

Riverside CCD Board of Trustees

May 2011 Board Self Assessment Highlights

Process

- Received report of board tasks and accomplishments
- Board Self-Assessment Form
 - 69 items in 8 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 board meeting

Overview

- With relatively few exceptions, all members rated all items from 3 to 5 (somewhat agree to strongly agree)
- 58 of the 69 items received an average of 4.0 and higher
 - 3 of those were 5.0, unanimous strong agreement
 - 34 of those were 4.6 or higher, indicating strong agreement
 - Doubled from prior years 17 of 69 rating of 4.6 or higher
 - 11 were rated between 3.0 – 3.8 (somewhat agree to agree)

Highly Rated Dimensions

- The following dimensions had high percentages of ratings 4.0 and above:
 - Commitment to Learners
 - Constituency Interface
 - Rankings consistent or slightly improved to prior years self assessment.
 - Community College System Interface
 - Rankings consistent to prior years self assessment.
 - Economic/Political System Interface
 - Rankings consistent or slightly improved to prior years self assessment, and board very unified in perception.
 - 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
 - reviews student success and outcomes.
- Average ratings below 3.8
 - The board monitors institutional effectiveness.

Constituency Interface

- One of the strongest dimensions
- Ratings remained consistent or increased over prior year
- 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; adhere to protocols regarding communication with employees, students, & media; support Foundation & fundraising
- No ratings below 4.2

Community College & Economic/Political Systems Interface

- Two very strong dimensions, with consistent or improved ratings over prior year
- Board very unified on Political Systems Interface dimension ratings
- Consistently high ratings of 4.2 – 5.0
 - 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
- No rating less than 4.2

Guardianship

- Strong dimensions, with ratings predominately 4.6 or higher
- Board very unified in dimension ratings, with one exception
- Average ratings for all items were 4.6 – 5.0
 - The Board performs its fiduciary responsibilities well, particularly related to planning and budgeting.
 - The highest ratings (5.0) were in fiscal review and facility plan implementation.
- One ranking at 4.0
 - Board assures that budget is linked to planning
 - Rating among trustees not unified in perception

Dimensions with Mixed Ratings

- The following dimensions had ratings of mixed variations:
 - Board Organization
 - Ratings range from 3.0 to 4.6, with some improved and some reduced from prior years self assessment
 - Many ratings among trustees not unified in perception
 - District Policy Leadership
 - Rankings range from 3.6 to 4.6, with some rating reduced from prior years self assessment
 - 2/3 of ratings among trustees not unified in perception
 - Management Oversight
 - Ratings range from 3.4 to 4.6, with majority rated consistent to prior years assessment
 - 50% of ratings among trustees not unified in perception

Board Organization

- Variability in average scores (3.0 – 4.6)
- Ratings varied both positively and negatively from prior years
- Ratings by trustees diverse in perceptions of dimensions
- Higher scores
 - works to achieve the District's goals; board meetings comply with state laws; agenda items contain sufficient background; knowledgeable about district; operates without conflicts of interest; board meetings allow appropriate input
- Lower scores
 - Board meetings conducted effectively; board operates as a unit;; board understands roles/responsibilities; board upholds final decisions

District Policy Leadership

- Variability in average scores (3.6 – 4.6)
- Ratings consistent or declined from prior years
- Majority of ratings by trustees diverse in perceptions of dimensions
- 5 items 4.2 – 4.6
 - Policy review process; involved in defining mission and goals; seeks advice and views of college constituents; policy recommendations contain adequate info & allow sufficient time for discussion
- 4 items 3.6 – 3.8
 - Board focuses on policy in discussions; differentiates its policy role from Chancellor/staff; seeks community input into policy; policy making is clear and transparent

Management Oversight

- Most rated 4.0 or higher with two rated 3.4
- Ratings consistent or declined from prior years
- Ratings by trustees diverse in perceptions of dimensions
- 7 items 4.2 – 4.6
 - Board provides high level support to and communication with chancellor; board evaluates chancellor and encourages professional growth; board is informed about key issues of the district; board sets clear goals and expectations for the chancellor
- 3 items 3.4 – 4.0
 - Board/chancellor have positive and cooperative relationship; climate of mutual trust & respect between board and chancellor; board has clear protocol in working with staff and chancellor

Greatest Change in Ratings

The 2011 assessment can be comparative to prior years ratings

- The following dimensions experienced the greatest increase in ratings:
 - Board reviews Mission Statement
 - Agendas contain adequate information for decision making
 - Board reviews Student Success and Outcomes
 - Board is knowledgeable about District
 - Board actively support foundation and fundraising
 - Board is adequately informed about district issues
 - Board supports and assist in seeking external funding
 - Board monitors implementation of facilities master plans
- The following dimensions experienced the greatest decrease in ratings:
 - Board understands roles/responsibilities
 - Board upholds majority decision of the board
 - Board monitors effectiveness of fulfilling mission
 - Board/Chancellor have a positive/cooperative relationship

Open Ended Questions

- Greatest Strengths
 - Its diversity of and contributions from members; genuine concern for the district; community connections; focus on education and students; advocacy
- Major Accomplishments
 - RCC accreditation standing and leadership; PLA; opening of new facilities; career and technical education; leadership

Open Ended Questions (cont')

- Areas for Board Improvement
 - Communication; board relations; contact protocol with staff; respect among colleagues; improved cooperation
- Most Pleased About
 - Quality of the district and sense of direction; work with teachers and students; work with legislators; support of board, community and chancellor; commitment/thoughtfulness of each board member; respect and institutional integrity

Open Ended Questions (cont')

- Possible changes in how the board conducts business:
 - Review naming procedures and board committee process; more policy decisions; be prepared for meetings; not rush meetings; respect and less grandstanding; follow protocol
- Priority Issues for Coming Year:
 - Increase communication with communities; school of the arts; BCTC; differential funding; working together cooperatively towards budget issues; fiscal stability; board leadership and trustee training; program evaluations; equal opportunity for students

What's Next—Use of Results

- Board Retreat & Relations
 - Setting of Board Goals and Priorities for coming year
- Board Relations with Chancellor to set goals priorities, and protocols for the coming year
- What else?