

Holding Itself Accountable: The Board's Responsibility for Self Assessment

Rebekah Burch Basinger

ABSTRACT: Although trustees are the usually forgotten players in the assessment movement, the ATS Standards include the work of the governing board among the aspects of institutional life targeted for periodic evaluation. This article looks at the benefits that derive from a regular, formalized process of self assessment by the governing board, both to the membership itself and for the betterment of the theological school. Using the wording of Standard 8.3.1.11 as a starting point, the author explores the who, why, how, and what of a successful board assessment process.

Introduction

Over the past thirty years or so, assessment has grown in importance within the world of academia, including for graduate schools of theology. Early on, the assessment movement was driven mainly by pressure from external bodies – accrediting associations, governmental agencies and foundation funders -- for greater accountability on the part of educational institutions. It was something schools did because they had to, and the resulting reports were usually relegated to a dusty shelf in the president's office. However, as the movement has matured, institutional leaders have come to appreciate the importance of regular evaluation to mission fulfillment and a school's economic vitality. While it's the unusual person who revels in the process, assessment is no longer a bad word in academic circles.

When educators discuss assessment, the focus tends toward teaching and learning, with an occasional nod to institutional finances and other matters of organizational effectiveness. Perhaps because most players within the academy have limited interaction with governing boards, trustee performance is seldom mentioned in the assessment literature. As was suggested more than twenty years ago and remains true today, “of all the issues that have been studies about higher education, the activities of boards of trustees is probably the least understood – and one of the most important.”¹

It is encouraging to note then, that the ATS standards include the work of the board among the aspects of institutional life targeted for periodic assessment. Specifically, the Standards state:

“The board has the responsibility to hold itself accountable for the overall performance of its duties, and shall evaluate the effectiveness of its own procedures.

It should also seek to educate itself about the issues it faces and about procedures used by effective governing bodies in carrying out their work. The board shall evaluate its members on a regular basis.”²

For those of us who believe an effective board is a prerequisite to an effective theological school, these are welcome words. It is gratifying that board members are invited, along with administrators and faculty, into the discovery of “how and in what form might questions be framed that lead us to deeper insight into the effectiveness and improvement of theological education.”³

An Apologetic for Board Assessment

When a board is giving attention to its own performance, it is inevitable that others within the institution will notice that something different is happening in the boardroom. The likely benefits of regular, formalized evaluation of the board’s work include:

Heightened board-esteem: The feelings of belonging and being appreciated that result from knowing they are “making the grade” encourage trustees to give their best volunteer efforts and their most generous financial support to the institution. As board members are affirmed in their work – both in and out of the boardroom – they are more likely to seek to make even greater contributions. “Behavioral psychologists and organizational learning experts agree that people and organizations cannot learn without feedback. No matter how good a board is, it’s bound to get better if it’s reviewed intelligently.”⁴

Thoughtful and regular assessment of the board’s work is a crucial step in moving trustees from the sidelines of institutional life and into full participation in advancing the

theological school. As a board chair reported at the conclusion of a weekend retreat, “We’ve learned that satisfaction arises from substantive work on vital challenges facing the school rather than the trivial, perfunctory, insubstantial, and marginally related issues that we’ve sometimes been stuck with.” To this, every one of the more than 8,000 members of the boards of ATS accredited schools should add a hearty “So may it be for us!”

Greater clarity about the board’s role: There’s considerable unanimity within the governance literature concerning the “job description” for the boards of nonprofit organizations, and in fact, this list of usual responsibilities is repeated in the ATS Standards, Section 8.⁵ There is less clarity, however, about how a board should organize for and carry out its assigned duties. Board members are frequently warned away from meddling in management issues and told to confine themselves to setting and policing operational policies. While there’s something to be said for keeping the board at arm’s length from day-to-day operations, a too narrow definition of acceptable board behavior can leave trustees wondering why they even bother to show up for meetings. It’s no surprise that students of nonprofit governance are beginning to ask if “it is time to revisit our assumptions about what boards do and should do.”⁶ A carefully crafted assessment plan allows a board to do just that.

By focusing on their own performance in the light of the challenges and priorities confronting the school, trustees are able to assess the appropriateness of the duties assigned to them. The assessment process also helps surface differences in understanding that may exist between staff and trustees regarding the proper role of the board. As one researcher warns, “When these expectations are implicit, or buried beneath layers of assumptions and values, they can lead to conflict over priorities, assignments and roles.”⁷ In a tight-knit seminary community, where shared governance and collegiality are deeply held valued, it is all the more important to seek agreement about the roles of the various partners in institutional governance. Board assessment is one aspect of that seeking. In the words of a veteran trustee: “A part of our

assessment work has been to articulate the board’s vision of where we fit in relationship to others – to bring new hope and energy for carrying forward improvements that are within our control.”

Affirmation of value added by the board: Nothing saps the energy and enthusiasm of volunteers faster than a sense of futility in their work. Board members want to know that their efforts count for something more than simply filling time in the boardroom. Regular assessment helps assure board members that their work, both individually and as a group, is adding value to the institution. Self-assessment also sends a clear message to the campus community that trustees are serious about their responsibilities and this, as the chair a Committee on Trustees, explained, helps to “bolster confidence in the board by all stakeholders.”

As trustees review a year’s worth of decisions and activities, they are able to assess the usefulness of their work to the institution. And when that happens, “members begin thinking and acting differently . . . bringing more thoughtful questions to the table, seeking relevant and focused information on problems before them, breaking into small discussion groups to brainstorm alternative directions and formulate recommendations, encouraging critical thinking about issues before the board, and getting feedback on board performance.”⁸

Recognition of assessment as learning: The assessment process creates teachable moments in the midst of the board’s busy schedule, encouraging trustees to learn from both the good and the not-so-good of their recent work. It is ironic that boards of academic institutions must be counseled to give attention to their own learning, but in practice, “the fact that board education and development need to be ongoing processes seems to have escaped even boards that have had good educational experiences.”⁹ As the boards’ *need to know* is put ahead of what external agencies *want to know*, assessment becomes a powerful means of continuing education for trustees. Assessment also enables board members to test the usefulness of their learning plan to the life of the institution.

Better governance: As stated in the preface comments to Standard 8: “Good institutional life requires that all institutional stewards know and carry out their responsibilities effectively, as

well as encourage others to do the same”¹⁰ and therein lies the definition of quality governance. If a seminary is to advance and thrive in today’s turbulent times, every unit within the school – including the board -- must operate in top form. Unfortunately, when academics talk about shared governance, the tenor of the conversation is usually on limiting the board’s role rather than on enhancing the quality of its contribution to institutional planning and decision making.

The wise board uses the assessment process to monitor the quality of shared governance on campus, and then moves ahead with confidence as a full player in the life of the institution. Data collected through a well designed assessment can dramatically change how a board uses its time, how it works with the president, and how the board, administration and faculty work together on critical issues facing the school.

Opportunity to focus on faith: Consistent with the God-centered purposes of a theological school, the assessment process should challenge board members to consider the interplay of faith and governance. Malcolm Warford, a former seminary president and continuing board consultant, writes: “Trustees are called to watch (to care for) the institution they serve and to discern God’s presence in the midst of institutional life. If this sense of an institution being claimed by God’s new reign is not part of the consciousness of trusteeship, then all of our rhetoric about faith and values really makes no difference at all. . .”¹¹

Good governance in a seminary setting is more than a legal requirement; it is a practice of faith. Theological school trustees have been given an exciting and unique role in the life of the Church, and when approached with a ministry heart, board work can be an instrument for God’s action. At its best, the assessment process should encourage trustees to reflect upon and testify to the ways in which the school’s theological heritage, mission, and commitments to the Church are reflected in boardroom decisions.

Parsing the Standard

Statement 8.3.1.11 provides helpful direction as trustees take up the challenge of self-assessment. While leaving ample room for interpretation across the wide diversity of institutional

settings and governance structures present within the ATS membership, the statement is a useful starting point from which a board can construct an acceptable assessment plan.

► The board has the responsibility to hold itself accountable for the overall performance of its duties . . .

The ATS standard is clear as to where the buck stops when it comes to board assessment. It is the board which bears ultimate responsibility for evaluation of its own effectiveness. Trustees may look to the president for assistance in designing and carrying out assessment activities, and his or her understanding of and advocacy for regular evaluation of the board's work is crucial to the success of any effort. Indeed, encouraging boards in their assessment activities is one way that presidents can show their respect for their boards. But in the end, assessing itself is board work.

Trustees must be willing to cast a critical eye on themselves and ask hard questions about the value-added aspects of their work, both individually and as a group. "It is a key responsibility of the board to make optimum use of all the resources entrusted to it, including the time and energy of its members – valuable and scarce resources of any organization – to accomplish the organization's mission and purpose."¹² A board has no one to blame but itself if the membership is disengaged, underperforming, or failing to provide adequate oversight of the institution.

That said, the idea of trying to squeeze one more thing into already jam-packed meeting agendas can be too much for trustees to contemplate. But in the wake of recent corporate scandals in the US and continuing leadership problems within the nonprofit community, a board's attention to its own performance has never been more important. "Board members sometimes fail to recognize that their responsibilities are just as great as, and perhaps greater than, those of their for-profit counterparts because of the social good represented by their organizations and the public trust implicit in their nonprofit status."¹³ If a board fails to live up to constituency expectations, it takes a long time for the institution to recover the public's trust, and especially so for religious organizations. In contrast, seminaries that are blessed with strong and self-reflective

boards are better positioned to attract the financial resources, goodwill, and quality people necessary for long term success and vitality.

The particulars of assessment are usually assigned to a specific trustee committee (e.g. Committee on Trustees, Board Development Committee, or Governance Committee), with the board chair and president acting as resource persons to the process. In many places, this will not be an easy assignment, and committee members should be prepared to respond to nay-sayers. However, board leadership dare not give in to members who think assessment is a waste of time or who may be cynical due to bad experiences with botched assessment efforts. “A governing board that is serious about its role in fostering change must live up to the values it espouses. That means being ready to change itself – its membership and the way it does business.”¹⁴

► . . . and shall evaluate the effectiveness of its own procedures.

Over the years, I’ve encountered many presidents who are disappointed in the board members with whom they must work. The myth that every other board is stronger, wiser, richer, and more engaged is alive and well within the world of theological education. And while the myth is repeated most often in schools where all or a majority of the membership is appointed by denominational authorities or a religious order, presidents of free-standing seminaries do their share of complaining as well. It seems that underperforming boards can be found in theological schools of every kind, size, and theological stripe, which may suggest that the problem with boards isn’t with the people serving on them, but rather with the policies and practices that shape trustee service. In the words of organizational guru Peter Drucker: “To build a successful team, you don’t start out with people – you start out with the job. You ask: What are we trying to do?”¹⁵

It is appropriate then that Standard 8 encourages boards to evaluate the effectiveness of their procedures. As is true for most groups, seminary boards tend to fall into familiar patterns of doing things. Committee structures are maintained without much thought, meeting agendas differ little from one meeting to the next, and boardroom protocol can discourage a true exchange of

ideas. There is a basic uniformity in the way a board works, regardless changes in the operating environment, within the institution, or in the board itself.

In contrast, strong boards understand that a one-size-fits-all set of board practices isn't likely to serve the institution well over time or in every situation. Just when a board hits its stride, a shift in administrative or board leadership, a sharp decline in funding, or a new direction in the seminary's programming can challenge "business as usual." However, "when trustees habitually appraise what they do, they are likely to take the next step and suggest changes in structure or procedure."¹⁶ Regular assessment allows the board to check whether their procedures are working for or against their best efforts and to make changes as needed. Trustees may think of their board's life as a given, but it can be examined and questioned.

► **It should also seek to educate itself about the issues it faces . . .**

A well-informed board is a more effective board, and to this point, the standard urges trustees to educate themselves about the issues facing the seminary and theological education at large. The board should look first at information related to the current situation of the institution, including data specific to top priorities of the seminary. In all cases, the information provided to board members must be germane to institutional priorities and the board's concerns. Boards don't need to know (nor can they know) everything, but what they do know must be accurate, easy to comprehend, and conducive to governance decisions.

Even as they watch over the present, trustees should also keep an eye on the future. Strong boards are constantly scanning the institutional horizon, ever alert for the small cloud that could become tomorrow's storm. If there's trouble outside the boardroom and if trustees themselves are in a state of high anxiety, it's not likely they will have the energy or patience for thoughtful evaluation and planning. As a seasoned board member observed, "It's tough to be reflective when you're living in the eye of the storm." The vigilant, educated board is ready and able to assist administrators toward strong, decisive action in response to early signs of danger.

By taking advantage of periods of relative calm to prepare themselves for the next crisis down the pike, board members can stave off institutional panic and seat-of-the-pants decision making. “In lieu of formal board training events at long intervals, boards could construe learning about their communities or constituencies as vital, continuous preparation for governing. Instead of merely recruiting members who appear to be well informed, organizations could use their meetings to promote learning by all board members.”¹⁷

A regular schedule of board assessment encourages trustees to ask questions, seek out information, consult advisors, and develop orderly plans for the future of the school. As board members focus on educating and equipping themselves for their leadership role, they’re also better able to identify and make use of individual talents and connections. In this way, the board models for the rest of the seminary community what it means to be a learning organization – a place where people at all levels of the operation are empowered to make their best contributions in support of the mission and ministry of the school.

►... and about procedures used by effective governing bodies in carrying out their work.

Interest in institutional governance is strong these days, and as a result, there’s no shortage of helpful information from which trustees of theological schools can select. A search of Amazon.com under the words “governing boards” turned up 31,771 entries, and even when the search was narrowed to “trusteeship,” the on-line bookseller showed 1,774 titles. Add to this the numerous magazines “just for boards” (e.g. *Board Member* (BoardSource), *Trusteeship* (AGB), and *In Trust Magazine*), along with journals such as *The Nonprofit Quarterly*, *Harvard Business Review* and *Leadership and Nonprofit Management*, and it’s obvious there’s a lot to be read. In addition to the usual print sources, there’s also a wealth of excellent resources available via the internet.¹⁸ It would seem there’s no excuse for board members to be uninformed about procedures used by effective governing bodies.

But ready availability doesn’t necessarily mean board members are taking advantage of the resources that are out there. Indeed, it’s the rare trustee who takes the time to track down

materials on his or her own. For the most part, it's up to the Board Development Committee, the board chair, and/or the president to seek out and make available materials and experiences that help educate trustees to the procedures used by effective governing boards. The leadership can also encourage trustees who serve on boards of other nonprofits to share best practices and good ideas encountered in their other "leadership lives." While there are unique aspects to governance of a theological school, there's a lot about good board work that translates well from one organizational setting to another. Effective boards are constantly seeking out new models, testing cutting-edge information about academic governance, and are open to insights from other board situations.

As the ideas just listed suggest, it's possible for board members to educate themselves to good board practice within the confines of their own boardroom s or in the comfort of their own homes. However, it has been my experience that there's nothing quite as invigorating to trustees as the opportunity to meet face-to-face with their counterparts from other seminaries. In the early 1990s, I was privileged to direct a Lilly Endowment-funded project for the Coalition of Christian Colleges and Universities that included as one of its many activities the opportunity for bringing together board members from several institutions for conversation around a topic of shared interest. Initially, there was concern whether board members would give up an extra weekend to participate, but in the end, the regional gatherings were well attended and trustees went away enthused by the opportunity to learn from and be with board members of other church-related colleges. More recently, I've seen this same enthusiasm in the president/board teams that have participated in In Trust's Good Faith Governance Seminars.

The good news is, presidents and board leaders don't have to wait for someone else to plan (and fund) these sort of events. Any board can extend an invitation to trustees of neighboring theological schools to come be part of an evening, day, or weekend of conversation and shared learning.

►The board shall evaluate its members on a regular basis.

While it's true that the whole of a good board is greater than the sum of its parts, the performance of each member is crucial to the overall effectiveness of the group. So it is important that regular assessment activities include an evaluation of individual board member performance. On the face of it, this may seem an uncivil thing when talking about volunteer work, but in reality, it is the most civil and grateful thing we can do. Besides, there's nothing like old-fashioned peer pressure to keep board members on their toes. "Directors who take their duties seriously, and let their fellow directors know they're expected to do the same, are the best insurance against a board whose first question, upon receipt of the quarterly earnings report is, 'When's lunch?'"¹⁹

No one accepts a board position with the intention of doing shoddy work, yet complaints about the quality of board performance continue to surface and too many trustees report feeling dissatisfied with their board service. However, as was noted previously in this article, when there are problems with board members, or when performance of the board fails to live up to what is desired, it is usually the system that's the culprit. In places where expectations of the board are high, where trustees are treated with respect, and where attention is paid to the system within which the board operates, it's amazing how board members grow in their enthusiasm for and understanding of their work.

Methods of Board Assessment

Up to this point, the focus has been on the requirement for and the benefits of regular assessment of the board's work. However, for the majority of board leaders and presidents, the sticking point is not why assessment is important, but rather, how to do assessment. The general impression of newcomers to the assessment "game" is that it's a complicated, costly and too often futile exercise. Fortunately, evaluation can be done -- a lot can be learned -- without upsetting the board's schedule, the school's budget, or trustee tempers. As Daniel Aleshire suggested in a previous issue of *Theological Education*, "... the road that leads to good assessment is a wide

one. Good assessment uses many indicators in many ways to arrive at nuanced judgments about educational effects.”²⁰

Small Beginnings

If a board has never engaged in self-assessment, it may be best to ease into the process, beginning with some fairly simple activities. For example, the board chair might end each meeting with a ten to fifteen minute discussion of “ideas for improving our board.” Or committees can be encouraged to report to the full board the “clouds” they see on the institutional horizon and what they feel the board should be doing to prepare. At another time, board members might be asked to jot down short responses to questions such as:

- Looking back over the past year or so, what two or three things make you most proud of the board’s work? Conversely, with what issues do you think we might have done a better job?
- To what issues do you think the board needs to give more attention, and how would you like to receive information regarding these issues?
- What do you need from board leadership to help you be even more successful in your service to the school?

The Committee on Trustees collects the cards, tabulates the responses, distributes a summary report to board members even in advance of the next meeting, and most important, uses the information in shaping a learning plan for the board.

It’s also a helpful practice for the board chair, chair of the committee on trustees and the president to screen the agenda for the upcoming meeting with an eye to issues such as: What is the purpose of this meeting? What specific things do we want to accomplish? How will doing those things move us toward a major goal that will strengthen the school in the future? The board chair or president should then prepare and attach an executive summary or meeting primer to the agenda to guide trustees as they prepare themselves for the upcoming gathering of the board.

These advance comments help remind trustees of the goals the group has set for itself and how their efforts fits within the wider work and plans of the institution.

Taking the Next Step

For boards ready to dig a little deeper into self-understanding, In Trust's new Governance Audit is a useful mid-level assessment tool. Drawing upon the language of the ATS Standards, the audit highlights specific qualities and capacities of the good theological school. This easy to administer, easy to score instrument provides boards with a "snapshot" overview of trustee awareness in five operational zones: authority structures, enrollment management, resource development, educational systems, and economic vitality. The audit report identifies gaps in trustee understanding of the school's operation and programs, and serves as the basis for an annual learning plan for the board.

A Comprehensive Approach

While activities such as those just described can serve a board well in the short run, it's necessary from time to time to undertake a more extensive and formal assessment process. Many nonprofit boards conduct a comprehensive review of their performance every other year. Others, because of the time and expense involved, include a formal assessment as part of a three-year cycle of board development activities. A few standard issues are usually part of a formal assessment. These include questions about the composition of the board, processes for identifying and recruiting prospective members, committee structures, and attendance patterns. Pre-packaged survey instruments are a ready source of good questions addressing these routine issues, and it is usually a waste of time for a board to create their own questions on these subjects.

However, when it comes to the measuring the effectiveness of a board's contribution to the current and future effectiveness of a theological school, boilerplate surveys aren't as helpful. Trusteeship of a theological school, while in many ways similar to service on the board of a college or other nonprofit organization, is different because of the churchly aspects of the board's work. Theological schools have the dual mission of preparing men and women for pastoral and other Christian ministry, and of encouraging scholarship to undergird the community of faith in North America and beyond. Decisions made in theological school boardrooms about program

renewal, enrollment management, financial vitality and myriad other issues profoundly affect the future leadership of the Church.

It is important, then, that the assessment instruments used by seminary boards address the unique aspects of theological education. Fortunately, most of the major suppliers of board assessment tools (e.g. BoardSource, the Association of Governing Boards of Colleges and Universities, and In Trust) are now able to tailor their off-the-shelf assessment instruments to the evaluation needs of a specific board. In some cases, surveys can be completed on-line, with the scoring done by the vendor in addition to preparation of a report of the findings and recommendations. Many boards choose to work with an outside facilitator who assists in shaping evaluation activities and provides written and verbal feedback on the process. Here again, it's important that board leaders seek out counsel that understands and appreciates that theological schools are different from other educational institutions.

In the end, there's no one right way of assessment. It's up to each board to "seek the kind of help that best fits the unique configuration of personalities, organizational culture, and external pressures."²¹ The mechanics of the process are far less important than the learning that can be gained and the change that can result from whatever method a board chooses in evaluating its work. For the most part, boards already have at hand much of what they need to evaluate their own performance, and that's the combined wisdom of their own membership. Standard 8 gives boards the nudge they need to act on that wisdom.

Conclusion

When board leaders grab hold of the amazing potential present in the assessment process, trustees will be better equipped to exercise faithful leadership on behalf of the purpose of the theological school. In so doing, I believe trustees will see that holding themselves accountable for the overall performance of their duties is well worth the effort, ATS standards or not.

ENDNOTES

¹ Victor Baldridge, *Policy Making and Effective Leadership* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1978), 218.

² Standard 8: Authority and Governance, Statement 8.3.1.11, Bulletin 45, Part 1 (Pittsburgh: The Association of Theological Schools, 2002), 72.

³ Jeremiah J. McCarthy, “Editor’s Introduction: Unraveling the ‘Mysteries’ of Assessment and Evaluation,” *Theological Education*, Volume 39, No. 1 (2003), iv.

⁴ Jeffrey A. Sonnenfeld, “What Makes Great Boards Great,” *Harvard Business Review*, September 2002, 113.

⁵ Although there are slight variances in the wording and rank ordering of board responsibilities, for the most part, the content of the various lists can be summarized into five primary functions: set the organization’s mission and overall strategy; monitor management and hold it accountable for performance; hire, support and if necessary, fire the CEO; provide fiduciary oversight; and serve as a bridge and buffer between the organization and its environment.

⁶ William P. Ryan, Richard P. Chait and Barbara E. Taylor, “Problem Boards or Board Problems,” *The Nonprofit Quarterly*, Volume 10, Issue 2 (2003), 53.

⁷ Kevin P. Kearns, “Effective Nonprofit Board Members as Seen by Executives and Board Chairs,” *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Volume 5, No. 4 (1995), 338.

⁸ Thomas P. Holland and Douglas K. Jackson, “Strengthening Board Performance: Findings and Lessons from Demonstration Projects,” *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Volume 9, No. 2 (1998), 130.

⁹ Melinda R. Heppe, “Teaching Boards How To Clarify Priorities: Making Education and Reflection and Ongoing Process,” *In Trust Magazine*, Volume 8, No. 4 (1997), 10.

¹⁰ *Bulletin 45*, 70.

¹¹ Malcolm L. Warford, “Stewards of Hope: The Work of Trustees,” in *Building Effective Boards for Religious Organizations*, edited by Thomas P. Holland and David C. Hester (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2000), p. 14.

¹² Thomas P. Holland, “The Duties and Responsibilities of Boards of Religious Organizations,” in *Building Effective Boards for Religious Organizations*, edited by Thomas P. Holland and David C. Hester (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 2000), p. 25.

¹³ Jack C. Green and Donald W. Griesinger, “Board Performance and Organizational Effectiveness in Nonprofit Social Service Organizations,” *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Volume 6, No. 4 (1996), 399.

¹⁴ Barbara Hill, Madeleine Green and Peter Eckel, “Navigating the Currents of Change,” *AGB Trusteeship Magazine*, Volume 9, No. 5 (2001), 29.

¹⁵ Peter F. Drucker, *Managing the Non-Profit Organization* (New York: HarperCollins, 1990), 152.

¹⁶ Cyril O. Houle, *Governing Boards* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1989), 157.

¹⁷ William P. Ryan, Richard P. Chait and Barbara E. Taylor, “Problem Boards or Board Problems,” *The Nonprofit Quarterly*, Volume 10, Issue 2 (2003), 52.

¹⁸ Two on-line resources I’ve found to be particularly helpful are Board Café, an e-newsletter available at compasspoint.com and the e-newsletters available at charitychannel.com. The In Trust website (intrust.org) provides a more complete listing of internet sites of interest to governing boards.

¹⁹ Jeffrey A. Sonnenfeld, 113.

²⁰ Daniel O. Aleshire, “The Character and Assessment of Learning for Religious Vocation: M.Div. Education and Numbering the Levites,” *Theological Education*, Volume 39, No. 1 (2003), 9.

²¹ Jeffrey L. Bradney and Vic Murray, “Do Intentional Efforts to Improve Boards Really Work? The Views of Nonprofit CEOs,” *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, Volume 8, No. 4 (1998), 346.

Rebekah Burch Basinger is an independent consultant specializing in fundraising and board education. She is also a member of the In Trust Good Faith Governance Seminar faculty. Prior to starting her own business, Basinger served on the administrations of three private colleges and two educational associations. Her publications include numerous articles on fundraising and board work, and she is the co-author with Thomas Jeavons of *Growing Givers’ Hearts: Treating Fundraising as Ministry* (Jossey-Bass, 2000). She also contributed a chapter titled “The Trustees’ Role in Advancement: Beyond the Bottom Line” in *Advancing Small Colleges* (CASE books, W. Willmer editor, 2001). Basinger currently serves on the boards of the Evangelical Council for Financial Accountability and MAP International and is a member of the editorial council for *Seminary News*.