

# Riverside CCD Board of Trustees



**MAY 2010 BOARD SELF ASSESSMENT  
HIGHLIGHTS**

# Process



- Received report of board tasks and accomplishments
- Board Self-Assessment Form
  - 69 items in 7 dimensions
  - Open-ended questions
- Rating Scale
  - *1 = strongly disagree; 2 = somewhat disagree; 3 = somewhat agree; 4 = agree; 5 = strongly agree.*
- Results presented at May 17 special board meeting

# Overview



- With relatively few exceptions, all members rated all items from 3 to 5 (somewhat agree to strongly agree).
- 54 of the 69 items received an average of 4.0 and higher
  - 17 of those were 4.6 or higher, indicating strong agreement.
- 14 were rated between 3.2 – 3.8 (somewhat agree to agree).
- One item, conducting an annual chancellor evaluation, received a majority of N/A ratings.

# Highly Rated Dimensions



- The following dimensions had high percentages of ratings 4.4 and above:
  - Commitment to Learners
  - Constituency Interface
  - Community College System Interface
  - Economic/Political System Interface
  - Guardianship

# Commitment to Learners



- **Average ratings above 4.0**
  - the board is concerned about students; makes decisions on what is best for learners; is knowledgeable about the educational programs and services of the District; and monitors institutional effectiveness.
- **Average ratings below 3.8**
  - reviews reports on student outcomes and success; supports one student contract and a learner-centered curriculum.

# Constituency Interface



- **One of the strongest dimensions**
- **Average ratings above 4.2**
  - Knowledgeable about community; maintain good relationships with community leaders; attend community events; educate community, support partnerships; recognize accomplishments of college employees
- **Average ratings below 3.8**
  - Adhere to protocols regarding communication with employees, students, & media; support Foundation & fundraising

# CC & Economic/Political System Interface

- Two strong dimensions
- Consistently high ratings of 4.4 – 4.6
  - The Board is active in local, state and national events; knowledgeable about educational policy issues, and are strong advocates for RCCD at local, state, and national levels
- Only one rating less than 4.0
  - Board agendas contains sufficient state policy issues

# Guardianship



- **Average ratings for all items were 4.2 – 4.8**
  - The Board performs its fiduciary responsibilities well, particularly related to planning and budgeting.
  - The highest ratings were maintaining an adequate reserve and monitoring the appropriate use of District funds.



# Board Organization



- **Variability in average scores (3.2 – 4.8)**
- **Higher scores**
  - works to achieve the District's goals; board meetings comply with state laws; knowledgeable about district; operates without conflicts of interest; board meetings allow appropriate input
- **Lower scores**
  - Board operates as a unit; agenda items contain sufficient background..

# District Policy Leadership



- **5 items 4.0 – 4.6**
  - Policy review process; involved in defining mission and goals; seeks advice and views of college constituents
- **4 items 3.6 – 3.8**
  - Board focuses on policy in discussions; differentiates its policy role from Chancellor; seeks community input into policy; policy recommendations contain adequate info & allow sufficient time for discussion

# Lowest Rated Items



- **The lowest rated items (3.4 – 3.6) were:**
  - The Board is adequately informed about the important issues facing the District
  - The Board understand its policy role and differentiates it from those of the Chancellor and college staff
  - The Board focuses on policy in Board discussions
  - The Board activity supports the District's Foundation and fundraising efforts
  - The Board reviews the District's mission statement on a regular basis.

# Open-Ended Questions



- **Greatest Strengths**
  - Its diversity of and contributions from members; genuine concern for the district; community connections; focus on education and students; support for board decisions even when there is disagreement.
- **Major accomplishments**
  - Hiring a new Chancellor and new college presidents: review of almost all board policies.



- **Areas for improvement**

- avoiding micromanagement (may have increased during interim Chancellor's service); timing and specificity of board agenda items; historical perspective on ongoing projects; board leadership rotation; and representation from Moreno Valley and Norco.



- **Most Pleased About**
  - the good will of the faculty and staff during leadership change; the district coming together in the selection of a Chancellor; trustees' commitment to student access and success; the growth of the board.
- **Possible changes in how the board conducts business:**
  - review how committees conduct their business; review agenda items to ensure they are most important to the district.

# Major Priorities



- Helping the new chancellor get established, identifying goals and objectives for him, helping him be successful.
- Fiscal management in these economic times.
- Getting through accreditation.
- Major priority should be not to resist change and live in the past year.
- Project priorities and allocating the resources to complete these projects.
- The R.S.A

# Using the Results



- **The lower ratings reflect possible need for further attention to**
  - Defining and adhering to the Board's policy role
  - Reviewing board meeting agendas to ensure they meet the needs of the board
- **Work with the new Chancellor to set goals priorities, and protocols for the coming year**
- **What else?**



# Further Thoughts



- **Was this evaluation process effective?**
  - What would you change, if anything?