

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

Theses and Dissertations

6-26-2006

A study of the attitudes of selected campus leaders toward the role of student trustees at New Jersey state colleges and universities

Matthew S. Minnella
Rowan University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you - share your thoughts on our feedback form.

Recommended Citation

Minnella, Matthew S., "A study of the attitudes of selected campus leaders toward the role of student trustees at New Jersey state colleges and universities" (2006). *Theses and Dissertations*. 909.
<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/909>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact LibraryTheses@rowan.edu.

A STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF SELECTED CAMPUS LEADERS TOWARD
THE ROLE OF STUDENT TRUSTEES AT NEW JERSEY STATE
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by
Matt Minnella

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the
Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration Degree
of
The Graduate School
at
Rowan University
6/26/06

Approved _____
Dr. Burton Sisco

Date Approved June 26, 2006

ABSTRACT

Matthew S. Minnella

A STUDY OF SELECTED CAMPUS LEADERS TOWARD THE ROLE OF STUDENT TRUSTEES AT NEW JERSEY STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

2005/2006

Dr. Burton R. Sisco

Master of Arts in Higher Education Administration

The purpose of this study was to examine the attitudes of college and university presidents, board chairpersons, student trustees and student government presidents at eight member institutions of the New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities (NJASCU) concerning the role of student trustees. The major areas of interest included voting rights, compensation, roles, training, and conflicts of interest. Seventeen campus leaders from NJASCU institutions participated in the study. The subjects were mailed a survey to complete to document their attitudes toward the roles of student trustees. The study found that the majority of selected campus leaders agreed that student trustees should have voting rights. The majority of respondents did not believe that student trustees should receive compensation in terms of tuition assistance or academic credit for service on the board. There was a consensus that student trustees do receive the same training as appointed trustees and that it is the responsibility of the institution to prepare student trustees to serve on the board. Findings suggest that the role of the student trustee should be more in alignment with that of an appointed trustee.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the people who have aided and supported me in the completion of this thesis and this master of arts program. First and foremost I must thank Dr. Burton Sisco. Dr. Sisco believed in me when I doubted myself, encouraged me when I was down and was relentless in pushing me to fulfill my potential. Many instructors push students to reach a level of excellence in their academic pursuits, Dr. Sisco simply accepts nothing less. Through this process, Dr. Sisco has become more than an instructor and academic advisor, I count him as a mentor and friend as well.

I would like to offer unconditional thanks to Dr. Thomas Gallia, Vice President of University Relations at Rowan University. Dr. Gallia's input and expertise were pivotal in the framing of this study as well as the creation of the survey instrument. Dr. Gallia's continued support and advice truly made this study possible for me.

I would like to acknowledge Dr. Darryl Greer of New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities for offering his time, expertise and administrative assistance to me, which played an enormous role in this study.

Among my fellow classmates, I need to acknowledge Steven Bonora for his moral support and advisement while we both partook in this process. As well, I must acknowledge and thank William O'brien for setting a benchmark of excellence for myself as well as our entire cohort.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
ONE	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Significance of the Study	1
	Purpose of the Study	2
	Assumptions and Limitations	2
	Operational Definitions	3
	Research Questions	4
	Organization of Remaining Chapters	4
TWO	LITERATURE REVIEW	6
	Role of the Student Trustee	6
	Conflict of Interest	8
	Student Trustee Limitations	9
	Training of Student Trustees	10
	Compensation for Student Trustees	10
	Measurement of Attitudes	11
	Summary of Literature Review	11
THREE	METHODOLOGY	13
	Context of the Study	13
	Population and Sample	14
	Instrumentation	14
	Data Collection Procedures	15
	Data Analysis for Quantitative Data	17
	Data Analysis for Qualitative Data	17
FOUR	FINDINGS	18
	Profile of the Sample	18
	Research Questions	20
FIVE	SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	59
	Summary of the Study	59
	Purpose of the Study	59

Methodology	60
Data Analysis for Quantitative Data	62
Data Analysis for Qualitative Data	62
Discussion of the Findings	62
Conclusions	68
Recommendations for Future Research	71
REFERENCES	73
APPENDIX A: Institutional Review Board Application (IRB) Rowan University Approval	74
APPENDIX B: Consent Form	83
APPENDIX C: Survey	85
APPENDIX D: Letter to Participants	90

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
4.1	Age of Selected Campus Leaders.....	18
4.2	Gender of Selected Campus Leaders	19
4.3	Highest Level of Education of Selected Campus Leaders	19
4.4	Number of Years Served on Board of Trustees ...	20
4.5	Position Held at Institution	20
4.6	Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward Voting Practices of Student Trustees	22
4.7	Attitudes of College/University Presidents Toward Voting Practices of Student Trustees.....	23
4.8	Attitudes of Board Chairpersons Toward Voting Practices of Student Trustees	25
4.9	Attitudes of Student Trustees Toward Voting Practices of Student Trustees	26
4.10	Attitudes of Student Government Presidents Toward Voting Practices of Student Trustees	27
4.11	Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward Compensation for Student Trustees	29
4.12	Attitudes of College/University Presidents Toward Compensation for Student Trustees	30
4.13	Attitudes of Board Chairpersons Toward Compensation for Student Trustees	31
4.14	Attitudes of Student Trustees Toward Compensation for Student Trustees	33

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
4.15	Attitudes of Student Government Presidents Toward Compensation for Student Trustees	34
4.16	Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward the Roles of Student Trustees	36
4.17	Attitudes of College/University Presidents Toward the Roles of Student Trustees	37
4.18	Attitudes of Board Chairpersons Toward the Roles of Student Trustees	39
4.19	Attitudes of Student Trustees Toward the Roles of Student Trustees	40
4.20	Attitudes of Student Government Presidents Toward the Roles of Student Trustees	41
4.21	Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward Training for Student Trustees	43
4.22	Attitudes of College/University Presidents Toward Training for Student Trustees	44
4.23	Attitudes of Board Chairpersons Toward Training for Student Trustees	46
4.24	Attitudes of Student Trustees Toward Training for Student Trustees	47
4.25	Attitudes of Student Government Presidents Toward Training for Student Trustees	48
4.26	Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward Conflicts of Interest for Student Trustees	50
4.27	Attitudes of College/University Presidents Toward Conflicts of Interest for Student Trustees.....	51
4.28	Attitudes of Board Chairpersons Toward Conflicts of Interest for Student Trustees	53

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
4.29	Attitudes of Student Trustees Toward Conflicts of Interest for Student Trustees	54
4.30	Attitudes of Student Government Presidents Toward Conflicts of Interest for Student Trustees.....	56
4.31	Content Analysis for “What are the Roles and Responsibilities of Student Trustees”.....	57
4.32	Content Analysis for “What Changes Should be Made to the Role of Student Trustee”	58

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Student trustees of college and university boards hold important roles. They are given privileged information, vote on important matters and personally interact with people that are of esteem and authority. They shoulder the weight of representing the general student body on the highest governance level at their respective institution. Often, student trustees do not know exactly what they can or should do with these responsibilities. There is tension over whether a student trustee is an advocate for the current student body or if a student trustee has the same roles and responsibilities as an appointed trustee. This places a potential conflict, which may manifest into self-doubt, ethical dilemmas, and loyalty concerns that could limit the effectiveness of the student trustee.

Significance of the Study

The position of student trustee yields a significant influence that could have a great impact on students, institutions of higher education, and the general public. The lack of definitive guidelines for a student trustee can lead to confusion and misunderstanding. Studies are needed to gather information on what the main purpose and expectations of student trustees are as a means of maximizing their potential, improving communication among all trustees, and enhancing performance levels of those who serve as student trustees.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of selected student trustees, college or university presidents, board chairs, and student government presidents of eight public, four-year institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey about the roles, responsibilities, limitations, and needs of student trustees. The study sought to investigate the attitudes of selected students, administrators, and board members as a means of gaining a perspective on the role of the student trustee from the student trustees themselves as well as the three related groups that hold the most relevance to the position and work most closely with student trustees.

Assumptions and Limitations

It is assumed that all participants in this study answered the survey and open-ended questions truthfully. It is assumed that all surveys were completed by those individuals to whom they were addressed. As will be discussed in Chapter three, the surveys were all mailed to institutional board liaisons who dispersed the surveys and information to the subjects. It is assumed that the instrument is valid and reliable.

There are at least two major limitations in this study. The first and most prominent is the limitation of objectivity. The researcher has served as a student trustee and hence brings a host of biases, opinions and beliefs on the subject, which could influence the results of the study. Another limitation is that the study was conducted in the state of New Jersey and at only public schools within the state. Systems of higher education can be quite different from state to state and even between institutions within the same state, as can the rules governing student trustees. Therefore, the results of this study may not be applicable in all cases.

Operational Definitions

Appointed Trustee: A member of the board of trustees of a college or university that is a member of NJASCU who was appointed to that board by the governor of the State of New Jersey.

Attitudes: A pattern of responses that is viewed as evidence of one or more underlying attitudes as measured by the survey instrument employed in this study. The attitudes were measured using a Likert scale which asked each subject to read a series of statements and respond by selecting a choice of words that correlate with either agreement or disagreement with the statement.

Board Chairperson: The man or woman who is the designated Chairperson of the Board of Trustees of a college or university that is a member of NJASCU and who was appointed to the board by the governor of the State of New Jersey.

College or University President: The chief executive officer of a college or university that is a member of NJASCU who was selected to that position by the Board of Trustees of that institution.

NJASCU: New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities. This is a nonprofit, nongovernmental organization created by the state legislature to advance and support public higher education in New Jersey. The institutions included in this organization are Ramapo College, Montclair University, William Paterson University, Kean University, Rowan University, The College of New Jersey, Stockton College, New Jersey City University, and Thomas Edison State College.

Student Government President: The undergraduate male or female student who was elected by the student body to preside over the student government system that is officially recognized by a college or university that is a member of NJASCU.

Student Trustee: An undergraduate student of a college or university that is a member of NJASCU who was elected to a position on the board of trustees of the college or university they are attending.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders towards the voting rights and practices of student trustees?
2. What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders towards compensation for student trustees?
3. What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders towards the roles and responsibilities of student trustees?
4. What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders towards the training of student trustees?
5. What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders concerning the potential conflicts of interest for a student trustee as a representative of both the student body and the board of trustees?

Organization of Remaining Chapters

Chapter two explains the conceptual framework of the study based upon a review of previous studies on the subject of student trustees. Chapter three explains the context

of the study and defines the population, sample, instrumentation, procedures of the study and how the data were analyzed. The fourth chapter provides an analysis of the data collected. Chapter five includes a summary of the study and discusses key findings, along with offering conclusions and recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

A board of trustees is the highest authority in the organization of state colleges and universities. All members of these boards are appointed by state governments except for student trustees. Student trustees are elected by the student body, student government, or are appointed by the administration of the institution. Student trustees are always in the minority, as the boards are usually made up of 10 or more appointed trustees and just two student trustees. Student trustees often do not have the same voting rights as appointed trustees and are prevented from taking part in all board meetings and activities. These differences have raised questions such as, what is the role of the student trustee? How should they be prepared or compensated for their service? Can student trustees contribute in the same, presumably objective, manner as an appointed trustee? There have been a few studies that attempted to answer such questions, but the research is generally lacking in substance and currency.

Role of the Student Trustee

The role of a student trustee continues to be a vexing problem and creates much tension for all members of a board. The literature suggests a great deal of interest among those studying the position as well as a point of considerable confusion on the part of a student trustee. Several studies questioned students directly and found ambiguous results. McIntyre (1977) noted that the great majority of student trustees felt no conflict of interest between representing students and properly participating on the board.

Further, students who served in the dual role of student body president as well as student trustee did cite a conflict of interest. This role conflict can be explained by the fact that the student body president was elected to specifically represent the students, while the student trustee had the duty of representing “all segments of the academic community as well as the public interest” (McIntyre, 1977, p.16). Despite the distinction, 89% of all student trustees surveyed said that they represented the students.

Priest (1977), found even more uncertainty among a group of students trustees surveyed in Illinois. Of the 96 student trustees questioned, less than half of the group listed students as their “frame of reference, loyalty, or source of influence” (1977, p.23). The students instead claimed loyalty to the institution, the board, the public at large or a combination of these (Priest, 1977). When asked for a description of their role as a student trustee the most common aspect was that they “look out for student interests” (Priest, 1977, p.23).

Analysis done in California by the Advisory Committee on Education Services looked at these two concepts of the student trustee (Smith, 2000). The report noted that the California Student Association of Community Colleges had passed a resolution stating that the purpose of the student trustee was to represent the interests of the students (Smith, 2000). However, the actual report seemed to clearly favor the concept of the student trustees representing the community, much like an appointed trustee. It became evident to the committee that should the student trustee be loyal to the students, they would be seen by the rest of the board as not being “real members.”

A governing board of this type is not intended to have any one segregated group of constituents. Therefore, the integrity of the role of student trustee is better served and

taken more seriously if the student trustee acts in the manner of an appointed trustee (Smith, 2000). One might argue the usefulness of having a student on a board if the student is expected to behave like the rest of the board.

Trustees are chosen because of their involvement in the community, range of perceived influence and usually a particular area of expertise that is brought to the board. A lawyer might provide assistance on litigation matters, a prominent businessman would help with contracts, an educational official would investigate curriculum issues, and a student could represent what it is like living on campus and attending the institution.

The second reason the committee saw the role of the student trustee better served as an advocate for the entire community rather than the students was to make a clearer distinction between the student trustee and the leaders of the student body government (Smith, 2000). If the student trustee is another advocate in the mold of the student body president, the roles could be viewed as redundant. Instead, the student trustee can act as the link between the two bodies (Smith, 2000).

Conflict of Interest

Some research has questioned whether a student can be involved in major policy, acquisition, personnel, or budget matters of an institution without interjecting personal biases that reflect self interests. For instance, would a student trustee reject a proposed tuition increase which is justifiable and necessary because the student wishes to avoid paying more money for tuition? Woods and Nason (1977) addressed this issue arguing that, while they do not represent any specific constituency, any board member can be guilty of conflict of interest. The researchers suggested forming a code of ethics statement for the entire board to follow (Woods & Nason, 1977).

The example of a student having a conflict of interest concerning a tuition increase because they do not wish or are unable to pay the increased amount is only referencing the conflict on a personal basis for the student. Even if the student trustee could afford the increase in tuition, what if they knew of other students who could not? What if the student trustee knew that there was great pressure from the current student body to not raise tuition. However, at the same time there could be legitimate reasons for the tuition increase ranging from higher energy costs to state appropriation declines to a new collective bargaining agreement. The appropriate move for the institution could be to raise tuition, which appointed trustees would be likely to approve. Meanwhile, the sentiment of the student body could be staunchly opposed to such an increase. Priest's and McIntyre's studies both demonstrated that a majority of student trustees see the current student body as their frame of reference and representative constituency. Yet, the board of trustees mission is to advance the interests of the institution as a whole. This makes for a compelling conflict of interest for a student trustee.

Student Trustee Limitations

The literature cites two limitations with student trustees. The first is the lack of voting rights for the student trustees at many institutions. The literature shows that the right to vote has a significant impact on the experience of a student trustee. McLaughlin (1978) showed that the overwhelming majority of student trustees without a vote found the experience to be negative. The students felt patronized by the board as if their position was "token" (1978). The majority of respondents in McIntyre's study stated that they believed that the right to vote was the most effective way to "signify the importance of the student voice" (1978, p.17). They also stated that having a voting right inspired a

greater sense of responsibility and commitment to the board. Seventy percent of student trustees surveyed by Priest (1977) claimed that voting rights were “essential” to the position.

Training of Student Trustees

Several of the studies reported either a lack of training for the student trustees or the opinion by student trustees that more training was necessary. Priest (1977) revealed that 60% of students surveyed had received no orientation to the position. Only 25% of students surveyed by McIntyre (1977) had received any special training sessions for the position. A more recent study done by Lang (2003) showed that a majority of students do receive some form of training. However, the study respondents described the training as vastly incomplete. All students surveyed for the study suggested the need for more in-depth training (Lang, 2003). The students reported that they felt comfortable dealing with “student issues” but were unprepared to contribute to “institutional issues” (Lang, 2003).

Compensation for Student Trustees

Of the 96 student trustees surveyed by Priest (1977) only five reported receiving compensation for their services, either in academic credit or financial assistance. McIntyre (1977) recommended that the position should be supported with tuition waivers. She based this on four reasons. First, tuition support would serve to defuse conflict of interest when voting on tuition issues. It would be impossible to be objective if one was directly affected by the outcome. Another reason was to create a more equal field between student and appointed trustees. Appointed trustees do not receive any compensation for participating on the board. However, it does not cost the appointed

trustees anything to be a member of the board. Student trustees must pay tuition to participate. Therefore, tuition waivers would set both the student and appointed trustees in a situation where no cost or compensation is provided for either side. The amount of time to be an effective trustee while attending school full time would be greatly inhibited by part-time employment. The tuition waiver is presented as a way to attract the most competent and dedicated student who, if not for the waivers, might be unable to afford the time and effort to take on the position.

Measurement of Attitudes

This study sought to measure the attitudes of selected campus leaders about numerous aspects of the roles, responsibilities, training and compensation for the position of student trustee. The Likert scale system is often used in educational research to quantify attitude and was employed in this study. The system entails the respondent reading a statement and then responding by selecting a choice out of a continuum of numbers or words correlating to either their agreement or disagreement with the statement. When several such statements are collected a “pattern of responses is then viewed as evidence of one or more underlying attitudes” (Frankel & Walen, 2003, p.131).

Summary of Literature Review

The issue of whether student trustees represent the student body or the institution and community as a whole remains controversial. The literature suggests that student trustees should act in similar manner to non-student trustees. The proviso is that if student trustees are expected to act as non-student trustees they should be given the same rights and privileges. Also, it is clear from the literature that in order to act efficiently in the position, greater, more in-depth training is needed for the position. Furthermore, to

alleviate the potential for conflicts of interest, more time and energy should be given to the position and compensation should be considered as a means of attracting qualified applicants.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Context of the Study

The study was conducted at eight of the nine schools that are a part of the New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities (NJASCU). NJASCU membership includes The College of New Jersey, Kean University, Montclair State University, Stockton College, New Jersey City University, Ramapo College, Rowan University, Thomas Edison State College, and William Paterson University. The study investigated the attitudes of college/university presidents, board chairs, student trustees and student government presidents. Thomas Edison State College was excluded from the research because it does not maintain a student government in the mold of the other eight institutions.

NJASCU is a nonprofit, nongovernmental entity created by the state legislature in 1985 to advance and support public higher education in New Jersey. The organization's mission is to promote higher education as a public good and endorse the collective value of the state colleges and universities as servants to the public interest of the State of New Jersey.

NJASCU members had 88,782 total students as of Fall 2005 including 74,412 undergraduates. Of these, 18,172 students resided on campus and 14,192 bachelors degrees were awarded by NJASCU member institutions, which accounted for 44% of the state's total in 2005. Also, in Fall 2005, the total graduate and professional students

NJASCU schools totaled 14,370. The average tuition rate for member institutions in 2005 was \$5,745.20 (www.njascu.org)

Population and Sample

The population defined for this study consisted of all students currently serving as the voting student trustee, student body presidents, college and university presidents, and board chairs at the eight selected NJASCU public colleges and universities. The literature suggests role ambiguity and conflict of interest for student trustees between the board and the student body representation. This cross-section of individuals were chosen as leaders and individuals who are either part of the entities or those who work most closely with the entities in question for this research. Being as there are four categories of individual participants at eight different sites for a total population of 32, this study used the entire population as the sample.

Instrumentation

A survey titled *Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward the Role of Student Trustees* (Appendix C) was created by the researcher. The past research and literature on student trustees framed five areas of question concerning the position of student trustee, voting rights, roles and responsibilities, conflict of interest, training, and compensation. The survey was designed to determine the attitudes of board chairpersons, college and university presidents, student trustees and student government presidents towards the role of student trustees.

In an effort to confirm the reliability and validity of the survey, a pilot study was conducted. The researchers' aim was to pilot the study to participants that were closely related to the subjects selected for the actual study. For the pilot study a current alternate

student trustee, former student government president, university vice president and the director of the NJASCU were surveyed. The results of the pilot study supported the results found in the current study, suggesting both face and content validity.

The survey consisted of three sections. The first section gathered demographic information including age, gender, highest level of education, profession or academic major, how many years served on the board (if applicable), and what position the participant held at their institution. The second section contained 30 statements organized on a Likert scale to determine the subject's attitude toward the statement. The subject could respond to each statement by indicating Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral, Disagree, or Strongly Disagree. The statements were developed to measure the attitudes of subjects toward the roles, responsibilities, voting rights, training conflicts of interest and compensation of student trustees. The third section of the survey consisted of two open-ended questions which asked subjects to state in their own words what the roles and responsibilities of the student trustees were and what changes should be made to improve the effectiveness of the position. The reliability of the instrument was calculated using a split-half internal-consistency analysis. The reliability of the survey was .776 which deems the instrument to be reliable.

Data Collection Procedures

An Institutional Review Board (IRB) application (Appendix A) was submitted on February 21, 2006. The IRB approved the application on March 8, 2006. The researcher then contacted, by telephone, the board liaison at each of the eight institutions that were a part of the study. The researcher explained the study's purpose and relevance to the state and higher education and asked for assistance in reaching the population. In all eight

cases the board liaison was willing help and all eight suggested sending the surveys to them for distribution to the subjects.

On March 13, 2006 a package was mailed to each of the eight board liaisons. Each package contained a letter of explanation to the board liaison, an example copy of the survey to be distributed and four envelopes addressed to each of the subjects. The board liaisons then distributed the marked envelopes to each of the subjects. In each envelope was contained a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and assuring that the information and identities of the subjects would remain confidential, a consent form, the survey and a stamped addressed envelope for the subject to mail the survey back to the researcher. The initial deadline for returning the surveys was March 27, 2006.

The researcher placed numerous phone calls and emails to the board liaisons and subjects themselves to remind them to complete and return the survey as the deadline approached and passed. With an insufficient response rate, the researcher allowed the deadline to pass and continued contact with the board liaisons to check on the status of the participants surveys and also to make them aware that the surveys would be accepted passed that deadline stated on the survey.

Several weeks after the deadline for data collection had passed the researcher offered to conduct the survey over the phone with subjects who had not returned the survey. The researcher obtained three surveys through a phone interview where the researcher read all of the questions to the participant on the phone and recorded the answers onto a blank survey in the researchers' possession. By remaining vigilant, the response rate for the surveys was 53%.

Data Analysis for Quantitative Data

The data collected were inputted into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program. Using the SPSS program, the data were analyzed by descriptive statistics to calculate frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviation. The responses of the Likert scale questions were compared between the demographic groups of college/university president, board chairperson, student trustee and student government president to determine the congruence or difference of attitudes of each group for each research question.

Data Analysis for Qualitative Data

The data collected from the open-ended questions in the third section of the survey were analyzed through a content analysis procedure. The researcher examined the responses to the questions pertaining to what the respondents felt, in their own words were the roles and responsibilities of student trustees and what changes should be made to improve the effectiveness of the position. The open-ended questions were analyzed looking for common themes. The corresponding frequencies and percentages of the themes were then calculated and presented in table form.

CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

Profile of the Sample

The subjects in this study consisted of 32 selected campus leaders at eight of the nine member schools of the New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities (NJASCU). Within each institution the president, board chairperson, voting student trustee and student government president were surveyed, making four categories of campus leaders with eight possible subjects in each category. The researcher selected to survey the entire population of campus leaders for a total population study. For the study, 32 surveys were distributed, 17 were returned for a response rate of 53%.

Table 4.1 represents the age of the selected campus leaders. The most common age was 21, representing 30% of the sample, followed by 22 at 18%.

Table 4.1

Age of Selected Campus Leaders

n=17, M= 39.05, SD= 22.67		
Age	<i>f</i>	%
20	1	6
21	5	29.4
22	3	17.6
23	1	6
52	2	12
57	1	6
63	1	6
71	1	6
75	1	6
79	1	6

Table 4.2 describes the gender distribution of the sample. Seventy-one percent of respondents were male while 29% were female.

Table 4.2

Gender of Selected Campus Leaders

	n= 17, M= 1.29, SD= .469	
Gender	<i>f</i>	%
Male	12	70.6
Female	5	29.4

Table 4.3 describes the highest level of education obtained by the subjects in the sample. Forty-seven percent of respondents had not yet earned a college degree of any kind, 29% of respondents had earned doctoral degrees.

Table 4.3

Highest Level of Education of Selected Campus Leaders

	n= 17, M= 3.17, SD= 1.13	
Highest Level of Education	<i>f</i>	%
Doctorate Degree	5	29.4
Masters Degree	0	0
Bachelors Degree	4	23.5
Other	8	47.1

Table 4.4 represents the number of years served on the board of trustees by the respondents. The highest percentage (47%) was in respondents who had served zero years on a board of trustees followed next by 1-5 years (29%).

Table 4.4

Number of Years Served on Board of Trustees

n= 17, M= 1.94, SD=1.19		
Years Served on Board	<i>f</i>	%
16+	1	5.9
11-15	1	5.9
6-10	2	11.8
1-5	5	29.4
0	8	47.1

Table 4.5 represents what position respondents held at their institutions. Student trustees and student government presidents each represented 29% of the sample while board chairpersons represented 23% and college and university presidents represented 17%.

Table 4.5

Position Held at Institution

n= 17, M= 2.7, SD= 1.1		
Position	<i>f</i>	%
College/University President	3	17.6
Board Chairperson	4	23.5
Student Trustee	5	29.4
Student Government President	5	29.4

Research Questions

Research Question 1: What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders towards voting rights and practices of student trustees?

Tables 4.6 through 4.10 provide information regarding research question 1. Table 4.6 provides information regarding the attitudes of the selected campus leaders toward the voting practices of student trustees. Forty seven percent of respondents agreed that

the voting practices of student trustees. Forty seven percent of respondents agreed that the current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. Overall, 41% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. Ninety-four percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should not have voting rights. Twenty-nine percent of respondents agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. Conversely, 41% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. Fifty-three percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the current voting rights of student trustees should be maintained. Further, 18% of respondents disagreed that the current voting rights should be maintained. Forty-seven percent of respondents agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. Moreover, 47% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. Fifty-three percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees. Eighteen percent of respondents disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees.

Table 4.6

Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward Voting Practices of Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. n= 17, SD= 1.14, M= 2.94	0	0	8	47.1	2	11.8	5	29.4	2	11.8
Student trustees should not have voting rights. n= 17, SD= .624, M= 1.47	0	0	0	0	1	5.9	6	35.3	10	58.8
The right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. n= 17, SD= 1.03, M= 2.76	0	0	5	29.4	5	29.4	5	29.4	2	11.8
Current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained. n= 17, SD= 1.06, M= 3.58	4	23.5	5	29.4	5	29.4	3	17.6	0	0
The right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. n= 17, SD= 1.16, M= 2.88	0	0	8	47.1	1	5.9	6	35.3	2	11.8
The right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees. n= 17, SD= .870, M= 3.41	1	5.9	8	47.1	5	29.4	3	17.6	0	0

Table 4.7 provides information regarding the attitudes of college and university presidents towards the voting rights of student trustees. Thirty-three percent of subjects agreed that the current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. Conversely, 66% of the subjects disagreed that the current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. One hundred percent of the subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should not have voting rights. One hundred percent of the subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. One hundred percent of the

subjects agreed that current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained. One hundred percent of the subjects disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. Sixty-six percent of the subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees.

Table 4.7

Attitudes of College/University Presidents Toward Voting Practices of Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. n= 3, SD= 1.15, M= 2.66	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	2	66.7	0	0
Student trustees should not have voting rights. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 1.66	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3
The right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 1.66	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3
Current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained. n= 3, SD= 0, M= 4	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
The right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. n= 3, SD= 0, M= 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0
The right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees. n= 3, SD= 1, M= 3	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3	1	33.3

Table 4.8 provides information regarding the attitudes of board chairpersons toward the voting practices of student trustees. Twenty-five percent of subjects agreed that current voting practices limited the performance of student trustees. Overall, 75% of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that the current voting practices limit the

performance of student trustees. One hundred percent of the subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should not have voting rights. Twenty-five percent of the subjects agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. Conversely, 75% of the subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. Seventy-five percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that the current voting rights should be maintained. Further, 25% of the subjects disagreed that the current voting rights should be maintained. Twenty-five percent of the subjects agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. Overall, 75% of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. Fifty percent of subjects agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees. Fifty percent of subjects disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees.

Table 4.8

Attitudes of Board Chairpersons Toward Voting Practices of Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. n= 4, SD= 1.14, M= 2	0	0	1	25	0	0	1	25	2	50
Student trustees should not have voting rights. n= 4, SD= .577, M= 1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	50	2	50
The right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. n= 4, SD= 1.26, M= 2.25	0	0	1	25	0	0	2	50	1	25
Current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained. n= 4, SD= 1.26, M= 3.75	1	25	2	50	0	0	1	25	0	0
The right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. n= 4, SD= 1.41, M= 2	0	0	1	25	0	0	1	25	2	50
The right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees. n= 4, SD= 1.15, M= 3	0	0	2	50	0	0	2	50	0	0

Table 4.9 provides information regarding the attitudes of student trustees toward the voting practices of student trustees. Forty percent of the subjects agreed that current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. Forty percent of the subjects disagreed that current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. Eighty percent of the subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should not have voting rights. Twenty percent of the subjects agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. Twenty percent of the subjects disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. Twenty percent of the subjects strongly agreed that the current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained. Twenty percent of the

subjects disagreed that the current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained. Sixty percent of the subjects agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. Twenty percent of subjects disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. Eighty percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees.

Table 4.9

Attitudes of Student Trustees Toward Voting Practices of Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. n= 5, SD= 1.14, M= 2	0	0	2	40	1	20	2	40	0	0
Student trustees should not have voting rights. n= 5, SD= .577, M= 1.5	0	0	0	0	1	20	1	20	3	60
The right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. n= 5, SD= 1.26, M= 2.25	0	0	1	20	3	60	1	20	0	0
Current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained. n= 5, SD= 1.26, M= 3.75	1	20	0	0	3	60	1	20	0	0
The right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. n= 5, SD= 1.41, M= 2	0	0	3	60	1	20	1	20	0	0
The right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees. n= 5, SD= 1.15, M= 3	1	20	3	60	1	20	0	0	0	0

Table 4.10 provides information regarding the attitudes of student government presidents toward the voting practices of student trustees. Eighty percent of subjects agreed that current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. Eighty percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should not have

voting rights. Sixty percent of subjects agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. Forty percent of subjects strongly agreed that current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained. Twenty percent of subjects disagreed that the current voting rights of student trustees should be maintained. Eighty percent of subjects agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. Twenty percent of subjects disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. Forty percent of subjects agreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees.

Table 4.10

Attitudes of Student Government Presidents Toward Voting Practices of Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. n= 5, SD= .447, M= 3.8	0	0	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should not have voting rights. n= 5, SD= .894, M= 1.6	0	0	0	0	1	20	1	20	3	60
The right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 3.6	0	0	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0
Current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained. n= 5, SD= 1.34, M= 3.6	2	40	0	0	2	40	1	20	0	0
The right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees. n= 5, SD= .894, M= 3.6	0	0	4	80	0	0	1	20	0	0
The right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 3.4	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0

Research Question 2: What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders toward compensation for student trustees?

Tables 4.11 through 4.15 provide information regarding research question 2. Table 4.11 provides information regarding the attitudes of the selected campus leaders toward compensation for student trustees. Overall, 24% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. Forty-seven percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. Ninety-four percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be allowed to work off-campus while serving on the board. No respondents disagreed. Ninety-four percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that outside employment should be restricted for student trustees. No respondents agreed with the statement. Forty-seven percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of a student trustee. Conversely, 12% disagreed that serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of a student trustee. Eighteen percent of respondents agreed that student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board. Further, 70% disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board.

Table 4.11

Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward Compensation for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. n=17, SD= 1.22, M= 2.58	1	5.9	3	17.6	5	29.4	4	23.5	4	23.5
Student trustees should be allowed to work off-campus while serving on the board. n= 17, SD= .587, M= 4.29	6	35.3	10	58.8	1	5.9	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should receive compensation comparable to that received by the student government president. n= 17, SD= .848, M= 2.29	0	0	2	11.8	3	17.6	10	58.8	2	11.8
Outside employment for student trustees should be restricted. n= 17, SD= .587, M= 1.70	0	0	0	0	1	5.9	10	58.8	6	35.3
Serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of a student trustee. n= 17, SD= .874, M= 3.47	2	11.8	6	35.3	7	41.2	2	11.8	0	0
Student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board. n= 17, SD= 1.07, M= 2.17	0	0	3	17.6	2	11.8	7	41.2	5	29.4

Table 4.12 provides information regarding the attitudes of college and university presidents toward compensation for student trustees. Thirty-three percent of subjects agree that student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. Thirty-three percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. Sixty-six percent of subjects agreed that student trustees should be allowed to work off campus while serving on the board. One hundred percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees should receive compensation comparable to the student government president. Sixty-six percent of subjects disagreed

that outside employment for student trustees should be restricted. Thirty-three percent of subjects agreed that serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of a student trustee. One hundred percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board.

Table 4.12

Attitudes of College/University Presidents Toward Compensation for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. n= 3, SD= 1.53, M= 2.33	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3
Student trustees should be allowed to work off-campus while serving on the board. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 3.66	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should receive compensation comparable to that received by the student government president. n= 3, SD= 0, M= 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	100	0	0
Outside employment for student trustees should be restricted. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 2.33	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0
Serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of a student trustee. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 3.33	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 1.66	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3

Table 4.13 provides information regarding the attitudes of board chairpersons toward compensation for student trustees. Seventy percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. One hundred percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be allowed to work off campus while serving on the board. Twenty-five percent

of subjects agreed that student trustees should receive compensation comparable to that of the student government president. Seventy-five percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees should receive compensation comparable to that of the student government president. One hundred percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that outside employment should be restricted for student trustees. Fifty percent of subjects disagree that serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of the student trustee. Seventy-five percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board.

Table 4.13

Attitudes of Board Chairpersons Toward Compensation for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. n= 4, SD= .957, M= 1.75	0	0	0	0	1	25	1	25	2	50
Student trustees should be allowed to work off-campus while serving on the board. n= 4, SD= .5, M= 4.25	1	25	3	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should receive compensation comparable to that received by the student government president. n= 4, SD= 1.26, M= 2.25	0	0	1	25	0	0	2	50	1	25
Outside employment for student trustees should be restricted. n= 4, SD= .577, M= 1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	50	2	50
Serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of a student trustee. n= 4, SD= .577, M= 2.5	0	0	0	0	2	50	2	50	0	0
Student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board. n= 4, SD= .957, M= 1.75	0	0	0	0	1	25	1	25	2	50

Table 4.14 provides information regarding the attitudes of student trustees toward compensation for student trustees. Forty percent of subjects agreed that student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. Twenty percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. One hundred percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be allowed to work off campus while serving on the board. Forty percent of subjects agreed that student trustees should receive compensation comparable to that of the student government president. One hundred percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that outside employment for student trustees should be restricted. Eighty percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of the student trustee. Forty percent of subjects agreed that student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board. Sixty percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board.

Table 4.14

Attitudes of Student Trustees Toward Compensation for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. n= 5, SD= .836, M= 3.2	0	0	2	40	2	40	1	20	0	0
Student trustees should be allowed to work off-campus while serving on the board. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 4.6	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should receive compensation comparable to that received by the student government president. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 2.6	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0
Outside employment for student trustees should be restricted. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	60	2	40
Serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of a student trustee. n= 5, SD= .707, M= 4	1	20	3	60	1	20	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board. n= 5, SD= 1.09, M= 2.8	0	0	2	40	0	0	3	60	0	0

Table 4.15 provides information regarding the attitudes of student government presidents toward compensation for student trustees. Twenty percent of subjects strongly agreed that student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. Forty percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. One hundred percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be allowed to work off campus while serving on the board. Twenty percent of subjects agreed that student trustees should receive compensation comparable to that of the student government president. Eighty percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should

receive compensation comparable to that of the student government president. One hundred percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that outside employment for student trustees should be restricted. Sixty percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of the student trustee. Twenty percent of subjects agreed that student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board. Sixty percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board.

Table 4.15

Attitudes of Student Government Presidents Toward Compensation for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. n= 5, SD= 1.48, M= 2.8	1	20	0	0	2	40	1	20	1	20
Student trustees should be allowed to work off-campus while serving on the board. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 4.4	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should receive compensation comparable to that received by the student government president. n= 5, SD= 1.09, M= 2.2	0	0	1	20	0	0	3	60	1	20
Outside employment for student trustees should be restricted. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 1.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	60	2	40
Serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of a student trustee. n= 5, SD= .836, M= 3.8	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board. n= 5, SD= 1.3, M= 2.2	0	0	1	20	1	20	1	20	2	40

Research Question 3: What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders toward the roles and responsibilities of student trustees.

Tables 4.16 through 4.20 provide information regarding research question 3.

Table 4.16 provides information regarding the attitudes of the selected campus leaders toward the roles of student trustees. Fifty-nine percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. Eighteen percent of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. Fifty-nine percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be involved with institutional fundraising. No respondents disagreed. Fifty-three percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that access to executive session is essential to the role of a student trustee. Overall, 29% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that access to executive session is essential to the role of a student trustee. Seventy percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association. Further, 12% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association. Fifty-nine percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. Conversely, 18% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. Eighty-eight percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents'/board relations office. Further, 6% of respondents disagreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents'/board relations office.

Table 4.16

Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward the Roles of Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. n= 17, SD= 1.17, M= 3.58	4	23.5	6	35.3	4	23.5	2	11.8	1	5.9
Student trustees should be involved with institutional fundraising. n= 17, SD= .685, M= 3.7	2	11.8	8	47.1	7	41.2	0	0	0	0
Access to executive session is essential to the role of a student trustee. n= 17, SD= 1.41, M= 3.41	5	29.4	4	23.5	3	17.6	3	17.6	2	11.8
Student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association. n= 17, SD= 1.09, M= 3.76	4	23.5	8	47.1	3	17.6	1	5.9	1	5.9
Student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. n= 17, SD= 1, M= 3.41	1	5.9	9	52.9	4	23.5	2	11.8	1	5.9
Student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents'/board relations office. n= 17, SD= .781, M= 4.11	5	29.4	10	58.8	1	5.9	1	5.9	0	0

Table 4.17 provides information regarding the attitudes of college and university presidents toward the roles of student trustees. Sixty-six percent of subjects agreed that limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. Thirty-three percent of subjects disagreed that limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. Thirty-three percent of subjects strongly agreed that student trustees should be involved in institutional fundraising. One hundred percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that access to executive sessions is essential to the role of a student trustee. Thirty-three percent of subjects agreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government

association. Sixty-six percent of subjects agreed that student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. Thirty-three percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. One hundred percent of subjects agreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents/board relations office.

Table 4.17

Attitudes of College/University Presidents Toward the Roles of Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. n= 3, SD= 1.15, M= 3.33	0	0	2	66.7	0	0	1	33.3	0	0
Student trustees should be involved with institutional fundraising. n= 3, SD= 1.15, M= 3.66	1	33.3	0	0	2	66.7	0	0	0	0
Access to executive session is essential to the role of a student trustee. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 1.66	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3
Student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 3.33	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	0	0
Student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. n= 3, SD= 1.15, M= 3.33	0	0	2	66.7	0	0	1	33.3	0	0
Student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents'/board relations office. n= 3, SD= 0, M= 4	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4.18 provides information regarding the attitudes of board chairpersons towards the roles of student trustees. Twenty-five percent of subjects agreed that limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. Fifty percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that limiting access to executive

session significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. Fifty percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be involved with institutional fundraising. Fifty percent of subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that access to executive session is essential to the role of a student trustee. Fifty percent of subjects agreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association. Twenty-five percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government. Fifty percent of subjects agreed that student trustees are treated as equal by appointed trustees. Fifty percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents/board relations office. Twenty-five percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents/board relations office.

Table 4.18

Attitudes of Board Chairpersons Toward the Roles of Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. n= 4, SD= 1.29, M= 2.5	0	0	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25
Student trustees should be involved with institutional fundraising. n= 4, SD= .957, M= 3.75	1	25	1	25	2	50	0	0	0	0
Access to executive session is essential to the role of a student trustee. n= 4, SD= .957, M= 2.25	0	0	0	0	2	50	1	25	1	25
Student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association. n= 4, SD= 1.41, M= 3	0	0	2	50	1	25	0	0	1	25
Student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. n= 4, SD= .577, M= 3.5	0	0	2	50	2	50	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents'/board relations office. n= 4, SD= 1.29, M= 3.5	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	0	0

Table 4.19 provides information regarding the attitudes of student trustees toward the roles of a student trustee. Eighty percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. Eighty percent of subjects agreed that student trustees should be involved with institutional fundraising. Eighty percent of subjects agreed that access to executive session is essential to the role of a student trustee. One hundred percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association. Eighty percent of subjects agreed that student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. Twenty percent of subjects strongly

disagreed that student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. One hundred percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents/board relations office.

Table 4.19

Attitudes of Student Trustees Toward the Roles of Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. n= 5, SD= .836, M= 4.2	2	40	2	40	1	20	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should be involved with institutional fundraising. n= 5, SD= .447, M= 3.8	0	0	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0
Access to executive session is essential to the role of a student trustee. n= 5, SD= .836, M= 4.2	2	40	2	40	1	20	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association. n= 5, SD= .447, M= 4.2	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. n= 5, SD= 1.34, M= 3.4	0	0	4	80	0	0	0	0	1	20
Student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents'/board relations office. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 4.4	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4.20 provides information regarding the attitudes of student government presidents regarding the roles of a student trustee. Sixty percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of student trustees. Sixty percent of subjects agree that student trustees should be involved with institutional fundraising. One hundred percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that access to executive sessions is essential to the role of a student trustee.

Eighty percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association. Twenty percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association. Forty percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. Twenty percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. One hundred percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents/board relations office.

Table 4.20

Attitudes of Student Government Presidents Toward the Roles of Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. n= 5, SD= 1, M= 4	2	40	1	20	2	40	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should be involved with institutional fundraising. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 3.6	0	0	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0
Access to executive session is essential to the role of a student trustee. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 4.66	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association. n= 5, SD= 1.3, M= 4.2	3	60	1	20	0	0	1	20	0	0
Student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. n= 5, SD= 1.14, M= 3.4	1	20	1	20	2	40	1	20	0	0
Student trustees should receive administrative support from the presidents'/board relations office. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 4.4	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	0	0

Research Question 4: What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders towards the training of student trustees?

Tables 4.21 through 4.25 provide information regarding research question 4. Table 4.21 provides information regarding the attitudes of the selected campus leaders regarding the training of student trustees. Fifty-nine percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. Overall, 12% of respondents disagreed that student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. Ninety-four percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that it is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position. No respondents disagreed. Twenty-nine percent of respondents agreed that lengthening the term of office of the student trustee would improve the position. Further, 59% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed. Ninety-four percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should participate fully in board retreats. No respondents disagreed. Sixty-four percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. Overall, 12% of respondents disagreed that student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. Seventy-six percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the current two-year student trustee term should be maintained. Six percent of respondents disagreed that the current two-year student trustee term should be maintained.

Table 4.21

Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward Training for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. n= 17, SD= .931, M= 3.64	3	17.6	7	41.2	5	29.4	2	11.8	0	0
It is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position. n= 17, SD= .618, M= 4.58	11	64.7	5	29.4	1	5.9	0	0	0	0
Lengthening the term of office of the student trustee would improve the position. n= 17, SD= .996, M= 2.64	0	0	5	29.4	2	11.8	9	52.9	1	5.9
Students trustees should participate fully in board retreats. n= 17, SD= .771, M= 4.29	7	41.2	9	52.9	1	5.9	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. n= 17, SD= 1.11, M= 4	8	47.1	3	17.6	4	23.5	2	11.8	0	0
The current two-year student trustee term should be maintained. n= 17, SD= .781, M= 3.88	3	17.6	10	58.8	3	17.6	1	5.9	0	0

Table 4.22 provides information regarding the attitudes of college and university presidents towards the training of student trustees. One hundred percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. One hundred percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that it is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position. Sixty-six percent of the subjects disagreed that lengthening the term of office of the student trustee would enhance the position. One hundred percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should participate fully in board retreats. Thirty-

three percent of subjects strongly agreed that student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. Thirty-three percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. Sixty-six percent of subjects agreed that the current two year term for student trustees should be maintained.

Table 4.22

Attitudes of College/University Presidents Toward Training for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 4.33	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
It is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 4.66	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lengthening the term of office of the student trustee would improve the position. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 2.33	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0
Student trustees should participate fully in board retreats. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 4.33	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. n= 3, SD= 1.53, M= 3.33	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0
The current two-year student trustee term should be maintained. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 3.66	0	0	2	66.7	1	33.3	0	0	0	0

Table 4.23 provides information regarding the attitudes of board chairpersons toward the training of student trustees. One hundred percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. One hundred percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that it

is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position. Twenty-five percent of the subjects agreed that lengthening the term of office would enhance the position. Seventy-five percent of the subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that lengthening the term of office of the student trustee would enhance the position. Seventy-five percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should participate fully in board retreats. Fifty percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. Twenty-five percent of the subjects disagreed that student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. Seventy-five percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that the current two year student trustee term should be maintained. Twenty-five percent of the subjects disagreed that the current two year student trustee term should be maintained.

Table 4.23

Attitudes of Board Chairpersons Toward Training for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. n= 4, SD= .5, M= 4.25	1	25	3	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
It is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position. n= 4, SD= .5, M= 4.75	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lengthening the term of office of the student trustee would improve the position. n= 4, SD= 1.26, M= 2.25	0	0	1	25	0	0	2	50	1	25
Student trustees should participate fully in board retreats. n= 4, SD= 1.41, M= 4	2	50	1	25	1	25	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. n= 4, SD= 1.29, M= 3.5	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	0	0
The current two-year student trustee term should be maintained. n= 4, SD= 1.25, M= 3.75	1	25	2	50	0	0	1	25	0	0

Table 4.24 provides information regarding the attitudes of student trustees toward the training of student trustees. Forty percent of the subjects agreed that student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. Twenty percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees receive the same training as appointed trustees. Eighty percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that it is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position. Forty percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that lengthening the term of office of the student trustee would enhance the position. One hundred percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should participate fully in board retreats. One hundred

percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. Eighty percent of subjects strongly agreed or agreed that the current two year student trustee term should be maintained.

Table 4.24

Attitudes of Student Trustees Toward Training for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. n= 5, SD= .836, M= 3.2	0	0	2	40	2	40	1	20	0	0
It is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position. n= 5, SD= .894, M= 4.4	3	60	1	20	1	20	0	0	0	0
Lengthening the term of office of the student trustee would improve the position. n= 5, SD= .894, M= 2.6	1	20	1	20	3	60	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should participate fully in board retreats. n= 5, SD= .447, M= 4.2	1	20	4	80	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. n= 5, SD= .447, M= 4.8	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
The current two-year student trustee term should be maintained. n= 5, SD= .707, M= 4	1	20	3	60	1	20	0	0	0	0

Table 4.25 provides information regarding the attitudes of student government presidents toward the training of student trustees. Twenty percent of the subjects strongly agreed that student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. Twenty percent of subjects disagreed that student trustees receive the same training as appointed trustees. One hundred percent of the subjects strongly agreed or

agreed that it is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position. Sixty percent of the subjects strongly agreed that lengthening the term of office of the student trustee would enhance the position. One hundred percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should participate fully in board retreats. Sixty percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. Eighty percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that the current two year student trustee term should be maintained.

Table 4.25

Attitudes of Student Government Presidents Toward Training for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. <i>n</i> = 5, <i>SD</i> = 1.09, <i>M</i> = 3.2	1	20	0	0	3	60	1	20	0	0
It is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position. <i>n</i> = 5, <i>SD</i> = .547, <i>M</i> = 4.6	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lengthening the term of office of the student trustee would improve the position. <i>n</i> = 5, <i>SD</i> = 1.09, <i>M</i> = 3.2	3	60	0	0	2	40	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should participate fully in board retreats. <i>n</i> = 5, <i>SD</i> = .547, <i>M</i> = 4.6	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend. <i>n</i> = 5, <i>SD</i> = 1, <i>M</i> = 4	2	40	1	20	2	40	0	0	0	0
The current two-year student trustee term should be maintained. <i>n</i> = 5, <i>SD</i> = .707, <i>M</i> = 4	1	20	3	60	1	20	0	0	0	0

Research Question 5: What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders toward the potential conflict of interest for a student trustee as a representative of both the student body and the board of trustees?

Tables 4.26 through 4.30 provide information regarding research question 5. Table 4.26 provides information regarding the attitudes of the selected campus leaders towards conflicts of interest for student trustees. Ninety-four percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. Overall, 6% of respondents disagreed that advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. Fifty-three percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. Conversely, 12% of respondents disagreed that the same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. Seventy-six percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. Further, 18% of respondents disagreed that student trustees represent the interest of the current student body. Twelve percent of respondents agreed that student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. Overall, 76% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. Seventy percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. Conversely, 18% of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed that remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. Eighty-eight percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees.

Overall, 6% of respondents disagreed that student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees.

Table 4.26

Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward Conflicts of Interest for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. n= 17, SD= .771, M= 4.29	7	41.2	9	52.9	0	0	1	5.9	0	0
The same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. n= 17, SD= .799, M= 3.47	1	5.9	8	47.1	6	35.3	2	11.8	0	0
Student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. n= 17, SD= .970, M= 3.7	3	17.6	10	58.8	1	5.9	3	17.6	0	0
Student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. n= 17, SD= .927, M= 2.11	0	0	2	11.8	2	11.8	9	52.9	4	23.5
Remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. n= 17, SD= 1.29, M= 3.94	8	47.1	4	23.5	2	11.8	2	11.8	1	5.9
Student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees. n= 17, SD= 1.04, M= 4.29	9	52.9	6	35.3	1	5.9	1	5.9	1	33.3

Table 4.27 provides information regarding the attitudes of college and university presidents toward conflicts of interest for student trustees. Sixty-six percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that advancing the college or university as a whole is the primary responsibility of the student trustee. Thirty-three percent of the subjects disagreed that advancing the college or university as a whole is the primary responsibility of the student trustee. Thirty-three percent of the subjects agreed that the same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. One

hundred percent of the subjects agreed that student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. One hundred percent of the subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that the student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. Sixty-six percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. Thirty-three percent of the subjects disagreed that remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. Sixty-six percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees. Thirty-three percent of the subjects strongly disagreed that student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees.

Table 4.27

Attitudes of College/University Presidents Toward Conflicts of Interest for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. n= 3, SD= 1.53, M= 3.66	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3	0	0
The same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 3.33	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	0	0
Student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. n= 3, SD= 0, M= 4	0	0	3	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. n= 3, SD= .577, M= 1.33	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	2	66.7
Remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. n= 3, SD= 1.53, M= 3.66	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3	0	0
Student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees. n= 3, SD= 2.08, M= 3.33	1	33.3	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	33.3

Table 4.28 provides information regarding the attitudes of board chairpersons toward conflicts of interest for student trustees. One hundred percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. Seventy-five percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that the same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. Fifty percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. Fifty percent of the subjects disagreed that student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. One hundred percent of the subjects disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. Fifty percent of the subjects strongly agreed that remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. Twenty-five percent of the subjects disagreed that remaining objective and impartial is the role of the student trustee. One hundred percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees.

Table 4.28

Attitudes of Board Chairpersons Toward Conflicts of Interest for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. n= 4, SD= .5, M= 4.25	1	25	3	75	0	0	0	0	0	0
The same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. n= 4, SD= .816, M= 4	1	25	2	50	1	25	0	0	0	0
Student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. n= 4, SD= 1.5, M= 3.25	1	25	1	25	0	0	2	50	0	0
Student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. n= 4, SD= .577, M= 1.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	50	2	50
Remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. n= 4, SD= 1.5, M= 3.75	2	50	0	0	1	25	1	25	0	0
Student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees. n= 4, SD= .5, M= 4.75	3	75	1	25	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table 4.29 provides information regarding the attitudes of student trustees toward the conflicts of interest for student trustees. One hundred percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. Twenty percent of the subjects agreed that the same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. Forty percent of the subjects disagreed that the same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. One hundred percent of the subjects agreed that student trustees represent the current student body. Forty percent of the subjects agreed that the student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. Sixty

percent of the subjects disagreed that the student trustees are solely responsible to the student body. One hundred percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. Eighty percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees.

Table 4.29

Attitudes of Student Trustees Toward Conflicts of Interest for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 4.4	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
The same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. n= 5, SD= .836, M= 2.8	0	0	1	20	2	40	2	40	0	0
Student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. n= 5, SD= 0, M= 4	0	0	5	100	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. n= 5, SD= 1.09, M= 2.8	0	0	2	40	0	0	3	60	0	0
Remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 4.4	2	40	3	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
Student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees. n= 5, SD= .836, M= 4.2	2	40	2	40	1	20	0	0	0	0

Table 4.30 provides information regarding the attitudes of student government presidents toward conflicts of interest for student trustees. One hundred percent of the subjects strongly agree or agree that advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. Eighty percent of the subjects

agreed that the same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. Sixty percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. Twenty percent of the subjects disagreed that the student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. Sixty percent of the subjects disagreed that student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. Sixty percent of the subjects strongly agreed that remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. Twenty percent of the subjects strongly disagreed that remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. One hundred percent of the subjects strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees.

Table 4.30

Attitudes of Student Government Presidents Toward Conflicts of Interest for Student Trustees

	Strongly Agree		Agree		Neutral		Disagree		Strongly Disagree	
	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%	<i>f</i>	%
Advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. n= 5, SD= .771, M= 4.29	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
The same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees. n= 5, SD= .447, M= 3.8	0	0	4	80	1	20	0	0	0	0
Student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. n= 5, SD= .970, M= 3.76	2	40	1	20	1	20	1	20	0	0
Student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 2.4	0	0	0	0	2	40	3	60	0	0
Remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. n= 5, SD= 1.78, M= 3.8	3	60	0	0	1	20	0	0	1	20
Student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees. n= 5, SD= .547, M= 4.6	3	60	2	40	0	0	0	0	0	0

Tables 4.31 and 4.32 provide information regarding the open-ended questions asked of respondents. Table 4.31 provides information regarding the open-ended question, "In your own words, what are the roles and responsibilities of student trustees?" Overall, 40% of the respondents stated that the role of the student trustee is to advance the college or university and its' community. Eighty percent of respondents felt that the role of the student trustee was to communicate the perspective of the students to the board of trustees and administration in general. Forty percent of the respondents stated that the role of the student trustee was to be a liaison between the board and the students, providing information about each group to each group.

Table 4.31

Content Analysis for “What are the Roles and Responsibilities of Student Trustees”

Theme	Frequency	%
Advance college or university and community as a whole.	6	40
Communicate student perspective to the Board of Trustees.	12	80
Liaison between the administration and the students and student leaders.	6	40

Table 4.32 provides information regarding the second opened question. Overall, 20% of respondents felt that no changes were necessary to the position. Forty percent of the respondents stated that the position would be more effective if some or all of the legislative limitations on the position, including lack of access to executive session, the right to vote on litigation, the right to vote on personnel matters and the right to vote on property acquisition, were removed. Further, 20% of respondents stated that there should be more accountability of the student trustees time and actions in service to their institution. Twenty-five percent of the respondents stated that there should be more interaction between the student trustees and the student population and student government association.

Table 4.32

Content Analysis for “What Changes Should be Made to the Role of Student Trustee”

Theme	Frequency	%
No changes should be made.	3	20
Remove legislative limitations on the position.	6	40
More interaction of the student trustee with the students and .	3	20
More accountability	4	26

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of the Study

Student trustees of college and university boards hold important roles. They are given privileged information, vote on important matters and personally interact with people that are of esteem and authority. They shoulder the weight of representing the general student body on the highest governance level at their respective institution. Often, student trustees do not know exactly what they can or should do with these responsibilities. There is tension over whether a student trustee is an advocate for the current student body or if a student trustee has the same roles and responsibilities as an appointed trustee. This places a potential conflict which may manifest into self-doubt, ethical dilemmas, and loyalty concerns. In this study, selected leaders from eight member institutions of NJASCU were surveyed to determine their attitudes toward the roles and practices of student trustees at New Jersey public colleges and universities.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the attitudes of selected student trustees, college or university presidents, board chairs, and student government presidents of eight public, four-year institutions of higher education in the state of New Jersey about the roles, responsibilities, limitations, and needs of student trustees. The study sought to investigate the attitudes of the selected students, administrators, and board members as a means of gaining a perspective on the role of the student trustee from the student trustees

themselves as well as the three related groups that hold the most relevance to the position and work most closely with student trustees. Further, the study sought to determine if there were any significant relationships between the selected demographics and the attitudes toward the roles, responsibilities, limitations and needs of the student trustees.

Methodology

The researcher surveyed college and university presidents, board chairpersons, student trustees and student government presidents within the NJASCU. These groups were chosen because they have the most contact and relevance to the position of student trustee. Access to the subjects was made through mailings to the board liaison at each institution. A total of 32 subjects were sent surveys. In order to insure the rights of each subject, an Institutional Review Board application was submitted on February 22, 2006. The application was approved March 8, 2006. Also approved was an informed consent form. Subjects were instructed to read and sign the consent form before completing the survey.

A survey titled *Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward the Role of Student Trustees* was designed by the researcher based upon relevant literature. The survey consisted of three sections. The first section contained questions of background information of the subject including age, gender, highest level of education, profession or academic major, how many years of service on the board and what position the subject held at their respective institution. The second section contained 30 Likert scale statements arranged on a five point scale from 5- Strongly Agree, 4- Agree, 3- Neutral, 2- Disagree, to 1- Strongly Disagree. Subjects were asked to respond to each statement

reflecting the degree to which they agreed with the statement. The third section of the survey asked the subjects to answer two open-ended questions.

On March 13, 2006 a package was mailed to each of the eight board liaisons. Each package contained a letter of explanation to the board liaison, an example copy of the survey to be distributed and four envelopes addressed to each of the subjects. The board liaisons then distributed the marked envelopes to each of the subjects. In each envelope was contained a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study and assuring that the information and identities of the subjects would remain confidential, a consent form, the survey and a stamped addressed envelope for the subject to mail the survey back to the researcher. The initial deadline for returning the surveys was March 27, 2006.

The researcher placed numerous phone calls and emails to the board liaisons and subjects themselves to remind them to fill out and return the survey as the deadline approached and passed. Due to an insufficient response rate, the researcher allowed the deadline to pass and continued contact with the board liaisons to check on the status of the participants' surveys and also to make them aware that the surveys would be accepted beyond the deadline stated on the survey.

Several weeks after the deadline for data collection had passed the researcher offered to conduct the survey over the phone with subjects who had not returned their survey. The researcher obtained three surveys through a phone interview where the researcher read all of the questions to the participant on the telephone and recorded the answers onto a blank survey in the researcher's possession. This approach yielded a response rate of 53%.

Data Analysis for Quantitative Data

The data collected were inputted into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) computer program. Using the SPSS program the data were analyzed by descriptive statistics to calculate frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviation. The responses of the Likert scale questions were compared between the demographic groups of college/university president, board chairperson, student trustee and student government president to determine the congruence of attitudes of each group for each research question.

Data Analysis for Qualitative Data

The data collected from the open-ended questions in the third section of the survey were analyzed through a content analysis procedure. The researcher examined the responses to the questions pertaining to what the respondents felt, in their own words were the roles and responsibilities of student trustees and what changes should be made to improve the effectiveness of the position. The open-ended questions were analyzed looking for common themes. The corresponding frequencies and percentages of the themes were then calculated and presented in table form.

Discussion of the Findings

Research Question 1: What are the attitudes of the selected campus leaders towards the voting rights and practices of student trustees?

Just over 94% of the total population disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should not have voting rights. There was a clear level of congruence between all categories agreeing that student trustees should have voting rights of some kind.

There was much less agreement concerning what those rights should be. With 66% of college and university presidents and 75% of board chairpersons disagreeing or strongly disagreeing that current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees, the non-student subjects seem to support current practice. In fact, 100% of college and university presidents and 75% of board chairpersons agreed or strongly agreed that current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained.

The responses among the students were much less uniform. While 80% of student government presidents agreed that the current voting practices limit the performance of the student trustees, at the same time 40% agreed that the current voting practices for student trustees should be maintained with only 20% disagreeing. Student trustees were more divided within in each statement. Forty percent of student trustees both agreed that current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees. Moreover, 40% of student trustees disagreed that the current practices limit the performance of student trustees.

One hundred percent of college and university presidents and 75% of board chairpersons disagreed or strongly disagreed that the right to vote on issues dealing with litigation or personnel. These groups are evenly split on the issue of student trustees having the right to vote on issues of property acquisition. Thirty-three percent of college and university presidents agreed that student trustees should vote on property acquisition and 33% disagreed. Of the board chairpersons, 50% agreed and 50% disagreed.

Of student government presidents, 60% or more agreed that the student trustees should be extended the right to vote on litigation, personnel, and property acquisition. Student trustees were again indistinct concerning the right to vote on litigation issues

with 20% agreeing and 20% disagreeing, the rest being neutral. Sixty percent of student trustees favored the right to vote on personnel. Eighty percent of student trustees strongly agreed or agreed that they should be extended the right to vote on property acquisition.

It would appear that of the current voting rights denied to student trustees, issues of property acquisition would be the only one to have any semblance of congruence, with the presidents and board chairs split on the issue and the students strongly in favor. The matters of litigation and personnel are clearly divided between the students and the presidents and board chairpersons.

Studies by McLaughlin, Priest and McIntyre all found that having the right to vote was essential to a positive and effective experience of a student trustee. The results of this study would support this claim, in that almost all subjects felt that student trustees should have voting rights. However, the attitudes toward issues of whether the current restrictions on voting rights of student trustees limit the position and what restrictions should potentially be removed have shown to be extremely diverse. McIntyre's study found that voting rights were the most effective way to signify the importance of the student voice. If the student trustee right to vote is more a symbolic action than one of practice perhaps the restrictions do not matter. However, the attitudes of whether this is true are scattered both between groups of campus leaders and within them.

Research Question 2: What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders towards compensation for student trustees.

The literature suggests that student trustees should receive tuition assistance so that they do not need to work, or work as much while serving on the board. This way the

student trustee would have the time necessary to be an effective member of the board and still maintain academic excellence (McIntyre, 1977). The findings of this study do not support the literature. Sixty-six percent of college and university presidents as well as 75% of board chairs disagreed or strongly disagreed that student trustees should receive tuition assistance. Forty percent of student government presidents disagreed or strongly disagreed while only 20% agreed that student trustees should receive tuition assistance. Forty percent of student trustees agreed that the position of student trustee should receive tuition assistance. Furthermore, the findings do not support the idea that student trustees should not maintain employment while serving on the board. One hundred percent of board chairpersons, student trustees and student government presidents agreed that student trustees should be allowed to work off-campus while serving on the board. While 66% of college and university presidents also agreed. No respondent in any category disagreed that student trustees should be allowed to work off-campus while serving on the board. Likewise, 100% of board chairpersons, student trustees and student government presidents disagreed that outside employment should be restricted for student trustees. Sixty-six percent of college and university presidents disagreed that outside employment should be restricted for student trustees. It is clear that the subjects of this study disagree with the McIntyre study conclusions. There was also a high level of agreement that the student trustee should not receive compensation comparable to that of the student government president. One hundred percent of college and university presidents disagreed that student trustees should receive compensation comparable to the student government president. Board chairpersons disagreed by 75% with the statement. Eighty percent of student government presidents disagreed that student trustees should

receive compensation comparable to their own. Even 40% of student trustees disagreed with the statement while no student trustees agreed that they should receive compensation comparable to the student government president.

Research Question 3: What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders toward the roles and responsibilities of student trustees?

Early studies by Priest (1977) and McIntyre (1977) reported that the majority of student trustees claim to represent the interests of the student body. A later study by Smith (2000) concluded that the integrity of the position of student trustee is better served by the student trustee acting more in a manner similar to appointed trustees. Findings show evidence that the selected campus leaders believe that the role of the student trustee is akin to that of an appointed trustee. Fifty-nine percent of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that limiting access to executive session significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee. Only 18% disagreed with the statement. Fifty-nine percent of respondents believed that student trustees should be involved with institutional fundraising while no respondents disagreed. Overall, 59% of selected campus leaders believed that student trustees were treated as equals by appointed trustees while just 18% disagreed.

Research Question 4: What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders toward the training of student trustees.

The Lang study (2003) showed that while the majority of student trustees receive some training, it was considered incomplete by the majority of subjects. The results of this study concerning training are split between the student and non-student subjects. One hundred percent of college and university presidents and board chairpersons agreed

that student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. Only 40% of student trustees agreed with the statement. Although, only 20% of student trustees disagreed that student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees. The majority of student government presidents were neutral on the statement. The results also show that 100% of respondents in all categories strongly agreed or agreed that it is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position.

Research Question 5: What are the attitudes of selected campus leaders concerning the potential conflicts of interest for a student trustee as a representative of both the student body and the board of trustees.

The most recent literature on this matter concludes that student trustees should act in a manner similar to an appointed trustee rather than an advocate for the student body. This is to maintain the integrity of the student trustees' position as a "real" board member (Smith, 2000). Also, this would help provide a clearer distinction between the role of the student government president and that of the student trustee. If the student trustee was purely an advocate for the student body, the student trustee and student government president could be seen as having redundant roles (2000). The findings show that the selected campus leaders agreed that student trustees should act in ways similar to appointed trustees. All board chairpersons, student trustees, and student government presidents surveyed strongly agreed or agreed that advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. Further, 66% of college and university presidents strongly agreed or agreed with the statement. One hundred percent of college and university presidents and board chairpersons disagreed

that student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. Meanwhile, 60% of student government presidents disagreed that student trustees are accountable solely to the student body, with 40% being neutral. Student trustee respondents were split on the issue with 60% disagreeing and 40% agreeing that student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. Overall, 88% of respondents strongly agreed or agreed that student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees. While these findings show support for the student trustee acting in similar manner as an appointed trustee, the findings also show that the selected campus leaders still see student trustees as a representative of the interests of the student body. One hundred percent of college and university presidents and student trustees agreed that student trustees represent the interests of the current student body. Sixty percent of student government presidents agreed. Board chairpersons were split on the statement with 50% strongly agreeing or agreeing and 50% disagreeing.

Conclusions

The findings suggest that all of the selected campus leaders believe that student trustees should have voting rights. There was a division between the attitudes of student leaders and non-student leaders concerning what specific voting rights should be extended to student trustees. The student trustees and student government presidents more frequently responded that student trustees should have the same voting rights as appointed trustees. The findings show that the majority of college and university presidents and board chairpersons are strongly against student trustees voting on personnel or litigation matters. However, the college and university presidents and board

chairpersons were evenly split between those who agreed and disagreed that student trustees should be given the right to vote on matters of property acquisition.

The findings reveal that college and university presidents, board chairpersons and student government presidents do not believe that student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board. Forty percent of student trustees did believe student trustees should receive tuition assistance. Furthermore, the general consensus of all the selected groups of campus leaders was that the student trustee should not receive compensation comparable to that of the student government president. Moreover, there was a general consensus that student trustees should not be limited or restricted concerning employment off-campus while serving on the board. All selected groups disagreed that student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board.

The findings show large discrepancies between the attitudes of the selected campus leaders concerning the role of a student trustee. All groups of campus leaders agreed that student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association and the president's/board relations office. Therefore, these inquiries do not help determine which position is the predominant role of a student trustee as a student leader or trustee. Student leaders largely agreed that access to executive session is essential to the role of a student trustee. Meanwhile, college and university presidents and board chairpersons largely disagree. This suggests that the student leaders desire the student trustee position to be more akin to an appointed trustee than college and university presidents and board chairpersons. All groups of selected leaders tended to believe that student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees. Also, there was a strong consensus that student trustees should be involved with institutional

fundraising. These both show evidence that the attitude of selected campus leaders is that the role of a student trustee is similar to that of an appointed trustee.

The question of training student trustees had the highest levels of agreement between all groups of selected campus leaders. The findings show that the majority of respondents believed that student trustees do receive the same training as appointed trustees. The overwhelming majority of campus leaders believed that it is the responsibility of the institution to educate student trustees in preparation for the position. Furthermore, the findings reveal a consensus that the length of term for student trustees should be maintained at two years.

The findings suggest that student trustees should act as an appointed trustee while representing the student body on the board of trustees. The vast majority of campus leaders believed that advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee. This is the role of an appointed trustee as well. The findings show that the majority of respondents in all groups of campus leaders believe that remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee. This is the role of an appointed trustee. The findings show a clear consensus that student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees. Also, all groups of campus leaders disagreed that student trustees are accountable solely to the student body. However, all groups of campus leaders agreed that the student trustees represent the interests of the current student body.

Recommendations for Future Research

The following recommendations are made for further research:

1. A larger study geographically involving campus leaders from the region or the entire country should be done.
2. A larger study involving more campus leaders should be done. All the leadership groups of this study could be expanded. All appointed board members could be surveyed rather than the board chairperson. The administrative president's cabinet, including all vice presidents along with the president of the institution, should be surveyed. The student trustees of the current time as well as within the last five to 10 years would be a good expansion on that category. Also, the entire student government executive board or senate should be studied.
3. A qualitative study design involving interviews with subjects of the different categories of campus leaders would give more conclusive results. The survey items can always leave some doubt as to the intention of the response. For example, a student government president could agree that the current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained because that student government president finds the current system satisfactory. That student government president could also agree that current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained as an alternative to eliminating voting rights of student trustees entirely. Therefore, the motivation of the response is not entirely conclusive. An interview would yield more information on the intentions and true feelings regarding the position of student trustee.

4. A study including both public and private institutions should be conducted for comparisons to previous research.

REFERENCES

- Frankel, J.R. & Walen, N.E. (2003). How to design and evaluate research in education (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lang, K.C. (2003, September 12). Training students to be trustees. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50, 12-14.
- McIntyre, V.L. (1977). Student trustees: The national picture. *AGB Reports*, 19, 15-20.
- McLaughlin, R. (1978). Inside student trusteeship. *AGB Reports*, 20, 41-42.
- New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities. (2006, April 12). NJ Higher Education Fast Facts. In *State College/University Facts at a Glance*. Retrieved April 28, 2006, from http://www.njascu.org/fast_facts.htm
- Priest, E.M. (1977). Student trustees of public colleges. *AGB Reports*, 19, 21-24.
- Smith, C. (2000). *Perspectives on the role of student trustees in California community colleges* (Community College League of California, Sacramento Publication No. BBB31327). Sacramento, CA.
- Woods, G.P., & Nason, J.W. (1977). Student-Faculty trusteeship: A short debate *AGB Reports*, 19, 12-14.

Appendix A

Institutional Review Board Application (IRB)
Rowan University Approval

Rowan University
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
HUMAN RESEARCH REVIEW APPLICATION

RECEIVED FEB 22 2006

INSTRUCTIONS: Check all appropriate boxes, answer all questions completely, include attachments, and obtain appropriate signatures. Submit an **original and two copies** of the completed application to the Office of the Associate Provost.

NOTE: **Applications must be typed.**
Be sure to make a copy for your files.

FOR IRB USE ONLY:

Protocol Number: IRB- 2006-058

Received: _____ Reviewed: _____

Exemption: Yes No

Category(ies): _____

Approved [Signature] (date) 3/16/06

Step 1: Is the proposed research subject to IRB review?

All research involving human participants conducted by Rowan University faculty and staff is subject to IRB review. Some, but not all, student-conducted studies that involve human participants are considered research and are subject to IRB review. Check the accompanying instructions for more information. Then check with your class instructor for guidance as to whether you must submit your research protocol for IRB review. If you determine that your research meets the above criteria and is not subject to IRB review, **STOP**. You do not need to apply. If you or your instructor have any doubts, apply for an IRB review.

Step 2: If you have determined that the proposed research is subject to IRB review, complete the identifying information below.

Project Title: A Study of the Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders toward the Role of Student Trustees at New Jersey State Colleges and Universities.

Researcher: <u>Matt Minnella</u>	
Department: <u>Educational Leadership</u>	Location: <u>Rowan University</u>
Mailing Address: <u>201 Mullica Hill Rd.</u> (Street)	<u>Glassboro, NJ 08028</u> (Town/State/Zip)
E-Mail: <u>minnel99@students.rowan.edu</u>	Telephone: <u>(973) 945-5079</u>
Co-Investigator/s: _____	
Faculty Sponsor (if student)* <u>Dr. Burton Sisco</u>	
Department <u>Educational Leadership</u>	Location: <u>Rowan University</u>
E-Mail: <u>sisco@rowan.edu</u>	Telephone: <u>(856) 256-4500 ext. 3717</u>

Step 3: Determine whether the proposed research eligible for an exemption from a full IRB review.

Federal regulations (45 CFR 46) permit the exemption of some types of research from a full IRB review. If your research can be described by one or more of the categories listed below, check the appropriate category(ies), complete questions 1-5, and complete the Assurances on the last page of the application.

If your research cannot be described by any of these categories, your research is not exempt, and you must complete the entire "Human Research Review Application."

- Category 1** - Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as: (a) research on regular and special education instructional strategies; or (b) research on the effectiveness of, or the comparison among, instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
- Category 2** - Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior, unless: (a) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that the human participants can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the participants; and (b) any disclosure of the human participants' responses outside the research could reasonably place the participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the participants' financial standing, employability, or reputation.
(Note: Exemption for survey and interview procedures does not apply to research involving children. Exemption for observation of public behavior does not apply to research involving children except when the investigator does not participate in the activities being observed.)
- Category 3** - Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under Category 2 above if: (a) the human participants are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or (b) federal statute requires without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.
- Category 4** - Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that participants cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the participants.
- Category 5** - Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of department or agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine: (a) public benefit or service programs; (b) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs; (c) possible changes in or alternatives to these programs or procedures; or (d) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.
- Category 6** - Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies: (a) if wholesome foods without additives are consumed; or (b) if a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.
(Note: Exemption categories cannot be applied to research involving fetuses, pregnant women, human in vitro fertilization, or prisoners.)

Please answer Questions 1-5 below

1. WHAT IS THE OBJECTIVE OF THE RESEARCH?

The research is intended to determine the attitudes of college or university presidents, board chairpersons, student government presidents and student trustees toward the role of student trustees.

2. DESCRIBE THE DESIGN OF THE RESEARCH INCLUDING WHAT WILL BE REQUIRED OF SUBJECTS (ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEET IF NECESSARY):

The study design requires subjects to respond to a questionnaire consisting of three sections. The first section will collect background information on the subject. The second section will use responses to a set of Likert scale statements to determine the attitudes of the subjects toward student trustees. The third section will ask two open ended questions related to the role and future of student trustees.

3. DESCRIBE THE SUBJECTS WHO WILL BE PARTICIPATING (NUMBER, AGE, GENDER, ETC):

Subjects will include the institution president, board chair, student government president and student trustee from all members of the New Jersey Association of State Colleges and Universities except Thomas Edison State College.

4. DESCRIBE HOW SUBJECTS WILL BE RECRUITED (e.g. ADVERTISEMENTS, ANNOUNCEMENTS IN CLASS, E-MAIL, INTERNET)

Subjects will be contacted by telephone and will be mailed a letter explaining the research as well as a consent form, self-addressed stamped envelope and the survey.

5. WHERE WILL THE RESEARCH BE CONDUCTED:

The survey will be dispensed and collected from Rowan University.

NOTE: IF THE RESEARCH IS TO BE CONDUCTED IN ANOTHER INSTITUTION (e.g. A SCHOOL, HOSPITAL, AGENCY, etc.) A PERMISSION LETTER FROM AN ADMINISTRATOR ON THE LETTERHEAD OF THAT INSTITUTION MUST BE ATTACHED.

IF THE RESEARCH IS TO BE CONDUCTED AT ANOTHER UNIVERSITY, A SIGNED COPY OF THE IRB APPROVAL FORM FROM THAT UNIVERSITY MUST BE ATTACHED.

ATTACH THE CONSENT FORM TO THIS APPLICATION. The Consent Form must address all of the elements required for informed consent (SEE INSTRUCTIONS).

NOTE: IF THE ONLY RECORD LINKING THE SUBJECT AND THE RESEARCH WOULD BE THE CONSENT DOCUMENT, AND THE RESEARCH PRESENTS NO MORE THAN MINIMAL RISK OF HARM TO SUBJECTS, YOU MAY USE AN ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE FOR CONSENT. IF YOU WISH TO REQUEST PERMISSION FROM THE IRB TO USE AN ALTERNATIVE PROCEDURE, ATTACH A COPY OF THE FIRST PAGE OF YOUR RESEARCH INSTRUMENT OR A LETTER WITH THE REQUIRED INFORMATION (see Instructions).

If you are requesting an exemption from a full IRB review, STOP. Complete the last page of this application ("Certifications"), and forward the completed (typed) application to the Office of the Associate Provost for Research, The Graduate School, Memorial Hall.

IF YOU CANNOT CLAIM ONE OF THE EXEMPTIONS LISTED ABOVE, COMPLETE ALL OF THE ABOVE AS WELL AS THE FOLLOWING ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR A FULL IRB REVIEW.

Does your research involve a special population?

- Socioeconomically, educationally, or linguistically disadvantaged racial/ethnic group
- Pregnancy/fetus
- Cognitively impaired
- Elderly
- Terminally ill
- Incarcerated
- No special population

At what level of risk will the participants in the proposed research be placed?

(Note: "Minimal risk" means that the risks of harm anticipated in the proposed research are not greater, considering probability and magnitude, than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests. The concept of risk goes beyond physical risk and includes risks to the participant's dignity and self-respect as well as psychological, emotional, or behavioral risk.)

Minimal Risk More than Minimal Risk Uncertain

1. HOW WILL SUBJECTS BE RECRUITED? IF STUDENTS, WILL THEY BE SOLICITED FROM CLASS?

2. WHAT RISKS TO SUBJECTS (PHYSIOLOGICAL AND/OR PSYCHOLOGICAL) ARE INVOLVED IN THE RESEARCH?

3. IS DECEPTION INVOLVED IN THE RESEARCH? IF SO, WHAT IS IT AND WHY WILL IT BE USED?

4. WHAT INFORMATION WILL BE GIVEN TO THE SUBJECTS AFTER THEIR PARTICIPATION? IF DECEPTION IS USED, IT MUST BE DISCLOSED AFTER PARTICIPATION.

5. HOW WILL CONFIDENTIALITY BE MAINTAINED? WHO WILL KNOW THE IDENTITY OF THE SUBJECTS? IF A PRE-AND POSTTEST DESIGN IS USED, HOW WILL THE SUBJECTS BE IDENTIFIED?

6. HOW WILL THE DATA BE RECORDED AND STORED? WHO WILL HAVE ACCESS TO THE DATA? ALL DATA MUST BE KEPT BY THE PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR FOR A MINIMUM OF THREE YEARS.

CERTIFICATIONS:

Rowan University maintains a Federalwide Assurance (FWA) with the Office of Human Research Protection (OHRP), U.S. Department of Health & Human Services. This Assurance includes a requirement for all research staff working with human participants to receive training in ethical guidelines and regulations. "Research staff" is defined as persons who have direct and substantive involvement in proposing, performing, reviewing, or reporting research and includes students fulfilling these roles as well as their faculty advisors.

Please attach a copy of your "Completion Certificate for Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams" from the National Institutes of Health.

If you need to complete that training, go to the Web Tutorial at <http://cme.nci.nih.gov/>.

Responsible Researcher: I certify that I am familiar with the ethical guidelines and regulations regarding the protection of human participants from research risks and will adhere to the policies and procedures of the Rowan University Institutional Review Board. I will ensure that all research staff working on the proposed project who will have direct and substantive involvement in proposing, performing, reviewing, or reporting this research (including students fulfilling these roles) will complete IRB approved training. I will not initiate this research project until I receive written approval from the IRB. I agree to obtain informed consent of participants in this project if required by the IRB; to report to the IRB any unanticipated effects on participants which become apparent during the course or as a result of experimentation and the actions taken as a result; to cooperate with the IRB in the continuing review of this project; to obtain prior approval from the IRB before amending or altering the scope of the project or implementing changes in the approved consent form; and to maintain documentation of consent forms and progress reports for a minimum of three years after completion of the final report or longer if required by the sponsor or the institution. I further certify that I have completed training regarding human participant research ethics within the last three years as indicated below my signature.

Signature of Responsible Researcher: Maia Minicella Date: 2/21/06

Faculty Advisor (if Responsible Researcher is a student): I certify that I am familiar with the ethical guidelines and regulations regarding the protection of human participants from research risks. I further certify that I have completed training regarding human participant research ethics within the last three years as indicated below my signature (attach copy of your "Completion Certificate for Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams" from the National Institutes of Health).

Signature of Faculty Advisor: Paul R. J. Date: 2/21/06



Search

GO

[NCI Home](#)[Cancer Topics](#)[Clinical Trials](#)[Cancer Statistics](#)[Research & Funding](#)[News](#)[About NCI](#)

Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams

Completion Certificate

This is to certify that

matt minnella

has completed the **Human Participants Protection Education for Research Teams** online course, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), on 11/21/2005.

This course included the following:

- key historical events and current issues that impact guidelines and legislation on human participant protection in research.
- ethical principles and guidelines that should assist in resolving the ethical issues inherent in the conduct of research with human participants.
- the use of key ethical principles and federal regulations to protect human participants at various stages in the research process.
- a description of guidelines for the protection of special populations in research.
- a definition of informed consent and components necessary for a valid consent.
- a description of the role of the IRB in the research process.
- the roles, responsibilities, and interactions of federal agencies, institutions, and researchers in conducting research with human participants.

National Institutes of Health
<http://www.nih.gov>

[Home](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Policies](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Site Help](#) | [Site Map](#)

A Service of the National Cancer Institute



FIRST TO KNOW



Search

cc

[NCI Home](#) | [Cancer Topics](#) | [Clinical Trials](#) | [Cancer Statistics](#) | [Research & Funding](#) | [News](#) | [About NCI](#)



Human Participant Protections Education for Research Teams

Completion Certificate

This is to certify that

Burton Sisco

has completed the **Human Participants Protection Education for Research Teams** online course, sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), on 09/29/2004.

This course included the following:

- key historical events and current issues that impact guidelines and legislation on human participant protection in research.
- ethical principles and guidelines that should assist in resolving the ethical issues inherent in the conduct of research with human participants.
- the use of key ethical principles and federal regulations to protect human participants at various stages in the research process.
- a description of guidelines for the protection of special populations in research.
- a definition of informed consent and components necessary for a valid consent.
- a description of the role of the IRB in the research process.
- the roles, responsibilities, and interactions of federal agencies, institutions, and researchers in conducting research with human participants.

National Institutes of Health
<http://www.nih.gov>

[Home](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Policies](#) | [Accessibility](#) | [Site Help](#) | [Site Map](#)

A Service of the National Cancer Institute



Appendix B
Consent Form

Consent Form

I agree to participate in a study entitled "A Study of the Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders Toward the Role of Student Trustees at New Jersey Public Colleges and Universities" which is being conducted by Matt Minnella, a graduate student at Rowan University. The purpose of this study is to define the role of student trustees more clearly so they might serve their institutions more effectively. The data collected in this study will be used as part of my Master's Thesis.

I understand that I will be required to answer questions on a survey. My participation in this study should not exceed 15 minutes.

I understand that my responses will be anonymous and that all the data gathered will be confidential. I agree that any information obtained from this study may be used in any way thought best for the research project, provided that I am in no way identified and my name is not used.

I understand that there are no physical or psychological risks involved in this study, and that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time without penalty.

If I have any questions or concerns regarding my participation in this study I may contact Dr. Burton Sisco at (856) 256-4500 ext. 3717 or Matt Minnella at (973) 945-5079 or via email at minnel99@gmail.com.

(Signature of Participant)

(Date)

(Signature of Investigator)

(Date)

Appendix C

Survey

Attitudes of Selected Campus Leaders toward the Role of Student Trustees

The following survey is designed to measure your attitudes toward the role of the student trustees at your institution. It will take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete. Your answers will be kept completely confidential and data collection will be anonymous. The data collected in this study will be used to determine a clearer definition of the role of student trustees that will be used as part of a Master's thesis project to be completed by Matt Minnella. For the purposes of this study the term "student trustee" refers to the student that has been elected by the student body or student government and is currently in the position of the voting student representative on the board of trustees. The term "appointed trustee" refers to all other members of the board that were appointed and confirmed by the state of New Jersey. It is understood by the researcher that several items suggest policies that conflict with current New Jersey statute in chapter 64 of title 18A which established the position of student trustee. It is the aim of this study to obtain your attitudes toward the position of student trustee independent of the current legal definition of the position. Once again, I appreciate your participation. Thank you.

Part I. Background Information

Please respond to the following questions by filling out the appropriate spaces

Age: _____

Male: _____ Female: _____

What is your highest level of education obtained?

Bachelor's Degree Master's Degree Doctoral Degree Other

What is your profession or academic major? _____

How many years have you been a member of the board of trustees? (if applicable) _____

The position you hold at your institution is:

College/University President Board Chairperson Student Trustee Student Government President

(please continue inside)

Part II. Attitudes

The following statements reflect attitudes toward the position of student trustee. For each statement please place an "X" in the box that best describes your level of agreement ranging from Strongly Agree; Agree; Neutral; Disagree; or Strongly Disagree.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. Current voting practices limit the performance of student trustees.					
2. Limiting access to executive sessions significantly inhibits the role of a student trustee.					
3. Student trustees receive the same comprehensive training as appointed trustees.					
4. Student trustees should receive tuition assistance for service on the board.					
5. Advancing the college or university community as a whole is the primary responsibility of a student trustee.					
6. The same legal liability laws that apply to appointed trustees should apply to student trustees.					
7. Student trustees should be allowed to work off-campus while serving on the board.					
8. It is the responsibility of the institution to educate the student trustee in preparation for the position.					
9. Student trustees should be involved with institutional fundraising.					
10. Student trustees should not have voting rights.					
11. Student trustees represent the interests of the current student body.					
12. Student trustees should receive compensation comparable to that received by the student government president.					

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
13. Lengthening the term of office of student trustees would improve the position.					
14. Access to executive session is essential to the role of a student trustee.					
15. The right to vote on issues dealing with litigation should be extended to student trustees.					
16. Current voting rights for student trustees should be maintained.					
17. Student trustees should receive administrative support from the student government association.					
18. Student trustees should be offered the opportunity to attend any conferences that appointed trustees attend.					
19. Outside employment for student trustees should be restricted.					
20. Student trustees should be held to the same ethical standards as appointed trustees.					
21. The right to vote on issues dealing with personnel should be extended to student trustees.					
22. Student trustees should receive administrative support from the president's/board relations' office.					
23. Students should participate fully in board retreats.					
24. Serving on the board and attending school should be the primary focus of a student trustee.					
25. Remaining objective and impartial is the role of a student trustee.					
26. Student trustees are accountable solely to the student body.					
27. Student trustees should receive academic credit for service on the board.					

(continue on back)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
28. The current two-year student trustee term should be maintained.					
29. Student trustees are treated as equals by appointed trustees.					
30. The right to vote on issues dealing with property acquisition should be extended to student trustees.					

Section III. Recommendations

Listed below are open ended questions. Please answer the questions in the area provided.

1. In your words, what are the roles and responsibilities of student trustees?

2. What changes should be made to improve the effectiveness of the role of student trustees?

Thank you for completing this survey. Please return the survey in the envelope provided by **March 27, 2006**. If you would like to receive summary results of this research, please include the name and address to which you would like them to be sent.

Appendix D
Letter to Participants

February 13, 2006

Dr. Donald Farish
President
Rowan University
201 Mullica Hill Rd
Glassboro, NJ 08028

Dear Dr. Farish:

I am a graduate student in the Educational Leadership Department at Rowan University. I am conducting a research project for my thesis under the supervision of Dr. Burton Sisco as part of my master's in higher education administration program.

The purpose of my research is to determine the attitudes of selected campus leaders on the role of student trustees at New Jersey public colleges and universities. My hope is that the study will help to form more definitive guidelines and direction for student trustees to follow as well as promote a more uniform mission and effective service for student trustees throughout the state. I believe the results of this study will benefit the student trustees, trustee boards and the entire college and university community in the state of New Jersey.

I am requesting your assistance in gathering data for this research project. I have enclosed a consent form and survey for you to complete and return to me by **March 27, 2006**. The research is focused on a relatively small group of selected leaders including student trustees themselves and those they interact with the most, so your participation is imperative to the success of the study. Please be fully aware that all information gathered for this study will remain confidential and will only be used for this research project. All participants answers will be codified before data analysis and no identifiable traits of the participants will be used in the research report.

If you have any questions regarding the survey please feel free to contact Dr. Burton Sisco, my thesis advisor at (856) 256-4500 ex.3717. You may also contact me directly at (973) 945-5079 or via email at minnel99@gmail.com. I have enclosed a self-addressed stamp envelope for you to return the survey. Please have the survey back by March 27, 2006. Thank you for your assistance in completing this study.

Sincerely,

Matt Minnella

