, March 27-30, 1977. Microfilm.
- Roper, Melinda. "Ecclesiastical Imperatives in Theological Education." Theological Education 19 (Autumn 1982): 108-18.

- Rowntree, Derek. Statistics Without Tears: A Primer for Non-Mathematicians. New York: Charles Scribner and Sons, 1981.
- Rudolph, Federick. The American College and University: A History. New York: Vintage Books, 1962.
- Sanford, Nevitt, ed. The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Savage, S.J., Thomas J. "The Board's Role in Maintaining Institutional Identity." Current Issues in Catholic Higher Education 4 (Winter 1984): 3-6.
- Scheaffer, Richard; Mendenhall, William and Ott, Lyman. Elementary Survey Sampling, 2d ed. North Scituate, MA: Duxbury Press, 1979.
- Scott, Robert W. "Trustee Selection: Private Colleges and Universities." AGB Reports 22 (November-December 1980): 13-16.
- Sherrill, Henry W. "Organization of the Board." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards, 31-45. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.
- Shockley, Grant S. "National Church Bodies and Inter-denominational Theological Education." Theological Education 15 (Spring 1979): 155-61.
- Shriver, Donald W., Jr. "The Accountability of Theological Education to the Mission of the Church." Theological Education 17 (Autumn 1980): 59-73.
- Skinner, Gail Marie. Governing Boards of American Colleges and Universities: A Study of Roles and Role Conflict. Ph.D. diss., University of Madison-Wisconsin, 1980.
- Stackhouse, Reginald. "The Place of the Theological College in the University." Theological Education 13 (Winter 1977): 101-06.
- Stamm, Martin J. "Catholic Education's New Lay Trustees." AGB Reports (September-October 1979): 19-24.
- _____. The New Guardians of American Catholic Higher Education: An Examination of Lay Participation on the Governing Boards of Roman Catholic-Affiliated Colleges and Universities. Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1979.

- Stendahl, Krister. "Divinity School Governance Within University Structures: A Private U.S. University Perspective." Theological Education 12 (Fall 1975): 40-43.
- Stevenson, Dwight E. "Models of Governance." Theological Education 12 (Fall 1975): 29-35.
- Stewart, Campbell. "The Place of Higher Education in a Changing Society." In The American College: A Psychological and Social Interpretation of the Higher Learning by Nevitt Sanford, ed., 894-939. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1966.
- Thompson, Hugh L. and Miller, John Edgar. "A Board Self Improvement Tool." AGB Reports (March-April 1979): 44-47.
- Tietjen, John H. "Planning, Mission Goals, Programs." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards, 67-74. Washington D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.
- Trotter, F. Thomas. "The Seminary as the Church's School." Theological Education 15 (Spring 1979): 105-08.
- _____. "Trustees and Academic Affairs." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards, 87-98. Washington D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.
- van Beeck, S.J., Franz Jozef. "The Role of Colleges and Universities in Preparing Leadership and Ministries in the Church." Occasional Papers on Catholic Higher Education 4 (Summer 1978): 4-10.
- Wagoner, Walter D. The Seminary: Protestant and Catholic. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.
- Warren, Jonathan R. "Types of University Governing Boards." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1974. Microfilm.
- Weeks, Kent M. Trustees and Preventive Law. AGB Pocket Publications, no. 4. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1980.
- Williams, Colin. "Purpose in a University Divinity School." Theological Education 14 (Spring 1978): 67-73.

Wilson, Logan. "External Governance in Higher Education: Bane or Boon." AGB Reports 17 (March-April 1975): 28-36.

Woods, Geraldine P. and Nason, John W. "Student-Faculty Trusteeship: A Short Debate." AGB Reports 19 (March-April 1977): 12-14.

Ziegler, Jesse H. "Key Issues Facing AATS in 1972." Theological Education 9 (Autumn 1972): 25-32.

_____. "Indications of Crisis in Theological Education." Theological Education 9 (Autumn 1976): 40-43.

_____. "Future Pressures in Accrediting Affecting ATS." Theological Education 14 (Autumn 1977): 43-51.

_____. "Trustee Conduct." In The Good Steward, by Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 57-65. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1983.

Zwingle, J. L. "Build a Better Board." AGB Reports 18 (1976): 32-36.

_____. Effective Trusteeship: Guidelines for Board Members. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1982.

APPENDICES

TIMETABLE FOR THE COMPLETION OF THE STUDY

November 12, 1984	Committee meeting to approve proposal
November 20, 1984	Mail questionnaire to participants
December 4, 1984	Send follow-up letter - to nonrespondents
November - December, 1984	Complete draft of Chapters II and III
December 20, 1984	Tabulate Final response rate to questionnaire
December, 1984 - January, 1985	Analyze data Complete draft of Chapter IV
January - February, 1985	Complete draft of Chapter V
April, 1985	Defense of dissertation
May, 1985	Complete revisions and administrative re- quirements for grad- uation
June, 1985	Commencement

Appendix B

November 20, 1984

Dear

We are writing to request your assistance with a research project supported by the Department of Educational Administration at Michigan State University. The purpose of this project is to examine and describe the structure and nature of the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries in the United States.

Your role as chief executive officer of (name of institution) provides you with the perspective, insight, authority, and level of responsibility that makes your participation in this research project critical to its success. We are confident that the results of this project will be instructive to you and your colleagues across the country as you plan to meet the future challenges of theological education.

We would greatly appreciate your taking a few minutes out of your busy schedule to complete the enclosed survey instrument and return it in the enclosed self-addressed envelope by 4 December 1984. All responses will be kept strictly confidential; the survey instrument is coded for follow-up purposes only.

This study is being conducted with the knowledge and interest of the Association of Governing Boards and the Lilly Endowment. The results of this study will be forwarded to both organizations.

Thank you for your time and cooperation in assisting us with this study. We are confident the results of this study will provide important and meaningful information to you and your colleagues across the country.

Sincerely,

Rev. Thomas F. X. Hoar, S.S.E.
Principal Investigator

Louis C. Stamatakos, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Educational
Administration

bas

Appendix C

December 4, 1984

Dear

On November 20, 1984, you were sent a survey instrument to complete in support of a research study designed to examine and describe the structure and nature of the governing boards of theological schools and seminaries in the United States.

According to our records, we have not yet received a completed survey instrument from you. For your convenience, we are enclosing a second survey instrument. Please take a few minutes out of your busy schedule to complete it and return it in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope by December 20, 1984.

We very much appreciate your time and your assistance in helping us complete this research study. We will be more than happy to provide you with the results of this study for your future use.

We are grateful for your help. We look forward to receiving your response by December 20th.

Sincerely,

Rev. Thomas F. X. Hoar, S.S.E.
Principal Investigator

Louis C. Stamatakos, Ph.D.
Professor
Department of Educational
Administration

bas

Enclosures

THE GOVERNING BOARDS OF THEOLOGICAL SCHOOLS AND SEMINARIES IN THE UNITED STATES

Section I. Institutional Characteristics and Governing Board Composition.

1. What percentage of your current operating budget is provided by your sponsoring denomination/body? _____ %
2. Is your theological school or seminary governed by a Board of Trustees or Board of Directors? yes ____ no ____
3. How many voting members are authorized for the board? _____
4. How many positions are actually filled at this time? _____
5. How many board members must come from designated constituencies (e.g., sponsoring church organization, industry, faculty, alumni)? Please indicate below:

	Number required	Number now serving
a. Member(s) of the clergy of sponsoring denomination	_____	_____
b. Member(s) of sponsoring religious community	_____	_____
c. Member(s) of the laity	_____	_____
d. Member(s) of your faculty	_____	_____
e. Member(s) of your student body	_____	_____
f. Alumni of your institution	_____	_____
g. Other (please specify)	_____	_____

6. Please describe the voting board members according to the following:

a. **Sex.** How many are:

_____ Men

_____ Women

b. **Race.** How many are:

_____ White

_____ Black

_____ Hispanic

_____ Other Minority

7. Please indicate the age and educational background of your board members.

How many have: (highest degree)

How many are:

___ Less than high school diploma

___ Under 30 years old

___ High school diploma/equivalency

___ 30-39 years old

___ Associate's degree (A.A., A.S.)

___ 40-49 years old

___ Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S.)

___ 50-59 years old

___ Master's degree (M.A., M.Div.)

___ 60-69 years old

___ Doctorate degree (Ph.D., S.T.D.)

___ 70 years old or older

___ Professional degree (M.D., D.D.S., D.Min., J.D., L.L.B.)

8. **Primary occupation.** How many board members are involved in each of the following primary vocations? **(Count each board member only once):**

Church

___ Denominational or church executive

___ Pastoral minister (i.e., parish)

___ Specialized ministry (i.e., hospital chaplain, etc.)

___ Other (please specify) _____

Business

___ Executive/administrative officer of a large business

___ Executive/administrative officer of a financial or insurance firm

___ Proprietor or owner of a small company

___ Other (please specify) _____

Education

___ Officer/administrator of a theological school or seminary

___ Officer/administrator of a college or university

___ Faculty member of a theological school or seminary

___ Faculty member of a college or university

___ Full-time student

___ Teacher/administrator of a primary/secondary school

___ Other (please specify) _____

(Question 8: continued next page)

12. Are members of your board appointed by a church or denominational officer or a group other than the board? yes ____ no ____

If yes, please indicate who has the power to appoint by checking the appropriate item(s) below.

- ____ Administrative head of sponsoring denomination
(i.e., Bishop of Diocese; President of Church, etc.)
- ____ Administrative head of sponsoring religious body
(i.e., Religious Superior, Provincial Council, etc.)
- ____ National or regional synod or convention
- ____ Separate "corporate" body as part of a two-tiered board arrangement
- ____ Other (please specify) _____
- _____

13. If questions 11 or 12 do not accurately describe how individuals become members of your governing board, please briefly describe the procedure for trustee selection.

14. What is the length of a single term for members of your governing board? Please check below.

____ 1 year ____ 2 years ____ 3 years ____ 4 years ____ 5 years or more

15. Is there a limitation on the number of consecutive terms? yes ____ no ____
If yes, please check below.

____ 1 term ____ 2 terms ____ 3 terms ____ 4 terms ____ 5 terms or more

16. Is the Chief Executive Officer of your institution required to be a member of the clergy of the sponsoring denomination? yes ____ no ____

17. Is the Chief Executive Officer of your institution a full, voting member of the governing board? yes ____ no ____

18. Is the Chair of your governing board required to be a member of the clergy of the sponsoring denomination? yes ____ no ____

19. Is it required that the Chair of your governing board be an officer of the sponsoring denomination or religious body? (i.e., Bishop of the diocese, President of the Church, etc.) yes ____ no ____

27. What powers are reserved for the full board? (Briefly describe)

28. What powers are reserved (if any) for the executive committee? (Describe)

29. If you have a two-tiered governance arrangement, please describe the powers reserved for the board which is separate from the board of trustees.

30. Is it general practice for standing committees to meet at times other than regularly scheduled board meetings? yes ____ no ____

Section IV. Board Activities.

31. Does your board participate in an ongoing educational program regarding the role of the governing board? yes ____ no ____

32. Do you have a special orientation program for new trustees? yes ____ no ____

33. Does your board periodically participate in a process to review its performance? yes ____ no ____

If yes, how often? (please check)

____ Annually ____ Once every two years ____ Once every three years

____ Other (specify) _____

34. Please indicate the activities in which your governing board has a record of active participation. (Check as many as apply).

- ☐ Review of the Budget
- ☐ Approval of the Budget
- ☐ Review of investment policies
- ☐ Approval of investment policies
- ☐ Review of the curriculum
- ☐ Approval of the curriculum
- ☐ Physical plant renovation decisions
- ☐ Review faculty appointments
- ☐ Approve faculty appointments
- ☐ Review faculty promotions
- ☐ Approval of faculty promotions
- ☐ Review faculty handbook
- ☐ Approval of faculty handbook
- ☐ Selection and appointment of the Chief Executive Officer
- ☐ Formal assessment of the Chief Executive Officer's performance
- ☐ Negotiation and approval of Chief Executive Officer's contract
- ☐ Election of the Chair of the Board
- ☐ Approve acquisition or sale of property
- ☐ Review guidelines for degrees
- ☐ Approval of guidelines for degrees
- ☐ Participate in the process of accreditation
- ☐ Review policies affecting the student body
- ☐ Approval of policies affecting the student body
- ☐ Review candidates for ordination
- ☐ Approve candidates for ordination
- ☐ Review candidates for graduation
- ☐ Approve candidates for graduation
- ☐ Review fundraising programs

(Question 34: continued next page)

Board Activities: (continued)

- _____ Approve fund raising programs
- _____ Fund raising activities
- _____ Approve changes in the bylaws of the institution and governing board
- _____ Review statement of mission and goals
- _____ Approve statement of mission and goals
- _____ Review long-range plans
- _____ Approve long-range plans
- _____ Trustee recruitment

35. Please list your board's three most time consuming activities over the past two years.

- a. _____
- b. _____
- c. _____

36. Please check if you would like a copy of the results of this study.

yes _____ no _____

Thank you for your assistance in completing this questionnaire. All materials will be kept in strict confidence. Please return the completed questionnaire by 4 December 1984 to:

**Rev. Thomas F.X. Hoar, S.S.E.
419 B Erickson Hall
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1034**

Code Number _____

✱ Questionnaire coded for follow-up purposes only.

COMPOSITION OF THE POPULATION**GROUP 1--Denominations with One Theological School or Seminary**

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
ASSEMBLIES OF GOD	Assemblies of God Graduate School
CHRISTIAN AND MISSIONARY ALLIANCE	Alliance Theological Seminary
CHURCH OF THE NAZARENE	Nazarene Theological Seminary
EVANGELICAL CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH	Evangelical School of Theology
EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCH OF AMERICA	Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
FRIENDS, RELIGIOUS SOCIETY OF	Earlham School of Religion
MORAVIAN CHURCH IN AMERICA	Moravian Theological Seminary
NEW JERUSALEM, CHURCH OF	Swedenborg School of Religion

GROUP 2--Denominations with Two or Three Theological Schools or Seminaries

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
BRETHREN Brethren Church (Ashland, Ohio)	Ashland Theological Seminary
Church of the Brethren	Bethany Theological Seminary
CHURCHES OF GOD Church of God (Anderson, Indiana)	Anderson College School of Theology
Churches of God, General Conference	Winebrenner Theological Seminary

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
EASTERN CHURCHES	
Greek Orthodox Church in America	Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology
Russian Orthodox Greek Catholic Church	St. Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary
REFORMED	
Christian Reformed Church	Calvin Theological Seminary
Reformed Church in America	New Brunswick Theological Seminary
	Western Theological Seminary
UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ASSOCIATION	Meadville/Lombard Theological Seminary
	Starr King School for the Ministry
GROUPS 3-11--Denominations with Four or More Theological Schools or Seminaries	

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
Group 3	
BAPTIST	
American Baptist Convention	American Baptist Seminary of the West
	Andover Newton Theological School
	Central Baptist Theological Seminary
	Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary
	Northern Baptist Theological Seminary
	Virginia Union University School of Theology

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
Group 3 Baptist (Continued)	
Baptist General Conference	Bethel Theological Seminary
Baptist Missionary Association of America	Baptist Missionary Association Theological Seminary
Conservative Baptist Association of America	Denver Conservative Baptist Seminary
Independent Baptist	Liberty Baptist Seminary
North American Baptist Conference	North American Baptist Seminary
Southern Baptist Convention	Golden Gate Baptist Theological Seminary
	Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
	New Orleans Baptist Seminary
	Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary
	Southern Baptist Theological Seminary
	Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary
Group 4	
CHRISTIAN	
Christian Churches and Churches of Christ	Cincinnati Christian Seminary
	Emmanuel School of Religion
	Lincoln Christian Seminary

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
Group 4 Christian (Continued)	
Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)	Christian Theological Seminary
	Lexington Theological Seminary
Group 5	
LUTHERAN	
The American Lutheran Church	Lutheran Northwestern Seminary
	Pacific Lutheran Theolo- gical Seminary
	Wartburg Theological Seminary
Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches	Christ Seminary-Seminex
Lutheran Church in America	Lutheran School of Theo- logy at Chicago
	Lutheran Theological Seminary at Gettysburg
	Lutheran Theological Semi- nary at Philadelphia
	Lutheran Theological Southern Seminary
The Lutheran Church- Missouri Synod	Concordia Seminary (St. Louis)
	Concordia Theological Seminary (Fort Wayne)
Group 6	
MENNONITE	
General Conference Mennonite Church	Mennonite Biblical Seminary
Mennonite Brethren Church in North America	Mennonite Brethren Seminary

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
Group 6 Mennonite (Continued)	
Mennonite Church	Eastern Mennonite Seminary
	Goshen Biblical Seminary
Group 7	
METHODIST	
African Methodist Episcopal	Payne Theological Seminary
African Methodist Episcopal Zion	Hood Theological Seminary
United Methodist Church	(Claremont) School of Theology
	Garrett-Evangelical Theological Seminary
	Iliff School of Theology
	Methodist Theological School in Ohio
	Saint Paul School of Theology
	Scarritt College
	United Theological Seminary
	Wesley Theological Seminary
Group 8	
PRESBYTERIAN	
Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church	Erskine Theological Seminary
Cumberland Presbyterian Church	Memphis Theological Seminary
Presbyterian Church in America	Covenant Theological Seminary

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
Group 8 PRESBYTERIAN (continued)	
Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.)	Austin Presbyterian Theological Seminary
	Columbia Theological Seminary
	Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary
	McCormick Theological Seminary
	Pittsburgh Theological Seminary
	Presbyterian School of Christian Education
	Princeton Theological Seminary
	San Francisco Theological Seminary
	Union Theological Seminary in Virginia
Group 9	
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH	
	Bexley Hall
	Church Divinity School of the Pacific
	Episcopal Divinity School
	Episcopal Theological Seminary of the Southwest
	General Theological Seminary
	Nashotah House
	Seabury-Western Theolo- gical Seminary

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
Group 9 PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH (Continued)	Trinity Episcopal School for Ministry
	University of the South School of Theology
	(Virginia) Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary
Group 10	
ROMAN CATHOLIC	Aquinas Institute
	Athenaeum of Ohio
	Catholic Theological Union
	Christ the King Seminary
	DeSales School of Theology
	Dominican House of Studies
	Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology
	Franciscan School of Theology
	Immaculate Conception Seminary
	Jesuit School of Theology at Berkeley
	Mary Immaculate Seminary
	Maryknoll Seminary
	Mount Angel Seminary
	Mount St. Alphonsus Seminary
	Mt. St. Mary's Seminary

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
Group 10 ROMAN CATHOLIC (Continued)	Oblate College
	Oblate School of Theology
	Pontifical College Josephinum
	Pope John XXIII National Seminary
	Sacred Heart School of Theology
	St. Anthony-on-Hudson Seminary
	St. Bernard's Institute
	St. Charles Borromeo Seminary
	St. Francis Seminary
	St. John's Provincial Seminary
	St. John's Seminary (Brighton)
	St. John's Seminary (Camarillo)
	St. Joseph's Seminary
	St. Mary Seminary
	St. Mary's Seminary and University School of Theology
	St. Meinrad School of Theology
	St. Patrick's Seminary
	St. Paul Seminary
	St. Thomas Seminary

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
Group 10 ROMAN CATHOLIC (Continued)	St. Vincent Seminary Seminary of the Immaculate Conception Seminary of St. Vincent de Paul SS. Cyril and Methodius Seminary Washington Theological Union Weston School of Theology
Group 11	
UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST	Bangor Theological Seminary Chicago Theological Seminary Eden Theological Seminary Lancaster Theological Seminary United Theological Semi- nary of the Twin Cities
Group 12	
INTERDENOMINATIONAL OR NONDENOMINATIONAL	Asbury Theological Seminary Colgate/Bexley/Crozer Columbia Graduate School of Bible and Mission Evangelical Seminary of Puerto Rico Fuller Theological Seminary Gordon-Conwell Theolo- gical Seminary

DENOMINATION	INSTITUTION
Group 12 INTERDENOMINATIONAL OR NONDENOMINATIONAL (Continued)	Graduate Theological Union Hartford Seminary Interdenominational Theological New York Theological Seminary Pacific School of Religion Reformed Theological Seminary Talbot Theological Seminary Union Theological Seminary Western Evangelical Seminary

Appendix F

MASTER CODE BOOK

VARIABLE #	OPTION #	NAME	RANGE	DESCRIPTION
--	1-2	Group	01-12	Denomination
--	3-4	School	01-44	
1	5-7	V-1	000-100 999=missing	Percentage
2	8	V-2	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	G. Board?
3	9-10	V-3	00-98 99=missing	# on Board
4	11-12	V-4	00-98 99=missing	# now on Board
5A1	13-14	V-5A1	00-98 99=missing	Clergy Req.
5A2	15-16	V-5A2	00-98 99=missing	Clergy Serv.
5B1	17-18	V-5B2	00-98 99=missing	Relig. Req.
5B2	19-20	V-5B2	00-98 99=missing	Relig. Serv.
5C1	21-22	V-5C1	00-98 99=missing	Laity Req.
5C2	23-24	V-5C2	00-98 99=missing	Laity Serv.
5D1	25-26	V-5D1	00-98 99=missing	Faculty Req.
5D2	27-28	V-5D2	00-98 99=missing	Faculty Serv.
5E1	29-30	V-5E1	00-98 99=missing	Student Req.

VARIABLE #	OPTION #	NAME	RANGE	DESCRIPTION
5E2	31-32	V-5E2	00-98 99=missing	Student Serv.
5F1	33-34	V-5F1	00-98 99=missing	Alum Req.
5F2	35-36	V-5F2	00-98 99=missing	Alum. Serv.
5G1	37-38	V-5G1	00-98 99=missing	Other Req.
5G2	39-40	V-5G2	00-98 99=missing	Other Serv.
6A1	41-42	V-6A1	00-98 99=missing	# Men
6A2	43-44	V-6A2	00-98 99=missing	# Women
6B1	45-46	V-6B1	00-98 99=missing	# White
6B2	47-48	V-6B2	00-98 99=missing	# Black
6B3	49-50	V-6B3	00-98 99=missing	# Hispanic
6B4	51-52	V-6B4	00-98 99=missing	# Minority
7A	53-54	V-7A	00-98 99=missing	<H.S.
7B	55-56	V-7B	00-98 99=missing	H.S
7C	57-58	V-7C	00-98 99=missing	Assoc.
7D	59-60	V-7D	00-98 99=missing	B.A.
7E	61-62	V-7E	00-98 99=missing	M.A.

VARIABLE #	OPTION #	NAME	RANGE	DESCRIPTION
7F	63-64	V-7F	00-98 99=missing	Ph.D.
7G	65-66	V-7G	00-98 99=missing	Profess.
7H	67-68	V-7H	00-98 99=missing	<30
7I	69-70	V-7I	00-98 99=missing	30-39
7J	71-72	V-7J	00-98 99=missing	40-49
7K	73-74	V-7K	00-98 99=missing	50-59
7L	75-76	V-7L	00-98 99=missing	60-69
7M	77-78	V-7M	00-98 99=missing	>70
8A	79-80	V-8A	00-98 99=missing	Denom Ex.
8B	81-82	V-8B	00-98 99=missing	Pastoral
8C	83-84	V-8C	00-98 99=missing	Special Min.
8D	85-86	V-8D	00-98 99=missing	Other
8E	87-88	V-8E	00-98 99=missing	Bus. Ex.
8F	89-90	V-8F	00-98 99=missing	Bus. Ins.
8G	91-92	V-8G	00-98 99=missing	Owner
8H	93-94	V-8H	00-98 99=missing	Other
8I	95-96	V-8I	00-98 99=missing	Ed. Sem.

VARIABLE #	OPTION #	NAME	RANGE	DESCRIPTION
8J	97-98	V-8J	00-98 99=missing	Ed. Univ.
8K	99-100	V-8K	00-98 99=missing	Fac. Sem.
8L	101-102	V-8L	00-98 99=missing	Fac. Univ.
8M	103-104	V-8M	00-98 99=missing	Student
8N	105-106	V-8N	00-98 99=missing	Teacher
8O	107-108	V-8O	00-98 99=missing	Other
8P	109-110	V-8P	00-98 99=missing	Acct.
8Q	111-112	V-8Q	00-98 99=missing	Lawyer
8R	113-114	V-8R	00-98 99=missing	Phys.
8S	115-116	V-8S	00-98 99=missing	Psych.
8T	117-118	V-8T	00-98 99=missing	Other
8U	119-120	V-8U	00-98 99=missing	Admin.
8V	121-122	V-8V	00-98 99=missing	Elected Off.
8W	123-124	V-8W	00-98 99=missing	Farmer
8X	125-126	V-8X	00-98 99=missing	Journalist
8Y	127-128	V-8Y	00-98 99=missing	Artist
8Z	129-130	V-8Z	00-98 99=missing	Government

VARIABLE #	OPTION #	NAME	RANGE	DESCRIPTION
8AA	131-132	V-8AA	00-98 99=missing	Homemaker
8BB	133-134	V-8BB	00-98 99=missing	Judge
8CC	135-136	V-8CC	00-98 99=missing	Other
8DD	137-138	V-8DD	00-98 99=missing	Ret. Min.
8EE	139-140	V-8EE	00-98 99=missing	Ret. Profess.
8FF	141-142	V-8FF	00-98 99=missing	Ret. Corp. Off.
8GG	143-144	V-8GG	00-98 99=missing	Ret. Other
9A	145-146	V-9A	00-98 99=missing	Other T. Board
9B	147-148	V-9B	00-98 99=missing	College Board
9C	149-150	V-9C	00-98 99=missing	Corp. Board
9D	151-152	V-9D	00-98 99=missing	CEO
10	153-154	V-10	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Self-Pert.
11	154	V-11	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Elect. and Appointed
12A	155	V-12A	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	APP.
12B	156	V-12B	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Bish.

VARIABLE #	OPTION #	NAME	RANGE	DESCRIPTION
12C	157	V-12/c	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Sup.
12D	158	V-12D	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Nat.
12E	159	V-12E	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Corp.
12F	160	V-12F	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Other
13	161	V-13	0=blank 1=response	Alter.
14	162	V-14	1=1 year 2=2 years 3=3 uears 4=4 years 5=5+ years 9=missing	Term on Board
15	163	V-15	0=no 1=1 term 2=2 terms 3=3 terms 4=4 terms 5=5+ terms 9=missing	Consecutive Terms
16	164	V-16	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	CEO/Clergy
17	165	V-17	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	CEO/Voting
18	166	V-18	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Chair/Clergy
19	167	V-19	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Chair/Officer

VARIABLE #	OPTION #	NAME	RANGE	DESCRIPTION
20	168	V-20	0=bimonthly 1=monthly 2=every 2 mos. 3=1/4 monthly 4=semi-annual 5=annually 6=other 9=missing	Meetings of Board
21	169	V-21	0=1/2 day 1=1 day 2=1 1/2 days 3=2 days 4=2+ days 5=other 9=missing	Length of Br.
22A	170	V-22A	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Budget
22B	171	V-22B	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Student Pol.
22C	172	V-22C	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Planning
22D	173	V-22D	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Fund Raising
22E	174	V-22E	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Denomination
22F	175	V-22F	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Audit
22G	176	V-22G	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Nominations
22H	177	V-22H	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Honors

VARIABLE #	OPTION #	NAME	RANGE	DESCRIPTION
22I	178	V-22I	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Bylaws
22J	179	V-22J	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Ed. Policy
22K	180	V-22K	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Personnel
22L	181	V-22L	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Trustee
22M	182	V-22M	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Plant Mgt.
22N	183	V-22N	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Other
23	184	V-23	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Exec. Comm.
If no, go to option # 191, question # 29.				
24	185	V-24	0=bimonthly 1=monthly 2=quarterly 3=semiannual 4=annually 5=other 9=missing	Exec. Meeting
25	186-187	V-25	00-98 99=missing	# on Exec. Committee
26	188	V-26	0=elected 1=office 2=appt. 3=combo 4=other 9=missing	Select. Exec. Committee

VARIABLE #	OPTION #	NAME	RANGE	DESCRIPTION
27 and 28	189	V-27B	0=blank 1=27 only 2=28 only 3=both	Power of: Full Board and Exec. Committee
29	190	V-29	0=blank 1=response	Two-tiered
30	191	V-30	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Standing Comm.
31	192	V-31	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Cont. Ed.
32	193	V-32	0=no 1=yes 9=missing	Orientation
33	194	V-33	0=no 1=annually 2=every 2 yrs. 3=every 3 yrs. 4=other 9=missing	Self-eval.
34A	195	V-34A	0=blank 1=yes	Review Budget
34B	196	V-34B	0=blank 1=yes	Approve Budget
34C	197	V-34C	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Invest.
34D	198	V-34D	0=blank 1=yes	App. Invest.
34E	199	V-34E	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Curr.
34F	200	V-34F	0=blank 1=yes	App. Curr.
34G	201	V-34G	0=blank 1=yes	Phy. Plant
34H	202	V-34H	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Fac. Appt.

VARIABLE #	OPTION #	NAME	RANGE	DESCRIPTION
34I	203	V-34I	0=blank 1=yes	App. Fac. Appt.
34J	204	V-34J	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Fac. Prom.
34K	205	V-34K	0=blank 1=yes	App. Fac. Prom.
34L	206	V-34L	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Fac. Hand.
34M	207	V-34M	0=blank 1=yes	App. Fac. Hand.
34N	208	V-34N	0=blank 1=yes	Select./Apt. CEO
34O	209	V-34O	0=blank 1=yes	Assess CEO
34P	210	V-34P	0=blank 1=yes	CEO contract
34Q	211	V-34Q	0=blank 1=yes	Elect Chair
34R	212	V-34R	0=blank 1=yes	App. Property
34S	213	V-34S	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Degree
34T	214	V-34T	0=blank 1=yes	App. Degree
34U	215	V-34U	0=blank 1=yes	Accreditation
34V	216	V-34V	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Student
34W	217	V-34W	0=blank 1=yes	App. Student
34X	218	V-34X	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Ordin.
34Y	219	V-34Y	0=blank 1=yes	App. Ordin.

VARIABLE #	OPTION #	NAME	RANGE	DESCRIPTION
34Z	220	V-34Z	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Grads
34AA	221	V-34AA	0=blank 1=yes	App. Grads
34BB	222	V-34BB	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Fund- raising
34CC	223	V-34CC	0=blank 1=yes	App. Fund- raising
34DD	224	V-34DD	0=blank 1=yes	Fundraising
34EE	225	V-34EE	0=blank 1=yes	App. Bylaws
34FF	226	V-34FF	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Mission
34GG	227	V-34GG	0=blank 1=yes	App. Mission
34HH	228	V-34HH	0=blank 1=yes	Rev. Long Plan
34II	229	V-34II	0=blank 1=yes	App. Long Plan
34JJ	230	V-34JJ	0=blank 1=yes	Trustee Rect.

