

Board Competency for Fiduciary Governance Responsibilities: A Basis for Competency and Fiduciary Enhancement Programs¹

Nimrod S. Salazar², Adventist University of the Philippines

Date Received: 6 January 2023 Revised: 29 June 2023 Accepted: 11 July 2023

Abstract

The challenge of providing good governance is paramount in higher education institutions. Governing boards play a pivotal role in governance as they help to ensure that management achieves the institution's stated goals and objectives. The purpose of this study was to explore the current practices of board competency and the duties of the board of trustees in seven selected institutions in the Southern Asia Pacific region as viewed by appropriate board respondents ($N = 114$). Strategic, contextual, analytical, political, educational, and interpersonal competencies, as well as fiduciary governance responsibilities, were reportedly practiced at a high level. Competency and governance responsibilities were closely associated, implying that the higher the competency of a board of trustees, the better was the performance of governance responsibilities. The Mann-Whitney results showed that female respondents practiced a higher level of fiduciary responsibilities than males. Moreover, the regression results identified educational competency as the strongest predictor of the practice of fiduciary governance responsibility. Recommendations and guidelines for educational competency and fiduciary enhancement programs were generated to assist in the development of good practices.

Keywords: *Board competency, fiduciary governance responsibilities, board development*

Introduction

In recent years, numerous challenges have been created by globalization and have shaped the educational landscape of higher education institutions (Rios, 2013). The evident scarcity of financial resources, unstable enrollment, high operational and capital expenditures, evolving cost of technology, and increasing competition between faculty and administrators were some perceived drawbacks of modernization (Afriyie, 2015; Canosa, 2008).

School governance by a board of trustees is a critically important mechanism for guiding the direction of higher educational institutions around the world. It is generally the highest organizational authority within an institution in decision and policy making (Arslan, 2013). Griffin (2011) emphasized that boards of trustees shape the direction of schools, provide for the well-being of all constituencies, and are held responsible for the overall performance of the institutions they govern. They are considered the guardians of the most important trust, values, and integrity of the organization (Barac, 2015). They are the owners in trust of a larger group of stakeholders such as students, parents, communities, and the whole constituency (Arslan, 2013).

The board has fiduciary responsibility, a feature that refers to stewardship of the tangible assets of the institution and the provision of guidance for it to remain faithful to its mission. The fiduciary responsibilities of the board of trustees include appointing and supporting the president. In the appointment of the president, the board of trustees is making a conscious decision to entrust the college or the university to an individual who can change its direction for decades (Collins, 2013). The board should give the president both psychological and substantive support (Chaffee, 2014; Davidson et al., 2014; Hartley, 2014; KASFAA Policy Manual, 2016; Shattock, 2012; Thomas, 2020; Wormell, 2013). Fiduciary responsibilities also involve assessing the president's performance, which should be

¹ An earlier version of this paper was presented at the 9th International Scholars' Conference held on October 25–26, 2022 at Asia-Pacific International University, Muak Lek, Thailand, and selected for publication in HBDS.

² Author's email address: NSSalazar@aup.edu.ph

done on a continual basis. Removal of the president would be anticipated when the board's expectations failed to be met (Arslan, 2013; Collins, 2013).

Trustees also authenticate an institution's claim of significance to external communities. They interact and explain its programs to the public, and in return interpret the public's sentiments and feelings to the institution (Chaffee, 2014; Davidson et al., 2014; KASFAA Policy Manual, 2016; Hartley, 2014; Shattock, 2012; Thomas, 2020; Wormell, 2013). A board of trustees that has accepted its roles and responsibilities are willing for its performance to be evaluated.

In terms of fiduciary responsibilities, each trustee is under obligation to protect, acquire and preserve the school plant, facilities, and grounds. They are expected to take all possible measures to promote safe and healthful surroundings for students, provide care for the campus vicinity, approve the design of the buildings and campus facilities, provide adequate space, and ensure the beauty of the buildings and grounds (Arslan, 2013; Collins, 2013; Ingram, 2016).

The scrutiny of board governance has attracted considerable attention in research publications. According to Chappell (2013), some board members do not provide enough oversight to the institution, while others have limited knowledge about their roles and responsibilities. These problems increase the demand for accountability by more knowledgeable board members (Huff et al., 2011). Santiago's (2008) research revealed some issues arising from trustees who had a limited knowledge of their roles and responsibilities or who failed to engage in fundraising initiatives to support the school's operation. Problems also occur when no orientation or professional training is provided for new and old members relative to their major responsibilities.

Since the work of the board of trustees is so important, aspects of the individual trustee's preparation, perceptions, attitudes, and practices should be considered (Jaskyte & Holland, 2015). It was therefore the purpose of this study to determine how the trustees of higher educational institutions perceived their competencies as board members and their practice of fiduciary governance responsibilities.

Specifically, answers to the following research questions were sought:

1. What is the perceived level of board competency in terms of strategic, contextual, analytical, political, educational, and interpersonal skills?
2. What is the perceived level of practice of fiduciary governance responsibility?
3. Is there a significant relationship between board competency factors and the practice of fiduciary governance responsibility?
4. Is there a significant difference in the practice of fiduciary governance responsibility when gender is considered?
5. Do gender and board competency factors predict fiduciary governance responsibility?
6. Based on the findings, what development program can be recommended to enhance board competency and fiduciary governance responsibilities?

Methodology

Research Design

A descriptive-correlational design was used to examine the relationship between board competency and fiduciary governance responsibilities. The results also served as the basis for a proposed development program to enhance board competency and the practice of fiduciary governance duties.

Participants and Sampling

The respondents of the study were board officers, board members, and institutional representatives who were serving on the boards of selected sectarian higher education institutions in the Asia-Pacific Region. Seven Seventh-day Adventist higher education institutions participated in the study. Purposive sampling was used in the study to include members of these boards of trustees and their administrative associates who had knowledge of the affairs of higher education institutions, their policy making bodies, and those who were involved with governance functions.

Instrumentation

The attributes of governance effectiveness were measured utilizing six board competencies for identifying effective trusteeship (Griffin, 2011). The instrument included questions about the demographic profile of respondents. It also contained a Board Competency Questionnaire (30 items) to reflect the respondent's level of practice with six competencies for effective trusteeship namely: Strategic, Contextual, Analytical, Political, Educational, and Interpersonal (Rahimi et al., 2011). A Governance Responsibilities Questionnaire (14 items) was also used to reflect the extent of respondents' fiduciary responsibility.

The data obtained were analyzed using SPSS. The following Cronbach's Alpha reliability figures were obtained: Strategic Competency = .892; Contextual Competency = .883; Analytical Competency = .909; Political Competency = .907; Educational Competency = .875; and Interpersonal Competency = .864. The Cronbach's Alpha reliability results for Governance Responsibilities were as follows: Fiduciary Responsibility = .947; Strategic Responsibility = .960; and Generative Responsibility = .945.

Data Gathering Procedure

The research questionnaire was validated by 10 specialists in the fields of education, business, theology, psychology, human resource development, governance, and research. After the validation process, a revised questionnaire was produced under the guidance of a research adviser. Appropriate permissions were gained, letters of request were sent to the Presidents of the concerned institutions, and visits were made to conduct a pilot study.

Data Analysis

A total of 115 participants completed the questionnaires, but the final population was 114 following the deletion of an outlier based on the recommendation of the university statistician. Means and standard deviations were used to present the respondents' demographic profiles and the level of practices for board competency and governance responsibilities as reflected in research questions 1 and 2. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to measure significant relationships between variables involved in board competency and fiduciary governance responsibilities as reflected in research question 3. The Mann Whitney *U* test was used to determine significant differences between two demographic variables that were related to the governance responsibilities variables referenced in research question 4. Multiple regression was used to compute the value of variables found in governance responsibilities that were related to board competency variables and demographic profile variables in research question 5. Based on the results and implications of the analysis, an educational competency program and a fiduciary enhancement program were outlined to enrich board governance.

Ethical Considerations

The researcher sought and was given the approval of the Ethics Research Board to conduct the study. Respondents were assured of strict confidentiality and appropriate steps were implemented throughout the study to ensure this happened.

Results and Discussion

The significant findings are presented in the following tables and discussed based on the research questions.

Level of Board Competency

The respondents' perception of the level of board competency is shown in Table 1. The mean scores revealed a high level of perceived board competency in all areas. The board's role is to review the institution's history, vision/mission, and objectives for the purpose of guiding decision-making as they keep track of their day-to-day course of action.

Table 1 *Descriptive Statistics on the Level of Board Competency*

Area	Mean	SD	Scaled Responses	Verbal Interpretation
Strategic Competency	3.21	0.53	Agree	High Competence
Contextual Competency	3.25	0.50	Agree	High Competence
Analytical Competency	3.14	0.55	Agree	High Competence
Political Competency	3.17	0.54	Agree	High Competence
Educational Competency	3.19	0.53	Agree	High Competence
Interpersonal Competency	3.25	0.48	Agree	High Competence
Grand Mean	3.20	0.52	Agree	High Competence

Legend. 3.50–4.00 *Strongly Agree* (High Competence); 2.50–3.49 *Agree* (Moderate Competence); 1.50–2.49 *Disagree* (Slight Competence) 1.00–1.49 *Strongly Disagree* (No Competence).

The results revealed that the perceived level of strategic competency was high. The Board of Trustees projects a good posture of strategic governance by working closely with the Chief Executive Officer and the school administrators to articulate the vision through a strategic plan with an appropriate combination of members’ knowledge and skills. They work together towards the realization of an action plan, with periodic review of organizational strategies to accomplish long-term goals.

The contextual competency was also high. This indicated that the board had knowledge of the institution’s history, vision/mission, and objectives for the purpose of guiding decision-making as they keep track of their day-to-day course of action. Clawson (2015) in his book “Level Three Leadership” emphasized that for board leadership to become effective, it must consider behaviors, thoughts, values, beliefs, and expectations to understand why people behave the way they do, and influence them in profound ways that move beyond monitoring and constraining behavior. Although the boards were active in this manner, ample time is still needed to discuss the norms, traditions, and values, and to adapt to the distinctive characteristics and culture of each institution’s environment.

From the respondents’ perspective, their board’s level of analytical competency was high, indicating that board members possibly had the analytical capability to postpone board decisions and to seek further information (Improving Board Effectiveness, 2016). When dealing with complex issues, boards are wise to utilize services of consultants, advisory committees, and legal entities to stay informed about significant trends, pitfalls of important issues, as well as to brainstorm and generate creative solutions to problems.

The political competence of boards was assessed, which involved the skill to build relationships with immediate stakeholders. Northouse (2015) emphasized two considerations to maintain a board’s political competence for governance and leadership. First is its overall political involvement as a means whereby the board influences its members and stakeholders to accomplish organizational goals through interactive exchange and dialogue (Ingenium Communications, 2013; Mourfield, 2014). The second area of leadership applies to ethical conduct in following the rules of governance. To maintain healthy relationships, the board must uphold the integrity of the governance process and the legitimate roles and responsibilities of other stakeholders (Griffin, 2011). It should often consult and communicate directly with its key constituents (Arslan, 2013; Gentius, 2015). Furthermore, Maricle (2014) emphasized the key importance of communication between the board and the community.

The results revealed that the perceived level of boards’ educational competency in selected Seventh-day Adventist Higher Education Institutions was high. The boards regularly reviewed meeting minutes and utilized their terms of reference to guide their deliberations and decisions. They also periodically carved out opportunities for board members to reflect on their work, assess their strengths and limitations, and examine the possible implications of their decision-making.

The results of the study revealed that the perceived level of interpersonal competency was high. Thus, it was thought that the boards favored teamwork as reflected in transparent decision-making, ensuring open communication to resolve problems and opportunities for learning. Nevertheless, there

is a need to explore nurturing the development of trustees as a group and strengthening their relationships by organizing events for board members to become better acquainted with each other.

Level of Practices of Fiduciary Governance Responsibilities

The perceived level of board fiduciary governance responsibilities was interpreted as high (Table 2). This outcome was shown in three major areas. First, the board provided the President with substantive support through a working policy that defined his duties and responsibilities in running the institution. Thus, the President was perceived to be an agent of the board with a complete mandate of responsibility, authority, and accountability. Second, the board showed responsibility to keep watch on the quality of the President’s performance. This meant making measurable performance evaluations of Presidential accomplishments that included indicators of governance effectiveness and efficiency.

Table 2 Descriptive Statistics on the Level of Fiduciary Governance Responsibilities

Statements	Mean	SD	Scaled Responses	Verbal Interpretation
Board provides working policy for the duties and responsibilities.	3.32	0.66	Agree	High Practice
Board approves budgetary requirements for physical plant facilities.	3.25	0.68	Agree	High Practice
Board conducts presidential search in full adherence to the criteria.	3.19	0.70	Agree	High Practice
Board works with President to establish new policies, goals, and guidelines.	3.16	0.70	Agree	High Practice
Board reviews policies and guidelines on physical plant facilities.	3.04	0.70	Agree	High Practice
Board evaluates the President’s performance.	3.04	0.71	Agree	High Practice
Board conducts a regular review of governance policies.	3.04	0.74	Agree	High Practice
Board reviews the progress of institution against the action plan.	3.03	0.73	Agree	High Practice
Board involves the services of the consultant on plant facility.	2.96	0.72	Agree	High Practice
Board establishes measurable evaluation performance for President’s accomplishments.	2.93	0.74	Agree	High Practice
Board measures its effectiveness and efficiency through governance indicators.	2.91	0.74	Agree	High Practice
Board provides clearly defined feedback after President’s evaluation.	2.91	0.75	Agree	High Practice
Board evaluates the President’s competency through performance appraisal checklist.	2.88	0.74	Agree	High Practice
Board physical plant committee conducts inspection.	2.83	0.72	Agree	High Practice
Grand Mean	3.04	0.51	Agree	High Practice

Legend. 3.50–4.00 *Strongly Agree* (High Competence); 2.50–3.49 *Agree* (Moderate Competence); 1.50–2.49 *Disagree* (Slight Competence) 1.00–1.49 *Strongly Disagree* (No Competence).

When the Board of Trustees determines the President’s responsibilities and effectiveness, the following principles must be observed in the evaluation process: The leadership of the President, the management effectiveness, the quality of academic programs and results, the President’s relationship with the community, teachers, faculty and staff, administrators, the board of trustees, parents, students, alumni, and the entire constituency. Lastly as an agent, the President is accountable and responsible for the entire institution and the steward of the entire assets of the institution. This is revealed by how he manages the physical plant facilities that can influence its services to its immediate stakeholders.

Arising from Legon's (2014) "Integral Leadership" notion, it follows that there should be an emphasis on the basic fiduciary duties of care, loyalty, and obedience. These principles should frame the board's orientation program to reinforce a degree of accountability for each individual trustee, as well as for the entire board (Governance Handbook, 2015).

Relationship Between Board Competency and Fiduciary Governance Responsibility

Details of the correlation analysis of board competencies and fiduciary governance responsibilities are shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Correlation Analysis Between Board Competencies and Fiduciary Governance Responsibility

Competency	r	p	Interpretation
Strategic Competency	.778	.000	Significant
Analytical Competency	.752	.000	Significant
Contextual Competency	.728	.000	Significant
Educational Competency	.794	.000	Significant
Political Competency	.731	.000	Significant
Interpersonal Competency	.709	.000	Significant

Strategic competency contributes to forming strategies and creating an institutional vision. A board with strategic competence can recognize a wider business and societal vision in the context of global markets (Keelin & Arnold, 2002; Ogbechie, 2012). In contextual competency, the board members use cultural and institutional norms to guide institutional behaviors. In analytical competency, the members try to examine the ambiguity and complexity of cases that they face. In political competency, the board's responsibility is to lead the institution to develop good relations with other constituents and organizations. In educational competency, board members understand their role related to governance of the institution. In interpersonal competency, board members form teams to initiate improvements in the board of trustees.

Gender Differences on the Practice of Fiduciary Governance Responsibility

Females showed a significantly higher level of fiduciary governance performance than males (projected Mann-Whitney U value obtained was 1067.50; p = .023). The results implied that gender diversity increased perceptions of high fidelity about sound decision making and strategies. Female board members are typically perceived to be more compliant with established rules and regulations (Minoletti, 2014). In general, men tend to lead with confidence and aggression. Women prefer to lead with caution and seek holistic approaches. Thus, the benefit of having a mixed board approach is advantageous.

Predictors of Fiduciary Responsibility

The predictors of fiduciary governance responsibilities are shown in Table 4. The significant predictors accounted for 71.4% of the total variance in fiduciary responsibility (F = 91.75, p < .001).

Table 4 Predictors of the Practice of Fiduciary Governance Responsibility

Predictors	Coefficients					
	R ² Change	B	SE	β	t	p
Constant		.295	.168		1.76	.081
Educational Competency	.631	.385	.082	.404	4.70	.000
Strategic Competency	.071	.300	.087	.312	3.44	.001
Analytical Competency	.013	.186	.083	.201	2.24	.027

Three variables predicted the extent to which perceived level of practice influenced fiduciary responsibility. The first variable was educational competency, which strongly influenced fiduciary

responsibility and accounted for 63.1% of variance. Strategic and analytical competencies did not project as strong an influence on fiduciary responsibility. The beta weight of educational competency projected a higher value compared to the other variables. The equation predicting fiduciary responsibility was $FR = .295 + .385EC + .300SC + .186 AC$.

The study results showed the robust ability of educational competency to predict the perceived level of practice of fiduciary responsibility. Educational competency refers to the ability of the board to consciously create opportunities for trustee education, training, and development for all board members to be informed about the institution, roles and responsibilities, and performance expectations in governance functions. These results imply the necessity to strengthen the educational competency of the board of trustees to obtain a high level of practice of fiduciary responsibility.

Conclusions

This study reinforced previous research indicating the significance of six competency dimensions, namely, strategic, contextual, analytical, political, educational, and interpersonal, to enhance governance performance. The results obtained revealed high perceived levels of competencies and practice of governance responsibilities in the institutions surveyed. However, they also showed that improvement is still possible.

Among the six board competencies, educational competency emerged as the strongest predictor of fiduciary governance responsibility. This implied that board leadership, together with school executives, should commit to creating opportunities for trustee education, training, and development. This is to ensure that trustees are knowledgeable and accountable in regard to their fiduciary roles and responsibilities.

Recommendations

Based on these findings, educational competency and fiduciary enhancement programs are recommended. Guidelines and suggested activities are outlined below.

A. Educational Competency Enhancement Program

Educational boards are encouraged to enter a process of continual education that will assist them in making better decisions (Korelich & Maxwell, 2015).

Board Education. The board should initiate a process of continuing education and training as an intentional commitment to enhance board competency performance. Board education is an initiative of educational leaders to lead boards to adopt self-learning activities during board retreats, summits, conventions, conferences, workshops, board forums, and board mentoring. The commitment of boards is to provide a well-planned continuing-education programs that equips the board members to perform their governance functions. Exceptional boards embrace the value of continuous learning in routine governance work and learning activities outside of the boardroom.

Suggested Activities. (a) Formulation and approval of board training and education policy, (b) creation of a Board Development Committee to spearhead the program, (c) assessment of current board member skills and competencies, (d) identification of competency qualification requirements, (e) recommendations of the board's needed skills and expertise, (f) setting participant responsibilities and roles during the training process, (g) implementation of programs and activities by the Board Development Committee, and (h) evaluation of the program by the Board Development Committee.

Suggested Training. The following steps are recommended: (a) Board Orientation—a process of providing the board members with basic information about the institution, the roles and responsibilities of board members, and their governance functions, (b) Leadership Succession Plan—an ongoing practice of the board in defining the school's strategic vision, identifying the leadership and managerial skills necessary to carry out the vision, and recruiting, developing and retaining board members to become effective, (c) Governance Training—a complete program of training in trusteeship that includes all the facets of school governance, (d) In-service Training—continuous training while serving in a trusteeship that is structured carefully with a facilitator to lead out, (e)

Package of Information—a package of information about the institution that is presented to the board members by the school executives, (f) Policies and Legal Liabilities—policies from the Seventh-day Adventist church and governmental legislation that affect the board’s governance functions. These must be communicated to the board members at the start of their tenure, (g) Board Meetings—designed to improve the working relationships of board members for unity and collaboration towards common goals, and (h) Code of Conduct for Board Members—expected discipline and behavior of board members to conduct themselves with the utmost integrity, dignity, and accountability.

Desired Outcomes. These outcomes could be as follows: (a) the Board provides a well-planned continuing education program and activities in the form of board retreats, summits, conferences, conventions, workshops, board forum, and mentoring, (b) an increase in the understanding of legal and fiduciary responsibilities, governance functions, policies, and operating procedures among board members, (c) high competence to engage in strategic thinking to guide the institution’s direction, (d) engage in deeper inquiry about issues confronting the institution, (e) explore root causes of problems encountered by management, and contribute alternative courses of action and new ideas in solving problems, and (f) develop collegial behavior and team leadership between the board and institutional management.

Responsibilities. For participants, the following duties are proposed: (a) the Board Chair—oversees the planning, implementation, and evaluation of continuing education and training activities. Works in partnership with the Board Development Committee to make sure that its guidelines are carried out effectively, (b) the Board Development Committee—responsible for the overall planning, implementation, and evaluation of board education/training activities. The committee chairperson is selected and approved by the Board, and committee members are selected by the chair in consultation with the Board Chair and approved by the full Board. Terms are for one year, up to a maximum of five consecutive years, and (c) Board Governance Resource Specialists—invited resource persons who provide a full range of training, orientation, and technical support in governance functions to the board members.

Board Orientation. A program ideally will be provided to new board members so that they will have a thorough knowledge of the history, culture, and values of the institution; roles and responsibilities of board members; governance functions, board policies, and operating procedures. It is also a valuable strategy for trustees to re-visit the distinctive characteristics of education and their role in Higher Education Institutions around the world. During the orientation process, the Board Policy Manual provides useful information about the institution’s mission, board structure/operations, and other pertinent information about governance functions. Easy access to this material can promote efficiency, accountability, and effective decision-making.

Suggested Activities. These activities include: (a) introduction of the Board Policy Manual to new board members and (b) presentation of the fundamental topics during the orientation program. In presenting the fundamental topics the following details are suggested:

General Information

- History, mission, vision, values, distinguishing institutional features, reputational advantages
- Board structure and processes
- Copy of the constitution and by-laws
- Strategic priorities, goals and objectives
- Summary of programs and services
- List of board members/staff and their contact information

Roles and Responsibilities

- Review board member roles and responsibilities
- Review school executive and officer roles and responsibilities
- Review board committees and their functions
- Discuss board expectations with new Board members
- Discuss board policies and operating procedures

- Discuss financial management and budget procedures
- Discuss fundraising strategies
- Present the current year's budget
- Provide a copy of current and audited financial statements
- Provide a copy of the most recent annual report

Other Information

- Provide copies of minutes from previous board meetings
- Organize a tour of school campus and facilities
- Provide brochures and other promotional materials
- Sign the Oath of Office

Desired Outcomes. These outcomes include: (a) the Board orients new members about the school's background, member responsibilities and roles, board policies and operating procedures, the constitution and bylaws, and functions and policies, (b) the Board Policy Manual is introduced during orientation as a guide and reference material, (c) understanding the institution's condition in terms of strengths, needs, challenges, and priorities. Understanding the Seventh-day Adventist philosophy of education and its distinct role in the academic world is also involved, and (d) appreciation of board members' skills, experience, and expertise.

Responsibilities. These responsibilities include: (a) the Board Chair oversees the orientation process in partnership with the President, Board Development Program Committee, and Governance Committee. The chair also leads out in the orientation process regarding member's roles and responsibilities, board meeting procedures, functional committees, board ethics, and accountability, (b) the President is responsible to orient new board members about institutional affairs, programs and services, staff roles, financial management, budgeting process, core policies and procedures, as well as the plant facilities, and (c) the whole board is responsible to welcome the new board members and serve as mentors for specific committee functions.

B. Fiduciary Responsibility Enhancement Program

A fiduciary responsibility enhancement program for the board is needed to enable regular and objective evaluation of the President's performance in accordance with established guidelines and criteria (Ingram, 2016). The President's performance evaluation should cover the areas of his leadership and management effectiveness, the quality of academic programs and results, and his relationship to school stakeholders and the board (Arslan, 2013; Bernstein et al., 2015).

Evaluating the President. Evaluating the President is one of the most important fiduciary responsibilities of the board. Initially, the board guides and directs the President with a working policy that defines his duties and responsibilities in running the institution. The President is perceived to be the agent of the board with a mandate of responsibility, authority, and accountability. The board shall determine the effectiveness of the President's performance through periodic evaluation that covers the areas of leadership and management effectiveness, the quality of academic programs and results, and the President's relationship with the immediate stakeholders and the board itself.

Suggested Activities. These evaluation activities include: (a) the College President prepares and submits his annual report to the board, (b) the Board Chair gathers information and feedback from constituency representatives through the use of a presidential evaluation form, (c) a formal appraisal discussion occurs in the board with due consideration of the President's annual report; a written summary of feedback from the constituency is also presented, (d) the Board Chair adds his personal evaluation to the presented documents, (e) a summary of appraisals is approved by the board; recommendations are finalized, and (f) post-evaluation feedback is presented by the Board Chair to the President.

Desired Outcomes. The suggested desirable outcomes are: (a) the board shall regularly evaluate the President according to established performance guidelines and criteria that cover the following areas: Leadership and management effectiveness, quality of academic programs and results, and relationship to immediate stakeholders and the board of trustees, (b) the President is faithful to his

fiduciary responsibilities involving the duties of care, loyalty, and obedience, (c) the President becomes a steward of the institution's entire assets and resources, and (d) a high-quality relationship is maintained between the President and the board.

Responsibilities. The suggested duties of the various entities are suggested as follows: (a) Board Chair—gathers information and feedback from constituency representatives through a presidential evaluation form. Adds his personal evaluation to documents presented in the board, (b) College President—prepares and submits his annual report to the board, (c) Governance Committee—spearheads preparation and submission of documents needed by the full board for formal appraisal/discussion, with due consideration to the President's annual report and a written summary of feedback from the constituency, (d) Committee Chairmen—submit an annual presidential evaluation to the Governance Committee, and (e) selected faculty and workers of the institution, students, alumni, and community representatives participate in evaluating the President during his term of office.

References

- Afriyie, A. (2015). Sustainable factor of higher education institutions: Why investment portfolio matters most. *Journal of Business Management and Economics*, 3(3), 16–22.
- Arslan, H. (2013). Effectiveness of board of trustees in university governance. *Middle-East Journal of Scientific Research*, 13(9), 1165–1171.
- Barac, Z. (2015). *Effective direction and control of higher education institutions: An empirical case study of the Croatian private business school* [Doctoral dissertation], University of St. Gallen, Switzerland. https://scholar.google.com/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=SdQi734AAAAJ&citation_for_view=SdQi734AAAAJ:5nxA0vEk-isC
- Bernstein, R., Buse, K., & Slatten, L. A. (2015). *Nonprofit board performance: board members' understanding their roles and responsibilities*. *American Journal of Management*, 15(1), 24–35. http://www.na-businesspress.com/AJM/BernsteinR_Web15_1_.pdf
- Canosa, H. (2008). Seventh-day Adventist higher education governing boards: A snapshot. *The Journal of Adventist Education (Summer 2008)*. <https://jae.adventist.org/>
- Chaffee, E. (2018, February 6). *Strategic leadership*. Leadership and Governance in Higher Education. <https://ellenchaffee.com/53-2/>
- Chappell, C.D. (2013). *The Virginia commission on higher education board appointments: The impact of legislative reform on public university governance* [Doctoral dissertation, George Mason University] Mason Archival Repository Service. <https://hdl.handle.net/1920/8350>
- Clawson, J.G. (2015). *Level three leadership: Getting below the surface* (3rd ed.). Pearson Prentice Hall.
- Collins, A. J., Jr. (2013). *The partnership between private university presidents and governing boards in effective governance* [Unpublished Dissertation Abstract]. Pepperdine University. <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1436258717>
- Davidson, C., Kaattari, J., & Trottier, V. (2014). *Board governance resource guide for nonprofit organizations*. Community Literacy of Ontario. <https://www.communityliteracyofontario.ca/wp/wp-content/uploads/2014/07/Board-Governance-Manual-June-2014.pdf>
- Gentius, P. (2015, July 6–8). *An examination of governing boards competencies at public institutions of higher education in Virginia*. [Paper presentation]. 7th International Conference on Education and New Learning Technologies, Barcelona, Spain. <https://library.iated.org/view/GENTIUS2015ANE>
- Governance Handbook. (2015). *For trustees of academies and multi-academy trusts and governors of maintained schools*. Department for Education, Great Britain. <https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/governance-handbook-for-trustees-of-academies-and-multiacademy-trusts-and-governors-of-maintained-schools>
- Griffin, W. M. (2011). *Board of trustees: The whole is greater than the sum of the individual parts* [Doctoral dissertation, National-Louis University]. Digital Commons@NLU. <https://digitalcommons.nl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1044&context=diss>
- Hartley, S. (2014). *Board of governors: Statement of primary responsibilities*. University of Portsmouth, Great Britain. <https://corporate-governance.docstore.port.ac.uk/A808947.pdf>
- Huff, P., Palmer, K., & Retzleff, D. (2011). *Building an effective board of directors: A toolkit for 4-H staff and 4-H leader organization members*. University of Wisconsin-Extension. <https://fonddulac.extension.wisc.edu/files/2011/09/Finalversion.pdf>

- Improving Board Effectiveness (2017). <https://hsctc.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Short-Version-Improving-Board-Effectiveness-.pdf>
- Ingenium Communications. (2013). *Best practices in board communication*. https://www.resultsmap.com/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/Best-Practices_Board-Communications-2013.pdf
- Ingram, R. T. (1980). *Handbook of college and university trusteeship*. The Jossey-Bass Series in Higher Education.
- Jaskyte, K., & Holland, T. (2015) Non-profit boards: Challenges and opportunities. *Human Service Organizations: Management, Leadership & Governance*, 39(3), 163–166. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23303131.2015.1035612>
- KASFAA Policy Manual. (2016). *Duties and responsibilities of the executive board*. <https://docplayer.net/20912650-5-duties-and-responsibilities-of-the-executive-board.html>
- Keelin, T. & Arnold, R. (2002). Five habits of highly strategic thinkers. *The Journal of Business Strategy* 23(5), 38–42. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb040273>
- Korelich, K., & Maxwell, G. (2015). The Board of Trustees' professional development and effects on student achievement. *Research in Higher Education*, 27, 1–15.
- Legon, R. (2014, March/April). The 10 habits of highly effective boards. *Trusteeship Magazine*, 22(2). <https://wou.edu/board/files/2014/10/10-Habits-of-Highly-Effective-Boards.pdf>
- Maricle, C. (2014). *Governing to achieve: A synthesis of research on school governance to support student achievement*. California School Boards Association. <https://www.mikemcmahon.info/CSBAGoverningAchieve2014.pdf>
- Mourfield, R. (2014). *Organizational change: A guide to bringing everyone on board* [Undergraduate honors thesis]. Indiana University, USA. <https://docplayer.net/11900006-Organizational-change-a-guide-to-bringing-everyone-on-board.html>
- Northouse, P.G. (2015). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. 7th edition. SAGE Publications.
- Ogbechie, C. I. (2012). *Key determinants of effective boards of directors: Evidence from Nigeria* [Doctoral dissertation, Brunel University]. <http://bura.brunel.ac.uk/bitstream/2438/7667/1/FulltextThesis.pdf>
- Rahimi, G., Damirchi, V. G., & Seyyedi, M. H. (2011). Surveying of organizational culture and management behavior affect in organizational innovation (Case study: Agriculture organization of Eastern Azerbaijan in Iran). *World Applied Sciences Journal* 14(11), 1763–1769. [https://www.idosi.org/wasj/wasj14\(11\)11/22.pdf](https://www.idosi.org/wasj/wasj14(11)11/22.pdf)
- Rios, P. (2013). A SWOT Analysis of globalization in Adventist higher education. *International Forum Journal*, 16(1), 62–78. <https://journals.aiias.edu/info/article/view/141>
- Santiago, P. P. (2008). *An analytical study of college/university board of trustees competencies, major responsibilities and performance strategies towards effective governance* [Unpublished Post-Doctoral Research Project]. North Philippine Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists, Pasay City, Philippines.
- Shattock, M. (2012). University governance: An issue for our time. *Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education*, 16(2) 56–61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603108.2011.645082>
- Thomas, L. (2020). *Effective board governance: A handbook for board members and Administrators of First Nations' Boards*. <https://www.fnesc.ca/wp/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/62116-FN-School-Governing-HandBook-V1R0-102120-B.pdf>
- Wormell, P., & McCallum, P. (2013, November). *The purpose and function of academic boards and senates in Australian universities*. Paper presented at the National Conference of Chairs of Academic Boards and Senates, University of Sydney, Australia. https://www.mq.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0006/1166919/the-purpose-and-function-of-academic-boards-and-senates-in-australian-universities.pdf