

Riverside CCD Board of Trustees

May 2013 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 21 Board meeting
- Reporting out/Goals setting scheduled June 18 Board meeting

Overview

- ✘ With relatively few exceptions, all members rated all items from 3 to 5 (somewhat agree to strongly agree)
- ✘ 57 of the 70 items received an average of 4.0 and higher
 - ✘ 2 of those were 5.0, unanimous strong agreement
 - ✘ 17 of those were 4.6 or higher, indicating strong agreement
- ✘ 13 were rated between 3.0 – 3.8 (somewhat agree to agree)
 - ✘ 60% were ranked at 3.8
 - ✘ No ranking was less than 3.2

Highly Rated Dimensions

- ✘ The following dimensions had high percentages of ratings 4.0 and above:
 - ✘ **Commitment to Learners**
 - ✘ Rankings consistent or improved to prior year self assessment
 - ✘ Greater than 50% were increased ranking from prior year
 - ✘ **District Policy Leadership**
 - ✘ Rankings consistent, with one decrease over prior year
 - ✘ Board varies on its perception on 7 of 9 dimensions
 - ✘ **Management Oversight**
 - ✘ Rankings consistent or slightly improved to prior years self assessment, but Board varied on its perception on many rankings

Commitment to Learners

- ✘ **Average ratings above 4.2 – ALL**
 - ✘ Board monitors institutional effectiveness;
 - ✘ reviews student success and outcomes;
 - ✘ makes decisions on what is best for learners; and
 - ✘ is knowledgeable about the educational programs and services of the District
- ✘ **Board unified on ranking (5.0) for demonstrated concern or success of all students**
- ✘ **Board diverse on ranking the 3 of 7 of the dimensions**

District Policy Leadership

- ✖ Ratings remained consistent with one decrease from prior year
 - ✖ Policy making is clear, transparent and inclusive
 - ✖ Board fairly unified on dimensions
- ✖ ALL ratings at or above 3.8
 - ✖ Rankings range from 3.8 to 4.4
 - ✖ 1/3 were 3.8
 - ✖ Board focuses on policy in Board discussions
 - ✖ Policy making is clear, transparent and inclusive
 - ✖ Board seeks community input in policy development
- ✖ Board diverse in its ranking in 7 of the 9 dimensions

Management Oversight

- ✘ Ratings remained consistent with two increases from prior year
 - ✘ Ranges from 4.0 to 4.8
- ✘ Majority of ratings by trustees diverse in perceptions of dimensions
 - ✘ Board varied in 6 of 10 dimensions
- ✘ Board unified in one dimension
 - ✘ Board annual evaluates Chancellor
- ✘ 7 of 10 dimensions ranked 4.0 to 4.4
- ✘ 3 of 10 dimensions ranked 4.6 to 4.8
 - ✘ Board evaluates Chancellor
 - ✘ Board sets clear expectations/goals for Chancellor
 - ✘ Board encourages professional growth of Chancellor

Dimensions with Mixed Ratings

✘ The following dimensions had high percentages of ratings 3.2 to 5.0:

+Board Organization

- ✘ Rankings consistent to prior year self assessment
- ✘ Board diverse in 3 dimensions and unified in 4 of the 12 dimensions

+Community Interface

- + Rankings consistent, with two decreased and one increased over prior year
- + Board unified on 2 of 9 dimensions

+Community College Interface

- + Rankings range from 3.6 to 4.4
- + Board diverse in perspective in 3 of 5 dimensions,
- + Board unified in one

Dimensions with Mixed Ratings (cont')

✘ The following dimensions had high percentages of ratings 3.2 to 5.0:

+ Economic / Political System Interface

- + Rankings range from 3.6 to 4.8

- + Rankings reduced from prior year in 1/3 dimensions

 - + Board diverse in 5 of 9 dimensions

 - + Board unified in one dimension

+ Guardianship

- + Rankings range from 3.2 to 4.4

- + Rankings mostly consistent with prior year, with one increase and one decrease

 - + Board diverse in 4 of 9 dimensions

 - + Board unified in one dimension

Board Organization

- ✘ These dimensions had wide range of rankings, ranging from 3.2 to 4.8
- ✘ Most rankings consistent with prior year
- ✘ Board unified in 4 of 12 dimensions
- ✘ Board diverse in perspective in 3 of 12 (25%) dimensions
 - ✘ Unified Dimension Rankings: Board operates as a unit; Board works to achieve District goals; Board meetings comply with state law; and Board is knowledgeable about culture, history and values
 - ✘ Diverse Dimension Rankings: Board understands its roles and responsibilities; Board operates without conflict of interest; Board is appropriately involved in accreditation process

Constituency Interface

- ✘ **Wide range in rankings, from 3.6 to 5.0**
 - ✘ Many rankings remained consistent (one increase and two decreases) from last year
 - ✘ Lowest ranking at 3.6, down from 4.2 prior year
 - ✘ Board members adhere to protocols for dealing with college and community citizens and media
- ✘ **Board diverse in one ranking (4.4)**
 - ✘ Board helps educate local community about college needs and causes
- ✘ **6 of 9 ranked 4.6 or above**
 - ✘ Board members unified in ranking 2 of 9 dimensions
 - ✘ 5.0: Board members assist and support District by attending community events
 - ✘ 4.8: Board members maintain good relationships with community leaders

Community College Systems Interface

- ✘ Lower rankings, ranging from 3.6 to 4.4
 - ✘ Board perspective diverse in 3 of 5 dimensions
 - ✘ Board unified in 1 of 5 dimensions
- ✘ One dimension ranked lower than prior year
 - ✘ 4.0, down from 4.4: Board supports the development of educational partnerships with state government agencies, where appropriate

Economic / Political System Interface

- ✘ Ratings all fairly strong
 - ✘ 7 of 9 ranked at 4.0 or higher
 - ✘ Most ratings remained consistent and 1/3 decreased from prior year
 - ✘ Board not unified on ranking in 5 of 9 of dimensions
 - ✘ 3 of 9, had a 2.0 – 5.0 spread in individual rankings
- ✘ Highest ranking at 4.8: Board actively seeks policies and civic support for the District
- ✘ Lowest rankings:
 - ✘ 3.6: Board is knowledgeable about national policy that affects District
 - ✘ 3.8: Board agendas contain sufficient state policy issues facing the District

Guardianship

- ✘ Variability in average scores (3.2 – 4.4)
 - ✘ Ratings fairly from prior year (one increase / one decline)
 - ✘ 1/3 ranked from 3.2 to 3.8
 - ✘ 1.3 ranked at 4.4
- ✘ Board not unified in ranking in 4 of 9 dimensions
- ✘ Board unified in one ranking (4.2) Board assures that the District budget reflects the District's mission and plans.

Greatest Change in Ratings-Increase

- ✘ **Segments of Board Organization, related to:**
 - ✘ Board meetings allow appropriate input from constituencies
 - ✘ Largest increase of any dimension (from 3.2 to 4.6)
 - ✘ Board works to achieve District's goal
 - ✘ Members uphold the final majority decision of the Board
- ✘ **Segment of Economic / Political System Interface, related to:**
 - ✘ Board actively seeks political and civic support for District
- ✘ **Segments of Management Oversight, related to:**
 - ✘ A climate of mutual trust and respect exists between the Board and Chancellor
 - ✘ Board clearly delegates the administration of the District to Chancellor
- ✘ **Segments of Guardianship, related to:**
 - ✘ Board monitors the implementation of facility master plans

Greatest Change in Ratings-Decrease

- ✘ **Segment of Constituency Interface relating to:**
 - ✘ Board members adhere to protocols for dealing with college and community citizens and media
- ✘ **Segments of Economic / Political System Interface, related to:**
 - ✘ Board is knowledgeable about national policy that affects District
 - ✘ Board agendas contain sufficient state policy issues facing District
- ✘ **Segment of District Policy Leadership, related to:**
 - ✘ Policy making is clear, transparent and inclusive

Open Ended Questions

What are the Board's Greatest Strengths?

- The ability to work together
- To listen to each other
- The community reputation of a majority of the Board
- Involvement in Community
- Genuine commitment to District
- Commitment to student success
- Relationships geared towards productivity and student success with faculty, staff, administrators and Chancellor
- Diversity
- Visibility at the State Level and locally

What are the major accomplishments of the Board this past year?

- Contract renewals
- Districting of Trustee areas
- Financial stability
- _____ for accreditation
- Successful implementation of re-Districting
- Harmonious and unanimous consent on contract negotiations
- A proactive transition into a single member (election) Districts
- Moving CSA forward with vision, mission and budget/plans

Open Ended Questions (cont')

What are the areas in which the Board could improve?

- Learning to be more cohesive and congenial
- Approach solving problem together
- Looking into the future and making appropriate adjustments
- A more proactive role in directing the Chancellor according to feedback
- Interpersonal interrelationships amongst Board members
- Training (on going) regarding Board responsibilities and roles

As a Trustee, I am most pleased about . . .

- School for the Arts approval
- Making a meaningful difference
- My involvement with the community
- The cooperation and Board meeting interactions with District stakeholders
- Being able to work with all stakeholder groups
- The compassion for students getting an education
- Proud of District
- Our staff, faculty and administrators willingness and motivation to go above and beyond in meeting student needs where they are at
- Surviving through financial challenges successfully

Open Ended Questions (cont')

As a Trustee, I would like to see the following change(s) in how the Board Conducts business.

- More cohesiveness and civility
- Move open comments to a time just prior to individual Board reports
- Discuss focused on agenda item, versus lectures
- Each Board member come prepared to discuss agenda items without using agenda items as a way to promote one's self
- Possible moving Board member comments to the front of the agenda

What issue(s) do you feel the Board should make a priority for the coming year?

- Selection of Chancellor
- Monitoring the continued outcome of the student success recommendations. This region and population has a great stake in "how" those outcomes result for the student. We should be on top of this process.
- Recruit a Chancellor who has experience in academic, business (finances of District), fund raising, good interpersonal skills with staff, faculty, student and public and Board members; and labor negotiations
- Seeking resolution to close the loophole that allows felons to serve as student representatives
- Forming partnerships with the business community

Goals set from June 2012

Board planned to:

1. Create a mission statement for the Board of Trustees with guiding principles for governance of the members of the Board elected by-District.
2. Continue to mature and develop the reorganized District with three, separately accredited colleges with greater autonomy and accountability.
3. Support and facilitate relationships with local schools, industries and businesses, to facilitate a better educational continuum and for “making life better” in our community. This includes a continuation of holding joint meetings with school Boards on focused topics of common interest.
4. Monitor student success and achievement of all student populations and review data and reports that provide perspective and trend analysis to support programs, operations and policy matters. Monitoring shall include attention to and support for efforts to close the “achievement gap” of under-prepared and under-represented students.
5. Strive for a positive, synergistic Board of Trustees that recognizes, respects, and capitalizes on the uniqueness of each individual, and that leverages and positions the Board for the overall advancement of the District.
6. Support the role of the Chancellor and actions of the Board as a whole; and to fulfill the greater mission of the District and Board, as we steadfastly focus on our core mission.
7. Set policy and direction for the District; support Chancellor in advancing and executing the plan, and monitor implementation through the CEO evaluation process.

Goals set from June 2012 (cont')

8. Advocate for the budget and provide stewardship for the District recognizing the fiscal dilemma community colleges face; including the right sizing of the District, monitoring enrollment (FTES), and advocate for new funding model(s).
9. Responsibly assure that mission and planning for colleges and District are linked to budget and resource development.
10. Advocate the role, mission, and vitality of community colleges within the state system, by exploring and addressing funding/revenue models to build sustainability.
11. Support the development of standards, policies and protocols that lead to efficiencies and sound resource development and implementation, including continued support for the Chancellor's role in resource development.
12. Support programs, policies and investments that advance the District and its operations into sustainable practices, including but not limited to use of technology, LEED certified development and other resource and environmentally sustainable measures.
13. Assure leadership and policy matters are undertaken and aligned with the District Strategic Plan Themes of Student Access; Student Success; Service to Community; System Effectiveness; Financial Resource Development; Organizational and Professional Development; and Green Initiatives.
14. The Board remains unanimous in their support of Chancellor in leading labor negotiations to assure District resources and services are maintained and responsibly deployed, and to anticipate fair bargaining agreements will be realized with all labor groups.