

Riverside CCD Board of Trustees

May 2009 Board Self Assessment Highlights

Process

- 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 13 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 and priorities for the coming year