



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
LURELEAN B. GAINES
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson
FLOYD K. TAKEUCHI
Public Member

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
LILY OWYANG

Tom Lane

accjc@accjc.org

3 hard copies

MEMO TO: Dr. Jan Muto
President
Riverside City College
4800 Magnolia Avenue
Riverside, CA 92506



FROM: Barbara A. Beno, President

Barbara A. Beno

DATE: November 23, 2009

SUBJECT: Enclosed Report of the Evaluation Team

Previously, the chairperson of the evaluation team sent you a draft report affording you the opportunity to correct errors of fact. We assume you have responded to the team chair. The Commission now has the final version of the report.

The Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges follows a policy of providing a copy of the final evaluation visit report to the chief executive officer of the visited institution prior to consideration by the Commission. Please examine the enclosed report.

- If you believe that the report contains inaccuracies, you are invited to call them to the attention of the Commission. To do so, a letter stating recommended corrections should be directed to the ACCJC President and signed by the chief executive officer of the institution. The letter should arrive at the Commission office by **December 11, 2009** in order to be included in Commission materials.
- ACCJC policy provides that, if desired, the chief administrator may request an appearance before the Commission to discuss the evaluation report. The Commission requires that the institution notify the Commission office by **December 11, 2009** or earlier of its intent to attend the meeting. This enables the Commission to invite the team chair to attend. The next meeting of the Accrediting Commission will be held on **January 6-8, 2010** at the Westin Hotel, San Francisco Airport, Millbrae, California. The enclosure, "Appearing Before the Commission," addresses the protocol of such appearances.

Please note that the Commission will not consider the institution as being indifferent if its chief administrator does not choose to appear before the Commission. If the institution does request to be heard at the Commission meeting, the chairperson of the evaluation team will also be asked to be present to explain the reasons for statements in the team report. Both parties will be allowed brief testimony before the Commission deliberates in private.

The enclosed report should be considered confidential and not given general distribution until it has been acted upon by the Accrediting Commission and you have been notified by letter of the action taken.

BAB/tl

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Patrick Schewardger, Accreditation Liaison Officer (w/o enclosure)



**ACCREDITING
COMMISSION
for COMMUNITY and
JUNIOR COLLEGES**

10 COMMERCIAL BOULEVARD
SUITE 204
NOVATO, CA 94949
TELEPHONE: (415) 506-0234
FAX: (415) 506-0238
E-MAIL: accjc@accjc.org
www.accjc.org

Chairperson
LURELEAN B. GAINES
East Los Angeles College

Vice Chairperson
FLOYD K. TAKEUCHI
Public Member

President
BARBARA A. BENO

Vice President
SUSAN B. CLIFFORD

Vice President
STEVE MARADIAN

Vice President
GARMAN JACK POND

Associate Vice President
LILY OWYANG

Appearing before the Commission

ACCJC policy provides that, if desired, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of an institution may request an appearance before the Commission to discuss the evaluation report. The opportunity is provided when the Commission is deliberating or acting upon matters that affect the institution.

The Commission meets in January and June. An institution must send written notification to the ACCJC office at least 15 days before the scheduled meeting if the CEO wishes to attend. If the institution wishes to submit additional material to the Commission, it should exercise care, keeping in mind the Commission cannot read and absorb large amounts of material on short notice. Material should arrive at the ACCJC office with the written notification that the CEO has accepted the invitation to address the Commission.

The Chief Executive Officer is expected to be the presenter, and should consult with Commission staff if there are plans to invite other representatives to join the CEO. On the day of the Commission meeting, ACCJC staff will escort the CEO (and additional representatives) to and from the designated waiting area to the meeting at the appropriate time.

An institution's presentation should not exceed five (5) minutes. The Chair of the institution's evaluation team or designee will also be invited to attend. The Commissioners may ask questions of the CEO or representatives, and then will continue their deliberations in private. The CEO will be notified in writing of the subsequent action taken by the Commission.

The Commission considers this opportunity beneficial to the process of accreditation and values the occasion to learn new information from the institution.

Policies that are relative to this process are the *Policy on Access to Commission Meetings*, *Policy on Commission Actions on Institutions*, *Policy on Commission Good Practice in Relations with Member Institutions*, and *Policy on the Rights and Responsibilities of ACCJC and Member Institutions in the Accrediting Process*.



FOLLOW UP VISIT REPORT

RIVERSIDE CITY COLLEGE

**4800 Magnolia Avenue
Riverside, CA 92506**

**A Confidential Report Prepared for
the Accrediting Commission for Community and Junior Colleges
Western Association of Schools and Colleges**

**This report represents the findings of the evaluation team
that visited
Riverside City College
on
October 19-20, 2009**

**Sherrill L. Amador, Ed.D., Team Chair
Mohamed Eisa, Team Member**



Introduction

At its January 2009 meeting, the Commission reviewed the Riverside City College October 2008 Follow-Up Report. The Commission took action to accept the report with the requirement that the institution complete a Follow-Up Report by October 15, 2009, followed by a visit of Commission representatives. The visit was to be in conjunction with the initial accreditation self study reports being submitted by Norco and Moreno Valley Campuses, Candidate institutions. The visit was to include both Riverside City College and the District Offices.

The Riverside City College Follow-Up Report of October 2009 was to demonstrate the institution's **complete resolution** of College Recommendation 1 and District Recommendations 1 through 5 as specified in the January 2008 Commission Action letter.

Riverside City College submitted its October 15, 2009 Follow-Up Report and the evaluation team visit was conducted on October 20, 2009, by Dr. Sherrill L. Amador, team chair, former CEO and commissioner; and Mr. Mohamed Eisa, Director of Planning, Research, and Student Outcomes at Diablo Valley College. During October 19-22 two separate comprehensive evaluation teams visited the Norco and Moreno Valley Campuses. On October 19, an evaluation team visited the District Offices. The district team consisted of Dr. Amador, chair, and the chairs of the Norco and Moreno Valley teams, Dr. Victoria Morrow, President, Skyline College and Dr. Willard Lewallen, President, West Hills College Coalinga; and five additional team members from the three college/campus teams: Mr. Eisa; Dr. Cynthia Azari, President Fresno City College; Mr. James Keller, Executive Vice Chancellor, San Mateo County CCD; Dr. Curtis Groninga, former Vice President, Administrative Services, Santa Rosa Junior College; and Dr. Harriett Robles, President, Mission College.

The Riverside City College team met with the College President, Vice President Instruction/Accreditation Liaison Officer as well as with members from the following groups: Strategic Planning Committee; Financial Resources, Institutional Mission & Effectiveness, Human Resources, and Technology Sub Committees; President's Cabinet; Executive Leadership from the Faculty Senate, California Service Employees Association, Associated Students, and California Teacher's Association; and department chairs. The team chair also meet with three staff members by appointment.

The District team met with three members of the Board of Trustees, the Chancellor, Associate Vice Chancellors of Institutional Effectiveness, Administration and Finance, and Human Resources; and members from the following groups: Chancellor's Cabinet; District Budget Advisory Council; and the District Strategic Planning Committee.

Since late 2006 the district and college have experienced many changes in leadership. There have been two interim chancellors and the new chancellor began July 2009. The college had an interim president until January 2009 when the new president was hired.

Over the last three years, the district and college/campuses have been transitioning to a multi-college district with three distinct colleges and a district office. The transition at Riverside City College is still a work in progress. The team found several instances where district personnel sit as permanent members of college committees; many services are still provided to all three campuses by Riverside City College; and some services physically reside on the Riverside City campus. The current situation is still creating organizational, financial, and physical plant conditions that will need to be resolved within the district once Norco and Moreno Valley are fully accredited colleges. The college/campuses and district office then will need to further clarify responsibilities as well as human and financial resources allocations for the various entities to complete this transition.

The team found the college and district culture to be collaborative and all those interviewed to be open, and very honest in their assessment of the college's and district's progress on the recommendations.

College Response to the Commission Recommendations

The visiting team's evaluation of the College's October 2009 Follow up Report focused on the following college recommendation and five district recommendations from the October 2007 Comprehensive Evaluation Visit Report which had not been resolved:

College Recommendation 1: *Institutional Commitments and Evaluation, Planning, and Improvement* The team recommends that the college reframe its mission to be comprehensive, including educational goals that may be fulfilled at the college and a description of the primary student population for which the college is designing programs (Standard IA).

- The team further recommends that the college clarify the ways in which the strategic plan aligns with the college mission statement, links to the strategic goals, drives budget allocation, and ensures the distribution of technology and human resources (Standard IIID.1).
- The team also recommends that the college develop a process of integrating program review with institutional goals, complete the implementation of the planning process, assess that process, and communicate the results of that assessment to all constituents in order to promote institutional effectiveness and identify areas for improvement (Standards IB.2, IB.3, IIB.4, and IIID.3).

Observations and Analysis of Evidence: The mission statement of Riverside City College was adopted by the Board of Trustees of Riverside Community College District (RCCD) in July 2008. The college's Strategic Planning Sub-Committee for Institutional Effectiveness, using its annual mission review process, determined that the college mission aligns with and supports the district's newly adopted mission statement and the team agrees with this assessment. The college's mission statement, as stated in the 2009-2010 Catalog, clearly delineates the student population for which the college is designing its programs and services. This population was identified as "... a diverse

community of learners that work toward individual achievement and life-long learning.” (RCC Catalog, page 2)

The team determined that the college does not have a completed strategic plan. Although the college states in its follow up report that it will submit a strategic plan to the District in November 2009, the draft still needed considerable work beginning with institutional goals being defined and agreed upon and that are measureable. The team reviewed the strategic plan draft and several documents with sub committee goals, and determined that no one document ties all the pieces together.

The college planning process is outlined in the Riverside Strategic Planning Committee Constitution & By-Laws, amended December 4, 2008. Since 2007-08, the college has been using its annual strategic initiatives for planning and resource allocation at the college and district levels. The college has completed two cycles of this process and completed the first evaluation of the process in May 2009; and, subsequently made changes for improving it. As called for in the process, the college develops strategic initiatives each year and the team confirmed the college had 2008-09 strategic initiatives and implemented them. However, strategic initiatives for 2009-10 had not been finalized at the time of the visit.

Integrated with the college’s strategic planning process is program review. The annual program review department templates were revised based on the recent evaluation of the planning process. The team noted that the college does not have a campus-based program review structure whereby all program review documents are reviewed by one college group on a regular basis. In most cases, program reviews are sent to the District Office of Institutional Effectiveness for a review and returned to the college to use with its processes.

The strategic planning process structure consists of nine sub committees; some examples are technology, human resources, leadership and governance, and finance. Each sub committee has its own goals, which must align with the college’s Strategic Planning Initiatives (annual). The sub committees use the program reviews annually to develop prioritized allocation requests which meet the strategic initiatives. The sub committees forward their prioritized requests to the Financial Resources sub committee. The final recommendation is made to the college president. For priorities which require use of district funds (i.e. additional allocation or use of Measure C), the Strategic Planning Committee (SPC) then reviews the final priorities for submission to the district, carried forward by the college president, for vetting through the district planning and allocation processes. The college receives a base budget based on the Budget Allocation Model developed by the District Budget Advisory Committee. The base funds and new funds are used to fund the strategic initiatives. The team determined that categorical funds are part of the planning process at the campus level, but not at the district level.

The college has multiple documents that reflect planning activities. However, by the structure of the strategic planning process with all of the sub-committees and their respective committees reporting to the SPC, the team determined that strategic planning

isn't really occurring at the college. Instead, operational planning is occurring. Interviews with the sub committee members and SPC members representing all constituent groups confirmed that there are no agreed upon long-term institutional goals stated in a strategic plan, and thus measurement of institutional goals has not occurred. By the nature of the operational planning that is occurring, much time is spent on the details of activities implementation and monitoring work products. Although the operational planning is very appropriate and thorough, the team determined that the college also needs to be focusing on the "big picture" and interpreting data for overarching institutional strategic directions in order for the college to fully meet Accreditation Standards. A review of the last two years of Strategic Planning Committee minutes yielded no discussions of institutional data in relation to long-term goals.

The Institutional Mission and Effectiveness Sub Committee has begun work on developing appropriate benchmarks to measure institutional progress and effectiveness as well as protocols for use of consistent data among all sub committees and within the district planning committees. The final institutional goals must be agreed upon by SPC before this work can be implemented. This requires examining and evaluating disaggregated data provided by the District Office of Institutional Effectiveness. As of September 2009, the District Office published its first annual Report Card. The SPC sub committee is using this document to ultimately develop an annual report specific to Riverside City College. The team noted that institutional research is done by the district staff and no district institutional researcher sits on the Institutional Mission and Effectiveness Sub Committee or SPC.

At the end of 2008-09, each SPC sub committee completed its self evaluation on its own goals. These documents consisted of highlighting task accomplishments associated with sub committee goals and an evaluation of the process. These documents were reviewed by SPC at its retreat in May 2009. Members of SPC and the subcommittee indicated to the team that these discussions helped further define and improve the college's planning processes.

In 2008-09, the college engaged the services of a strategic planning consultant to help develop the strategic plan for the college. However, based on the feedback from the college's faculty and staff, it appears that such work is still in the embryonic stages and has yet to be completed.

Despite the extensive efforts of SPC and its subcommittees during the past two years, the college does not have a cohesive, organized strategic plan that delineates the college's strategic directions. Absent also are the college's action plans (outside of annual or comprehensive program reviews) that spell out the action steps, responsible parties, timelines for implementation, expected outcomes, and projected resources needed to implement the strategic plan. Furthermore, the college does not have a planning calendar, nor does it have a set of performance indicators and benchmarks (other than provided by the district in the District's Report Card) to guide its journey toward reaching its goals. In addition, the college does not have a technology master plan. The college, along with the district and the two other campuses, does have a set of technology standards that guide its

acquisition, use, and upgrading of technology resources. The college does have an educational master plan, which does not appear to be linked to any long-term goals for the college's future educational program and services. It was developed by consultants for a facilities master plan.

Conclusion: The college has only partially implemented the recommendation. Per the ACCJC Rubric for Evaluating Institutional Effectiveness: Planning, the team finds the college to be moving from the awareness to the development level.

The college reframed its mission to be comprehensive and included a description of the primary student population for which the college is designing its programs. The college also developed and implemented a process for integrating programs review with resource allocation, assessed the process, communicated the results of the assessment to all constituents, and identified areas of improvement. However, the college has yet to complete its strategic planning document, with a focus on the broad, long-term institutional goals and overarching strategic directions, rather than the operational issues. Therefore, the college has not evaluated measurable institutional goals to determine its effectiveness. Furthermore, the team suggests that once the strategic plan is completed; the college clarifies the ways in which the strategic plan will align with the college mission statement, drive budget allocations, and assure distribution of technology, space, and human resources.

District Recommendation 1: The teams recommend that the board of trustees and chancellor develop and implement a district strategic plan that will:

- **Align with the district mission statement (Standards IA.1 and IID.1);**
- **Provide a framework for the college's/campuses' strategic plans (Standard IB.4); and**
- **Drive the allocation of district resources for the college, campuses, and district office (Standard IID.1; Eligibility Requirement 19). The need to connect budget and planning remains unfulfilled from the 2001 accrediting recommendations.**

Observations and Analysis of Evidence: Riverside Community College District developed a four-year Strategic Plan 2008-2012 that was approved by the Board of Trustees on October 21, 2008. The plan includes a revised mission statement, statements of vision and values, and six strategic themes. Further reading of the themes indicates that they are aligned with the district's mission.

The overarching themes, together with the 32 strategies, and more than 50 outcomes in the plan, provide a framework for the plans of the college/campuses. The planning documents at Norco and Moreno Valley campuses indicate that their plans are aligned with those of the district. Riverside City College does not have a completed strategic plan, but instead has been using annual strategic initiatives; therefore, the alignment could not be ascertained at the time of the visit.

In September 2009, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at the District prepared a report card highlighting the progress made by the district and its three educational entities relative to each of the 32 strategies. The 2008-09 Report Card is the first comprehensive report on outcomes related to the District strategic plan. The report card includes quantitative data, analysis and commentaries related to the outcomes and accomplishments at the district, and the college/campuses. This innovative approach clearly illustrates the interconnectedness and the alignment of strategic planning at Riverside Community College District and its college/campuses.

Interviews (October 19, 2009) with more than 50 persons from various groups representing the Board of Trustees, Chancellor's Executive Cabinet, District Accreditation Team, District Budget Advisory Council, District Strategic Planning Committee, and other members of the district community indicate that there is a well-established process for integration of planning and resource allocation at the district and the college/campuses. Furthermore, examination of the minutes of meetings of the District Budget Advisory Council and the District Strategic Planning Committee indicates that integration of strategic planning and resource allocation is a systematic, ongoing, and dynamic process that involves extensive dialogue among all constituents of the district and college/campuses. The process is evolving and being modified as circumstances dictate. The extensive effort that has taken place since 2007 in establishing a budget allocation model shows a high level of dedication, commitment, and buy-in on the part of the district and college/campuses.

Program review, the centerpiece of integrated planning and resource allocation at Riverside Community College District, includes five sets of reviews: comprehensive instructional program review, annual instructional program review, student services program review, college administrative unit program review, and district administrative program review.

Each one of the program review templates includes a section on the resources needed to carryout the goals and action plans of the respective units. Requests for resources (human, facilities, technology, etc.) in the program review are compiled and prioritized based on an agreed upon criteria established by the District Strategic Planning Committee. The prioritization report is submitted to the Chancellor for approval. In effect, college/campuses and district strategic planning processes link program reviews to the allocation of resources. However, it is suggested that program reviews focus more on programmatic improvements and less on becoming a vehicle for annual requests for resources.

Conclusion: The district has partially implemented the recommendation. The district has plans that are based on its mission and are linked to the planning processes at two campuses. The program review process is robust and results in evaluating units and programs at the district and at the college/campuses as well. This process has been evaluated for further improvement. The integration of program reviews, planning, and resource allocation is taking place and has resulted in a healthy dialogue that permeates the entire organization. Since the two campuses at Norco and Moreno Valley have

strategic plans in place as of October 20, 2009, while Riverside City College has an incomplete strategic planning document, full linkage could not be established.

District Recommendation 2: The teams recommend that the district and college/campuses develop, implement, and assess a resource allocation model that

- **Is open, transparent, and inclusive (Standards IB and IVB.3c);**
- **Is widely disseminated and reviewed periodically for effectiveness (Standards IID.2b and IID.3);**
- **Is linked to the strategic plans at the district, college, and campus levels (Standards IA.1, IID.1a-d, and IVB.3c).**

Observations and Analysis of Evidence: The District provided an effective summary response concerning the activities and processes engaged in during the development and implementation of the new budget allocation model (BAM). The model is aligned with the strategic planning processes at both the District and college/campus levels. By integrating the budget allocation with the strategic planning processes (including program review); the resource allocation model also reflects the initial decentralization of the decision-making authority from the District to the local college/campuses. As an example, the District reduced the amount of the unrestricted funds to the District offices (from 30% in 2007-08 to 20% in 2008-09) reflective of organizational adjustments necessary to establish the Norco and Moreno Valley campuses as separate colleges on par with Riverside City College. Both the 2008-09 and 2009-10 district budgets provide sufficient evidence that the Budget Allocation Model has been utilized in resource decision making.

The Budget Allocation Model was implemented in 2008 on a district-wide basis and reflected in the final 2008-09 and 2009-10 budgets. Development and implementation evidence is provided within the minutes of the District and three campuses Strategic Planning Committee minutes, the District Budget Allocation Council minutes, the Riverside Community College District Function Map and Exhibit G of the 2008-09 and 2009-10 Riverside Community College District Budgets.

The budget allocation process now begins at the local college/campus level while working within district guidelines. Through local program review, strategic planning and campus administrative review, program planning and budgeting priorities are established and shared with the district for inclusion in the next budget cycle. Local and district needs are discussed and reviewed within the participatory governance process through the three college/campus Strategic Planning Committees, the District Strategic Planning Committee and District Budget Advisory Council. Individual college/campus allocation priorities are reflected in the budget and it is left to them to implement and effectuate fiscal year priorities. New programs and initiatives are funded under the line item, "New District/College Programs/Initiatives" of the Budget Allocation Model. This is true even within a period of burgeoning financial crisis (2008-09) and greatly decreasing resource availability (2009-10).

A major theme of the Board adopted 2008-12 Riverside Community College District Strategic Plan was the adoption of a number of over-arching strategic themes. Strategic Theme Four (System Effectiveness) and Five (Financial Resource Development) are directly and indirectly linked to the development of the Budget Allocation Model. System Effectiveness Strategies Two and Three directly address the linking of program planning and budgeting via the establishment of procedures and processes that “...enhance and institutionalize operational and strategic planning processes that are deliberative, systematic, and data driven; complement the District and campus strategic and master plans; and effectively prioritize new and ongoing resource needs.” and, “...Institutionalize a budget allocation model that is data driven and informed by planning priorities.” The District has taken this to heart and developed an open, inclusive and widely disseminated budget planning process.

The new budget allocation model is complete, historically developed and based upon clear evidence. That evidence indicates that considerable thought was given to the continuous development of the “new” budget allocation model at the District and local college/campus levels. District and campus documents (including function maps, minutes of strategic planning and budget allocation committees) as well as the 2008-09 and 2009-10 budgets, helped identify and refine the individual college/campus’s allocations.

Conclusion: The District with Norco, Moreno Valley and Riverside City participation has implemented this recommendation.

It is apparent and documented that the new model was utilized in the 2008-09 and 2009-10 budget development processes. Despite the massive state funding crisis, the District will want to provide more evaluative information as to how well the model has worked in the future. This commitment to do so is stated in its Outcome Measure 3 for System Effectiveness Strategies: “...Degree to which the criteria set forth in the budget model are achieved.”

District Recommendation 3: The teams recommend that college, campus, and district administrators and faculty delineate, document, and assess:

- **The roles and responsibilities between and among the district’s entities (Standard IVB.3; Policy and Procedures for the Evaluation of Institutions in Multi-College/Multi-Unit Districts or Systems);**
- **The roles and scope of authority of the CEOs at the district and college/campus levels (Standard IVA.2);**
- **A feedback loop between and among the entities on key issues, such as planning, staffing priorities, etc. (Standards IVA.2, IVB.3, IVB.4, and IVB.6).**

Observations and Analysis of Evidence: The district and the college/campuses and divisions within them have organizational charts that delineate the areas of responsibility for positions. The team confirmed that each position has a job description that has been recently reviewed. Administrators from the district and the college/campuses have

developed a “function map” that provides in detail the distribution of responsibilities between and among the college/campuses and the district. Primary, secondary, and shared responsibilities for functions and operations are clearly identified. It was noted in several interviews with district administrators that functions, responsibilities, and positions may be relocated and/or reorganized as the district prepares for becoming a three-college district. The district has purchased a building not located on any campus that currently houses most of district administration personnel and related operations and functions. Plans are underway to bring remaining district personnel functions to this location.

The roles and scope of authority of the college/campus presidents and district chancellor have been assessed and delineated. The position descriptions for the presidents and district chancellor were revised before national searches were conducted. The president positions for Riverside City College and Moreno Valley and the district chancellor position were filled in 2009. Board Policies 6100 and 2430 along with Administrative Procedure 6100 provide for the delegation of authority to the district chancellor and college presidents.

Committees, teams, and structures have been implemented that facilitate feedback between and among the college/campuses and the district for key issues, initiatives, resource allocation, etc. Membership and purpose of district-wide committees are documented and undergo annual updates. District-wide committees exist for curriculum, assessment, budget, and program review. The team reviewed minutes of meetings and program review reports that documented communication (feedback) between and among the district and the college/campuses. The team also found evidence that the results of assessments and program reviews have led to staffing changes and decisions about resource allocation.

Conclusion: The district has fully addressed this recommendation.

District Recommendation 4: The teams recommend that the district clearly specify personnel selection procedures for district administrators including the position of chancellor. These selection processes must include input from the various college/campuses constituent groups (Standard IIIA.1, Standard IIIA.3, and IVB.1).

Observations and Analysis of Evidence: The District has adopted Administrative Procedures (AP) which specifies the selection and hiring criteria for all district and college employees. All administrative procedures go through a shared governance process before adoption and implementation.

AP 2431 specifies the chancellor selection. The current AP 2431 reflects the process that was used to select the current chancellor during 2008-09. The district experienced three separate searches before the chancellor was selected. AP 7121 specifies the president recruitment and hiring and includes the selection process. The current AP 7121 was used to select the Moreno Valley and Riverside City presidents during 2008-09. AP 7120 specifies the processes for all other employees. Team interviews confirmed that

constituent groups input was included in all searches. In fact, the Board of Trustees modified AP 2431 to be more inclusive of constituents in the chancellor's search process after the first process did not yield a new chancellor. All the hiring procedures are now revised to reflect the new structure of a multi-college district.

The Board of Trustees had previously adopted BP 3420: *Nondiscrimination* to honor its commitment to equal opportunity in education programs, employment and access to institutional programs and activities. In addition, the Board adopted a formal process for the periodic review and assessment of all Board Policies/Administrative Procedures (AP 2410).

Conclusion: The district has implemented this recommendation.

District Recommendation 5: As recommended by the 2001 accreditation visiting team, the teams recommend that the board of trustees implement its recently approved process for self-evaluation (Standard IVB.1g)

Observations and Analysis of Evidence: In April-July 2008, the Board of Trustees held a consultant guided discussion on board evaluation, the assessment tools, the linkages between strategic themes and initiatives, and the relationship of board and chancellor goals based upon board self-assessment. Board Policy 2745 outlines the general process for assessment but does not specify any one instrument or tool (other than discussion and dialogue) that will be used consistently by the Board. The policy outlines four key principles for Board Effectiveness to meet its fiduciary responsibilities and specifies that the self-evaluative dialogue will be structured around seven dimensions of Board Effectiveness. The BP 2745 states: "More formal measurement tools may be incorporated into the process over time."

Each board member completed an anonymous self-assessment instrument in May 2009. The results of the assessment were the basis for discussions held at a special board meeting in May 2009 on board effectiveness. At the June 2009 meeting, the Board reported plans and actions based on the results of its self-assessment. The critical difference between the 2008 and 2009 processes was in 2009 the Board reported to the public the assessment results with its planned actions. The Board members interviewed provided the team with examples of how the functioning of the Board has improved as the result of the last two assessments.

Board Policy 2745 states, "...It is anticipated that the Board will calendar discussions regarding a specific set of the dimensions each year. In keeping with these principles the Board of Trustees establishes a continuous self assessment process to both consider its effectiveness and model its commitment to continuous improvement, and said process will be conducted no less than annually." As a future action plan, the team confirmed that the Board of Trustees plans to do a self-evaluation annually in May and report on the results, plans, and actions in June in an open session.

Conclusion: The Board of Trustees has fully implemented the recommendation. However, the team suggests a revision in board policy stating the specific annual timelines to ensure sustainability of the new process.