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?