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## ABSTRACT

The results of this survey on student participation on college and university governing boards indicate that $14 \pi$ of all institutions in the U.S. have students.as members of their boards. of the different institutional types, and public 4-year colleges and universities stand at one end of the scale with about one in four including students on their governing boards, and the 2 -year colleges stand at the other, with only $8 \%$ of the public and $6 \%$ of the private 2-year colleges having students on their boards. Of the $86 \%$ of the institutions that do not now have students as members of their boards, $63 \%$ indicated either that they have had no plans for considering the possibility or that they have considered the possibility but are taking no definitive action. Concerning the possible authority students have as members of governing boards, of the 14\% of institutions that do have students on their boards, less than half permit voting on all issues and $58 \%$ indicated that students were not pernitted to vote on any board issues. (HS)


Survey No. 11
October 27, 1972

> Student Participation on Institutional Governing Boards
> Barbara A. Blandford

In June 1972, the United States Congress enacted the higher education bill (Public Law 93210), which included the following statement: "It is the sense of the Congress that the governing boards of institutions of higher education give consideration to student participation on such boards." Subsequently, several higher education associations received inquiries from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare asking them for information and policy views on the "sense of Congress" statement. Though most have responded to the question on policy views, the associations felt that available information on the present status of students on governing boards was inadequate. Therefore, in response to their concern, the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities asked the Higher Education Panel of the American Council on Education to conduct a survey to assess the extent of student participation on institutional governing boards and to learn more about such related questions as: How many institutions have students on their governing boards at the present time? How many are planning such a move? What means are used to include students on the boards? What authorisy do students hold on boards? What is the attitude of board members toward student participation?

[^0]At the end of August of this year, a questionnaire (Appendix A) was mailed to the Higher Education Panel representatives at 491 colleges and universities. This sample included all institutions that are members of the Panel, except for those that are "duplicates" in the sense that they have the same governing board as some other member institution (i.e., the various campuses of the State University of New York). With the questionnaire was sent a letter requesting that the president of the institution complete the form; it wis believed that the president would be the person best informed on the composition and attitudes of the board. After the return of 430 questionnaires ( 88 percent), the data were tabulated and weighted to represent the entire population of institutions in the United States. (See Appendix B for an account of the sampling and weighting procedures.)

## Results

The results of this survey (shown in Tables 1 - 3) indicate that 14 percent of all institutions in the United States have students as members of their governing boards. Table 1 shows that, of the different institutional types, the public four-year colleges and universities stand at one end of the scale, with about one in four including students on their governing boards, and the two-year colleges stand at the other, with only 8 percent of the public and 6 percent of the private two-year colleges having students on their boards. Among the reasons given by institutional presidents for not including students as members of their boards is the following statement from the president of a four-year private college:

We feel we have a better system [students on all board committees]. It permits student participation without some of the questionable consequences in a situation in which students actually sit on the board. . . . There are real problems when some people have a.special "in"
on the board and others do not. Finally, should a president be responsible to a student? Some consideration occasionally needs to be given to the authority of the president if [the president] is going to be held responsible -- and [the president] is!

Another comment came from the president of a two-year private college:
This president is adamantly opposed to the basic philosophy of student or employee representation on the Board.

Of the 86 percent of the institutions that do not now have students as members of their boards (Table 2), 63 percent indicated either that they have had no plans for considering the possibility or that they have considered the possibility but are taking no definitive action. In addition, 65 percent of these institutions said that they have alternative means for involving students in board decisions. These means vary considerably (as Table 2 shows) but the most common (used by 30 percent) is student membership on board comittees; another 9 percent said that a designated student liaison sat with the board. Although the ques'tionnaire item asked for alternative means "of a consistent and formal nature," some institutions listed means that can only be called informal and unsystematic: e.g., students invited to meetings where appropriate ( 12 percent), student government or a representative thereof invited to all meetings (12 percent).

Concerning the possible authority students have as members of governing boards, of the 14 percent of institutions that do lave students on their boards, less than half permit voting on all issues and 58 percent indicated that students were noi permitted to vote on any board issues. By far the largest proportion ( 75 percent) of these institutionehad only ane student board member and these student members sat on the board at most of these institutions (45 percent) by virtue of the office held (e.g., student government president).

The typical term of office for student members (at 81 percent of the institutions) is one year, whereas the typical term of office for nonstudent members (at 63 percent of the institutions) is four to six years.

One-fourth of these institutions reported the practice of having student board members began in 1970. At only 30 percent of the institutions was student board membership initiated in the four year period of 1966 - 1969. Of all institutions surveyed (Table 1), 45 percent indicated that most of the nonstudent members of their boards were either unfavorable or highly unfavorable toward the matter of student membership. Another 27 percent of all institutions indicated a highly favorable or favorable attitude among the nonstudent board members. Finally, 28 percent of the respondents said they could not judge the attitude of the board. However, although this is not reflected in the tables, 93 percent of those institutions that have student members on their boards indicated they were either highly favorable or favorable toward student membership, while only 16 percent of those institutions without students on their boards felt this way.

## Interpretation

The results of this survey seem to indicate that, although institutions are now including students on their boards more than they did in the past, those who do are still a small minority. The great majority are using various alternative means to involve students in decision making on the board level. Moreover, very few intend to include students on governing boards. It is also clear that, even in cases where students do hold board membership, they serve chiefly as advisors rather than as policy-makers. As earlier quoted comments illustrate, many college presidents feel student membership on boards
-5-
to be inappropriate. Underlying the "sense of Congress" statement is another issue mentioned by various of tiee respondents. It centers on the principle of institutional autonomy and freedcm from governmental interference. Many college presidents feel that Congress, through its statement, has violated that principle and has done so without any solid justification of accountability or responsibility.

Although it is the sense of this survey that institutions will not, in great numbers, include students on their governing boards, this survey provides a base of data that may be used in a few years to determine any trends in the inclusion of students on institutional governing boards.

Type and Control: Total Population
(Based on Weighted Estimates)
$N=2,554$


[^1]Distribution of Selected Item Responses by Type and Control:
Institutions Without Student Members on Board (Based on Weighted Estimates)
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## Appendix A

## CONFIDENTIAL

American Council on Education<br>Higher Education Panel Survey No. 11<br>Student Participation on Governing Boards

1. Please indicate the type of governing board that serves your institution by checking the appropriate item below:

Single governing board: Legal responsibility for the direct control and operation of a single institution or campus.

Multicampus governing board: Legal responsibility for the direct control and operation of more than one institutional unit (with or without a statewide coordinating agency or local advisory boards).
2. How many members serve on the governing board? [Include ex officio]
3. Please indicate whether more than one-half of your governing board's total membership is: [Check one item]
a. Self-perpetuating (determined by the board itself)
b. Appointed (by whom?
c. Elected (by whom?
$\qquad$
d. Other (please specify: $\qquad$
4. Is there currently any provision for student membership on the governing board of your institution?

If "Yes," go to item 非5.
If "No": Do you expect such membership will be seriously considered by the board or the appoirtting authority? [Check one item]
a. No
b. The matter has been fully considered with no affirmative action
c. Yes, but probably not for some time
d. Yes, it will be discussed soon
e. Yes, it is now under full consideration
f. Other (please specify:

Does your institution have any alternative means (of a consistent and formal nature) for involving students in board decisions (committee membership, a designated student liason invited to board meetings, etc.)?
a. No
b. Yes (please specify:

b $\qquad$
5. If students currently hold membership on your board, please respond to the items below. If not, skip this question and go to itein 非.
a. How many students a:e members of the board?
b. Are the student (s) on the board permitted to vote on:

1) All issues?
2) Some issues?
3) No issues?
c. How are student members selected? [Check one item]
4) General student election
5) Specific designee by virtue of office held (e.g., student government president)
6) Student government nomination
7) Board nomination
8) Other (please specify:
d. What is the average term of office for student members (in years)?
e. What is the average term of office for nonstudent members (in years)?
f. Is student membership required by the board's official bylaws? [Check one item]
9) Yes
10) No
11) Not currently, but will be soon
12) Do sot know
13) Other (please specify: $\qquad$
g. In what year did the first student(s) serve on your board?
$h$. Do student members serve on board committees?
14) Yes
15) No
6. Insofar as it is possible for you to express an opinion that reflects the attitude of most of the nonstudent members of your board toward the matter of student membership (voting or nonvoting), how would you evaluate their current sentiments?
a. Highly favorable
b. Favorable
c. Utifavorable
d. Highly unfavorable
e. Cannot judge

$$
\star * * * * *
$$

Thank You!!
Please return this form by September 8, 1972 to: Higher Education Panel, American Council on Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036 [return envelope provided].

Respondent's Name

Respondent's Title.
Area code: 非:
Respondent's Telephone Number

## Appendix B <br> Sampling and Weighting Issues

The population of interest in this survey consists of 2,554 institutions of higher education. This includes the 2,543 institutions in the American Council on Education's 1971 Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) and 11 independent medical schools. Usable responses were obtained from 430 of the 491 members of the Panel to whom questionnaires were mailed, for a response rate of 88 percent. The population of institutions was sorted into the 36 cells of the 1971 CIRP stratification design (see The American College Freshman: National Norms for 1971, ACE Research Reports, Vol. 6, No. 6, 1971) and tentative weights for each stratum (cell) were computed by dividing the number of population institutions in the stratum by the number of sample institutions in that stratum. Following inspection of the participation and weiglits in each cell, it was decided to combine certain cells and recompute weights for the combined cells. The final 29-cell structure, participation counts, and weighting factors are shown in Table B-1.

The frequency data from each institution were weighted in accordance with its cell membership and combined across institutions within a reporting category (institutional type by control):

$$
\hat{f}_{k}=\sum_{1}^{w_{w_{1 j}} f_{i k}} \begin{aligned}
& \text { where i indexes the institution } \\
& \text { where } j \text { indexes the stratum } \\
& \text { where } k \text { indexes the reporting category } \\
& \text { where } m_{k} \text { is the number of sampled insti- } \\
& \text { tutions in the category }
\end{aligned}
$$

The eatinate of item response percentage in a category was obtained by dividing the frequency estimate, so obtained, by the number of institutions in the category and multiplying by 100.

The absolute staidard crrors for such percentages vary with the magnitude of the percentage being estimated and are maximal for 50 percent. Ignoring the effect of stratification, but taking into account the fact that
sampling was done from a finite population, the standard error can be estimated as:

$$
\sigma_{\%}=\sqrt{\frac{P Q}{N_{k}}} \cdot \sqrt{1-\frac{M_{k}}{N_{k}}}
$$

Where $N_{k}$ is the number of population institutions in the category
The relative sampling errors may be estimated by dividing the absolute sampling error by the estimated categorical percentage. Generally, the absolute errors will be somewhat larger for the reporting breakouts than for all institutions combined. Some idea of the magnitude of error may be obtained by noting that for the estimated percentage of all institutions having some student membership on the governing board:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{\%} & =\sqrt{\frac{(14.3)(85.7)}{430}} \cdot \sqrt{1-\frac{430}{2554}} \\
& =\sqrt{\frac{1225.51}{430}} \cdot \sqrt{1-.1684}=\sqrt{2.8500(.8316)}=\sqrt{2.375} \\
& =1.54
\end{aligned}
$$

The 95 percent confidence 1 imits $( \pm 1.96 \sigma)$ are $\pm 3.02$, so that the population parameter estimated at 14.3 percent probably lies 11.3-17.3 percent.

Table B-1
Stratification Design and Cell Weights



[^0]:    Assisting in the preparation of this report were Don Abshire, John Creager and Joan Trexler.

[^1]:    "Other" includes superintendent and college corporation.
    ** "Other" includes superintendent and college corporation.

[^2]:    "Other" includes "considered, but alternate methods applied"; "student eligible to run in public election." **"Other" includes "student attendance encouraged at meetings"; "students meet with board committees"; "recent alumpi are members of the board"; "Board's committee on students meets with students"; "upperclassmen and recent graduates elect one member annually to Boari"; "President invites student government to meet with Board informally"; "student/faculty committee makes recomendations to Board"; and "joint committees appointed where appropriate."

