

Summary of 2017 Board Self-Assessment Form

The Riverside Community College District uses a board self-assessment tool which includes eight (8) dimensions which rank 70 different elements throughout the different dimensions. With receipt of the five, independently completed Board Self-Assessment forms, the composite results were developed. With the use of the same assessment tool from the Board's Self Evaluation since 2009, the results were tabulated and a comparative ranking to the board's evaluation to the three, prior reviews included.

As seen in last year's evaluation, the members were more split in their rankings, and some were large/'super' splits. While most rankings were in 3.0-5.0; this year's rankings of 2.0 were more prevalent than prior years, and rankings of 1.0 were seen for the first time by individual member(s). As such, the composite results reflect rankings of 2.8 to 4.8.

NUMERICAL RANKINGS

Dimensions with a perfect (5.0) Strongly Agree Rating: None

Dimensions assessed as Strongly Agree/Highly Rated Dimensions (4.0 or higher) in:

- Segments of Board Organization, related to:
 - Agenda items contain sufficient background and documentation for the board's review and consideration.
 - Board works to achieve District's goals.
 - Board meetings comply with state laws.
 - Members uphold the final majority decision of the board.
 - Board is appropriately involved in the accreditation process.
 - Board's knowledgeable about the culture, history, and values of the District.
- All segments of Commitment to Learners, except one ranked 3.8.
- All segments of Constituency Interface, except two ranked 3.6.
- Segments of Community College System Interface:
 - Board supports development of educational partnerships with state agencies, where appropriate.
 - Board members actively seek to understand state educational policy issues.
- All segments of Economic/Political System Interface, except for one ranked 3.4, and one ranked 3.75.
- Segments of District Policy Leadership, related to:
 - Policy recommendations contain adequate and accurate information and are presented with sufficient time to allow for study and discussion.
 - Board discusses issues openly and actively seeks the views of college constituents.
- All Segments of Guardianship, except one ranked 3.75 and one ranked 3.6

Dimensions assessed at “Somewhat Agreed/Lowest Rated” (3.0-3.9), included:

- Segments of Board Organization, related to:
 - Board meetings are conducted in an orderly, efficient and effective manner that provides sufficient time for discussion.
 - Board understands its roles and responsibilities.
 - Board meeting allow appropriate input from constituencies.
 - Board operates as a unit.
 - Board operates without conflict of interest.
 - Board reviews its mission statement regularly.
- Segment of Commitment to Learners, related to Board monitors the effectiveness of the District in fulfilling its mission.
- Segments of Constituency Interface, related to:
 - Board members adhere to protocols for dealing with college and community citizens and the media.
 - Board actively supports the District’s Foundation and fundraising efforts.
- Segments of Community College System Interface, related to:
 - Board members assist and support the District by attending events of CCCT and State Chancellor’s office.
 - Board members assist and support the District by attending events of the state Chancellor’s office.
 - Board is aware of the policies of state government and Chancellor’s office and Board of Governors.
- Segment of Economic / Political System Interface, related to:
 - Board attend national events on behalf of the interest of the District.
 - Board agenda contains sufficient state policy issues facing the District.
- Segments of District Policy Leadership, related to:
 - Board ensures and is involved in a systematic and comprehensive review of Board policies.
 - Board focuses on policy in Board discussions.
 - Policy-making process is clear, transparent, and inclusive.
 - Board seeks community input in developing policies that affect the community at large.
 - Board understands its policy role and differentiates it from those of the Chancellor and college staff.
- All segments of Management Oversight, except one ranked 2.8.
- Segments of Guardianship, related to:
 - Board ensures that District budget reflects District’s mission and plans.
 - Board assures that budget is linked to planning.

Dimensions ranked below 3.0, with 3.0 ranking equating to “Somewhat Agree” included rankings of 2.8, in:

- Segments of District Policy Leadership, related to:
 - Board is appropriately involved in defining the vision, mission and goals of the District.
 - Board, through the Chancellor, seeks advice and recommendations from faculty, staff and students in developing educational policy.
- Segment of Management Oversight, related to a climate of mutual trust and respect exists between the Board and the Chancellor.

CHANGE IN RANKINGS

Summary of Results from Prior Year Assessment

Overall, the results of the 2017 Board Self-Assessment showed variations of 59% of the dimensions to the prior year ranking. No elements within any dimensions were ranked 5.0. Rankings between 4.0-4.9 included 37 (53%); and rankings between 3.0 and 3.9 were 29 (41%). This year the rankings included 4 (6%) elements ranked at 2.8. With the comparative ranking to the board’s assessment in 2016, it is easy to see areas where the board saw measureable (+0.4 or more points, shown with **blue numbers**) favorable advancements in certain dimensions; and conversely, dimensions where measureable reductions (-0.4 or more points shown in **red numbers**) in ranking from the board members for the past 12 months. This year’s rankings were comprised a number of increases in 20 (29%) and a number of reductions in 21 (30%) the seventy elements ranked. However, final numerical rankings show only one measurement.

Seven of the eight dimensions received **positive increases from 2016, and included most notably:**

- Segments of Board Organization, related to:
 - Agenda items contain sufficient background and documentation for the Board’s review and decision.
 - Board works to achieve the District’s goals.
 - Members uphold the final majority decision of the board.
- Segments of Constituency Interface, related to:
 - Board helps education the local community about community college needs and causes.
 - Board supports the development of educational partnerships with community agencies, businesses, and local government, where appropriate.
 - Board members support the development of programs in partnership with local unified districts and other educational entities.
 - Board members adhere to protocols for dealing with college and community citizens and the media.

- Segments of Community College Community College Interface, related to:
 - Board supports the development of educational partnerships with state government agencies, where appropriate
 - Board members actively seek to understand state educational policy issues.
 - Board is aware of the state governmental and Chancellor’s office and Board of Governors.
- Segments of Economic/Political System Interface, related to:
 - Board is knowledgeable about national policy that affects the District. (largest increase of +0.8)
 - Board actively seeks political and civic support for the District.
 - Board advocates District interest to state agencies and legislators.
 - Board helps educate the state legislators about community college causes and District needs.
- Segments of District Policy Leadership, related to:
 - Policy recommendations contain adequate and accurate information and are presented with sufficient time to allow for study and discussion.
 - Board understands its policy role and differentiates it from those of the Chancellor and college staff.
- Management Oversight, related to Board has clear protocols for communicating with staff that include the Chancellor.
- Segments of Guardianship, related to:
 - Board policies assure effective fiscal management and internal controls.
 - Board regularly receives and reviews reports on the financial status of the District.
 - Board reviews the annual audit and monitors responses to recommendations.

This year’s rankings were somewhat positive, with modest amount ranked with a deviation greater than +0.4, over the prior year. Dimensions with the greatest concentration of increases were Constituency Interface (44%), Community College System Interface (60%), and Economic/Political System Interface (44%).

Seven of the eight dimensions received reduced rankings from 2016, and they included:

- Segments of Board Organization, related to:
 - Board meetings are conducted in an orderly, efficient and effective manner that provides sufficient time for discussion. (largest reduction of -1.2)
 - Board operates as a unit.
 - Board meetings allow appropriate input from constituencies (staff, faculty, student, community).
 - Board meetings comply with state laws.
 - Board operates without conflict of interest.
 - Board is appropriately involved in the accreditation process.

- Segment of Commitment to Learners related to Board monitors the effectiveness of the District in fulfilling its mission. (largest reduction from 5.0 to 3.8 [-1.2])
- Segments of Constituency Interface, related to:
 - Board is knowledgeable about community and regional needs and expectations.
 - Board actively supports District's Foundation and fundraising efforts.
- Segment of Economic / Political System Interface, related to:
 - Board attends national events of behalf of the interest of the District.
 - Board agendas contain sufficient state policy issues facing the District.
- Segments of District Policy Leadership, related to:
 - Board is appropriately involved in defining the vision, mission, and goals of the District (lowest rated element at 2.8)
 - Policy-making process is clear, transparent, and inclusive.
 - Board seeks community input in developing policies that affect the community at large.
- Segments of Management Oversight, related to:
 - Board provides a high level of support to the Chancellor.
 - Board maintains open communication with Chancellor.
 - Board annually evaluates the Chancellor in a manner consistent with AP 2435
 - A climate of mutual trust and respect exists between the Board and the Chancellor. (lowest rated element at 2.8)
 - Board clearly delegates the administration of the District to the Chancellor.
 - Board sets clear expectations and goals for the Chancellor.
- Segment of Guardianship, related to Board assures that budget is linked to planning.

This year's rankings were not as negative as the prior year, with only a modest amount ranked with a deviation greater than -0.4, over the prior year. Dimensions with the greatest concentration of decreases were Board Organization (50%), District Policy Leadership (33%), and Management Oversight (60%).

PERCEPTION IN RANKINGS

Additionally, some areas show a spread of rankings, across three ranking levels or more, indicate a difference in perception board members with one another. Like the year prior, this year had a great number of splits at 43 (61%) with 21 (30%) of those being super splits (over 4 or more rankings).

This year the use of a rating of 2.0 was used as was in the prior year; but this year the use of 1.0 was introduced and used three times, and two of these uses then provided a super-split of rankings from 1.0 to 5.0. This use of rankings with a split across all five ranking numbers denote a strong different in perception by members of the board in the areas of Management Oversight of a climate of mutual trust and respect existing between the Board and the Chancellor; and the Board clearly delegations the administration of the District to the Chancellor. Dimensions that included rankings with large number of splits included; Board Organization (75%), Commitment to Learners (57%), Constituency Interface (44%),

Community College System Interface (80%), District Policy Leadership (78%), and Management Oversight (100%). Of these splits, Board Organization (50%), District Policy Leadership (57%), Management Oversight (100%), and Guardianship (44%) saw the majority of the splits to be super splits.

Similarly the dimensions ranked similarly (four or more members) indicated perceptions amongst members of the board which are primarily congruent with each other. Congruent rankings applied to nine (12%) of the 70 elements, and there were no clusters within any one dimension. This is the lowest seen in recent years. Areas of congruent perceptions include:

- Board Organization - Agenda items contain sufficient background and documentation for the Board's review and decision.
- Commitment to Learners – Board monitors the effectiveness of the District in fulfilling its mission.
- Constituency Interface – Board is knowledgeable about community and regional needs and expectations.
- Constituency Interface- Board recognizes and celebrates positive accomplishments of the District's students, faculty, and staff.
- Community College System Interface - Board members assist and support the District by attending events of State Chancellor's Office.
- Economic/Political System Interface – Board actively seeks political and civic support for the District.
- District Policy Leadership – Board ensures and is involved in defining the vision, mission and goals of the District.
- District Policy Leadership – Board, through Chancellor seeks advice and recommendations from faculty, staff and students in developing educational policy.
- Guardianship – Board reviews the annual audit and monitors responses to recommendations

One of the elements ranked with congruent perceptions of the board members, also include a split ranking; that element being Constituency Interface -- Board recognizes and celebrates positive accomplishments of the District's students, faculty and staff. This was also true in the 2016 ranking with the same element. All congruent rankings were four members, none included all five members ranking the same.

In June 2016, when the board reported out the result of the 2015 Self-Assessment, and then held a retreat in the fall of 2016, where the Board planned to:

- 1. Create and implement a process/ program to study emerging and persistent issues impacting the college.**
 - 1.1. Board holds workshops on identified issues and becomes better informed
 - 1.1.1. Board to hold workshop to identify subjects to be studied and identify the process to be used for such reviews.
 - 1.1.2. Develop a calendar for Board workshops
 - 1.1.3. In 2016/17 review implementation and value of workshops.
 - 1.1.3.1. 06/30/2017.
- 2. Study the relationship between the 3 colleges and establish a model to equalize services and funding.**
 - 2.1. Board adopts by 5/31/17 new policies on issues affecting the balancing of services and funding among the colleges.
 - 2.1.1. Hold a Board workshop before 1/1/17 on the factors to be considered for review and evaluation
 - 2.1.2. Review models from other multi-college districts for equalization of services and funding.
 - 2.1.3. Consider Chancellor's recommended model for equalization of funding and services.
 - 2.1.4. Adopt a model by 5/31/17.
 - 2.1.4.1. 05/31/2017.
- 3. Update Board policies to reflect expansion to 3 colleges in the District.**
 - 3.1. Board identifies, reviews, and adopts revised policies by 6/30/17
 - 3.1.1. Assign task to appropriate Board committee.
 - 3.1.2. Identify and review appropriate Board policies requiring updates.
 - 3.1.3. Board review and adoption of revised Board policies by 6/30/17
 - 3.1.3.1. 06/30/2017.
- 4. Improve Board relations and seek consensus on issues to act as a team.**
 - 4.1. Board evaluates and reports on improved relations by 1/1/17.
 - 4.1.1. Board to adjust behavior by listening more before speaking, seeking related data, asking questions rather than making statements, and seeking a solution that contains the elements from all members of the Board.
 - 4.1.2. Periodically self-evaluate the Board's practices and behavior.
 - 4.1.3. Thru the Board chair mentor Board members that are struggling with this goal.
 - 4.1.3.1. On-going, but no later than 01/01/2017.
- 5. Review District's governing budget policies and update where needed to reflect the Board's direction.**
 - 5.1. Board adopts revised budget policies by 4/30/17.
 - 5.1.1. Board to seek models of Board policies affecting District budgets.

5.1.2. Board to identify its budget goals to be included in updated Board budget policies.

5.1.3. Board considers and adopts Board policies to be used to guide.

5.1.3.1. 04/30/2017.

6. Improve communications w/ Chancellor & among members of the Board of Trustees.

6.1. Board & Chancellor participation in a communications training session.

6.2. Board and Chancellor resolve any communications issues by 1/1/17.

6.2.1. Meet with Chancellor to identify communication difficulties and potential resolutions.

6.2.2. Obtain communications training for the Board and Chancellor to resolve difficulties.

6.2.3. Evaluate communications with Chancellor by 1/1/17.

6.2.3.1. As quickly as possible, but not later than 01/01/2017.

This Summary is intended only to facilitate the board's self-evaluation process and reporting of outcomes for the June Board meeting.