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
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 contain 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
  o 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:
  o 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?