

2013

Board of Trustees Self Evaluation 2012

Research and Institutional Effectiveness Report 2013-04



Table of Contents

- Introduction 1
 - Board Self Evaluation Overview 1
 - Board Self Evaluation Timeline 2
- Summary of Results 3
 - The Survey..... 3
 - Comparison of 2011 and 2012 Internal Feedback..... 3
 - Comparison of employee groups..... 4
- Recommendations 5
 - Negative Difference Scores..... 5
 - Areas of minimal growth..... 5
 - Areas below 3.0 6
- Appendix A..... i
- Appendix B vii
- Appendix C xv

Introduction

Board Self Evaluation Overview

On January 25, 2011, in accordance with BP 2745, the Board appointed Trustees Mayra Cruz, Jeffrey Lease and Randy Okamura to serve as the Board's Self-Evaluation Committee. The Committee was charged to work with Chancellor Rita Cepeda and the Executive Director of Research & Institutional Effectiveness to develop and recommend a process and criterion for evaluation of the Board. The Committee agreed to focus the self-evaluation in two areas: Shared Accreditation Findings and Board Operations/Effectiveness, later known as "Workplan A & B" with an accompanying dashboard.

Responsibilities of this committee included the following: Developing and recommending a process of self-evaluation, analysis, reporting and internal and external presentations. This process commenced with the design and administration of a survey to three targeted audiences: the SJECCD seven-member Board of Trustees, internal constituents and external constituents, the latter two of which are not required per BP 2745, thus making this inclusion unprecedented in nature.

Subsequently, an analysis of survey findings and presentation of a written 121-page report to the Board during public session on May 10, 2011, was followed by a special study session on September 10, 2011, to examine the report results and follow a process to rank survey responses and prioritize areas to address within two categories: accreditation related and non-accreditation related. A simple "post it" process to tally votes was used during the study session seen below:



Board Self Evaluation Timeline

Jan 11, 2011:	ACCJC report “6 shared recommendations”
Jan 25, 2011:	Board Self Evaluation committee appointed
Jan 31, 2011:	ACCJC official letter (“SJCC on probation; EVC on warning”)
Feb 24, 2011:	First Board Self Evaluation Committee meeting
March 8, 2011:	Board Committee reports self evaluation process to full BOT; recommends 360 evaluation
May 6, 2011:	Board Self Evaluation Committee meeting
May 10, 2011:	121-page Board Self-Eval report presented to BOT in public session
Aug 16, 2011:	Board Self Evaluation Committee meeting
Sept 1, 2011:	Board Self Evaluation Committee meeting
Sept 10, 2011:	Board Self Evaluation special study session to prioritize areas to be addressed in a “workplan” (later known as “Workplan A & B” with accompanying dashboard)
Nov 8, 2011:	Board approves Workplan A & B
Jan-Aug 2012:	Intermittent updates to Board by Board Self Evaluation Committee
Oct 16-30, 2012:	2012 Board Self Evaluation survey conducted
Nov 17, 2012:	Board Presentation of Self Evaluation Process--CCLC Conference in Los Angeles.

Supporting Documents (located within District website front page, under “Board of Trustees Self Evaluation” banner button)

Full Self Evaluation Report

http://www.sjeccd.edu/aboutus/board/Documents/Board_Self_Evaluation_CorrectedDate.pdf

Workplan A & B

http://www.sjeccd.edu/aboutus/board/Documents/UPDATED_WORKPLAN_A_B%20Reviewed%20with%20Subcommittee%202012.pdf

Summary of Results

The Survey

The 2012 Board Self Evaluation went out to internal constituencies (SJECCD employees and student leaders), community members, and board members. This report is going to focus on the internal constituents. Of the 110 internal constituents who responded to the survey, 59 identified themselves as faculty, 36 as Classified or Confidential, and 15 as Administrator or Manager. The survey consisted of 87 items grouped into 12 themed groupings. Those groupings are: **Mission and Planning; Policy Role; Board-Chancellor Relations and Advocacy; Educational Programs and Quality; Fiduciary Role; Human Resources and Staff Relations; Board Leadership; Board Meetings; Board Education; Criteria Derived from Policy; and Accreditation Standards.**

Respondents were asked to respond to these 87 statements by indicating whether they:

1. Disagree Strongly; 2. Disagree; 3. Neither Agree nor Disagree; 4. Agree; 5. Agree Strongly

All of the statements were worded “positively” which means that a choice of 5 for a specific statement would indicate the most positive feedback and a choice of 1 indicates the most negative feedback. If a 3 was chosen, that indicates neutrality. The analysis will look at the average score given by the internal constituents on individual items as well as within the thematic groupings.

Comparison of 2011 and 2012 Internal Feedback

- In 2012, there were 110 responses from the internal constituents. This is compared to last year’s number of 36 responses.
- In most cases, the feedback from internal constituents indicates improved views about the performance of the Board of Trustees. Most of the average scores increased from 2011 to 2012.
- In all themed groupings, the average score for the Board of Trustees increased. The largest increases were in the area of Policy Role (with a difference score of .78) and Fiduciary Role (with a difference score of .77).
- Individual items within the themed groupings show internal constituent views of the Board improving vastly in certain areas. Highlights follow; see Appendix A for detailed results.
 - Under Mission and Planning, the internal audiences scored *an effective planning process* .96 points higher in 2012 than in 2011.
 - Under Policy Role, *The board clearly understands its policy role and differentiates its roles from those of the Chancellor*, scored 1.00 point higher in 2012 than in 2011.
 - Internal constituencies rated the *Board’s policies assures fiscal management and internal controls* .95 points higher and *budget reflects priorities in the district’s plans* .82 points higher.
 - Internal constituents are more favorable about the board’s ability to uphold a decision once it is made, scoring that item 1.23 points higher in 2012 than 2011.
 - Under Accreditation Standards, the Board received favorable increases in *publishing bylaws and policies* (1.09 difference score) and *being informed about and involved in the accreditation process* (1.15 difference score).

- Some opportunities for improvement exist.
 - Under Community Relations and Advocacy, *board members are active in community affairs wend down* .06 points from 3.50 in 2011 to 3.44 in 2012.
 - Under Human Resources and Staff Relations, Board Leadership, and Criteria Derived from Policy, many items continue to receive feedback scores of below 3.0. This indicates that most respondents “disagree” or “strongly disagree” with the statement they are responding to.
 - Some areas have higher marks (in the range of between 3.0 and 3.5) but improvement scores from 2011 to 2012 are below .20. Most of these are in the area of Policy, Board Leadership, and Human Resources and Staff Relations.

Theme	2011 (n=36)	2012 (N=110)	Difference
Mission and Planning	2.72	3.26	0.55
Policy Role	2.11	2.89	0.78
Board-Chancellor Relations	2.86	3.27	0.41
Community Relations and Advocacy	2.92	3.19	0.27
Educational Programs and Quality	2.66	3.04	0.38
Fiduciary Role	2.39	3.16	0.77
Human Resources and Staff Relations	2.36	2.87	0.51
Board Leadership	2.36	2.92	0.56
Board Meetings	3.06	3.33	0.27
Board Education	2.98	3.43	0.45
Criteria Derived from Policy	2.45	2.86	0.41
Accreditation Standards	2.79	3.21	0.42

Comparison of employee groups

- For the most part, the employee groups scored the themes very similarly. In a few cases, there are distinct differences between employee categories. See Appendix B.
 - For Educational Programs and Quality, the average score for Administrators/Managers was quite a bit higher than for Faculty and Classified/Confidential employees (3.34 compared to 2.98 and 2.86 respectively).
 - Faculty rated Board Leadership higher (3.04) than either Classified/Confidential (2.87) or Administrators/Managers (2.78).
 - In addition, Faculty rated Criteria Derived from Policy higher than the other groups (2.98 for faculty compared to 2.76 for both of the other employee categories).

	Faculty (n=59)	Classified or Confidential (n=36)	Administrator or Manager (n=15)	Total (n=110)
Grouping #1: Mission and Planning	3.19	3.05	3.62	3.26
Grouping #2: Policy Role	2.85	2.92	2.91	2.89
Grouping #3: Board-Chancellor Relations	3.37	3.22	3.16	3.27

	Faculty (n=59)	Classified or Confidential (n=36)	Administrator or Manager (n=15)	Total (n=110)
Grouping #4: Community Relations and Advocacy	3.14	3.15	3.32	3.19
Grouping #5: Educational Programs and Quality	2.98	2.86	3.34	3.04
Grouping #6: Fiduciary Role	3.15	3.05	3.30	3.16
Grouping #7: Human Resources and Staff Relations	2.91	2.70	3.00	2.87
Grouping #8: Board Leadership	3.04	2.87	2.78	2.92
Grouping #9: Board Meetings	3.36	3.28	3.35	3.33
Grouping #10: Board Education	3.29	3.50	3.59	3.43
Grouping #11: Criteria Derived from Policy	2.98	2.76	2.76	2.86
Grouping #12: Accreditation Standards	3.23	3.14	3.25	3.21

Recommendations

The Board of Trustees has taken on a ground-breaking task in committing to participate in a full 360 evaluation of its roles, policies, and practices. The result of this undertaking is clearly having an impact upon the image of the Board within the internal community. More people responded to the survey in 2012 than in 2011 providing positive feedback which, in most cases, improved upon the feedback from the previous year. In a few cases, the feedback was vastly more positive than in the previous year.

Recommendations can be derived from three places:

1. Negative difference scores
2. Areas where difference scores show minimal growth
3. Scores that remain below 3.0

Negative Difference Scores

There was only one area where the difference score showed a drop in performance. Board members refrain from attempting to manage employee work dropped .03 points. While this does not reflect a major change, it does not reflect positive improvement. This is one area that may be considered and opportunity for improvement.

Areas of minimal growth

Any area with a difference score of below 0.20 should be considered an opportunity for improvement. Below is a list of those areas that fall into this category:

Item	Difference Score
The board maintains a positive working relationship with the Chancellor	0.10
The board sets and communicates clear expectations for Chancellor performance	0.09
The board regularly received and reviews reports on institutional effectiveness	0.06
The board understands and protects academic freedom	0.01
The board's human resources policies provide for fair and equitable treatment of staff	0.11
The board expresses its authority only as a unit	0.02
Board meetings and study sessions provide sufficient opportunity to explore key issues	0.16
Agenda items provide sufficient information to enable good board decision-making	0.11
The board maintains confidentiality of privileged information	0.09
New members participate in a comprehensive orientation to the board and district	0.16
The board clearly defines and articulates its role	0.18
Trustees come to each meeting prepared and ready to debate issues fully and openly	0.04
Board behavior, and that of its members, exemplifies ethical behavior and conduct that is above reproach.	0.08
The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.	0.02
Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution	0.11

Areas below 3.0

Areas below 3.0 typically indicate that constituents, on average, disagree or strongly disagree, with statements on the survey. These should be considered opportunities for improvement. Most of the areas that continue to have a score of below 3.0 are in the area of Human Resources and Staff Relations, Board Leadership, and Criteria Derived from Policy. These three areas should be areas of focus.

Appendix A
Board Self-Evaluation
2011 and 2012 Comparison of Means

	2011 (n=36)	2012 (n=110)	Difference Score
Grouping #1: Mission and Planning			
Board members are knowledgeable about the culture, history, and values of the district.	3.06	3.48	0.42
The board regularly reviews the mission and purposes of the institution.	2.91	3.29	0.38
The board spends adequate time discussing future needs and direction of the district	2.53	3.12	0.59
The board assures that there is an effective planning process and is appropriately involved in the process.	2.14	3.10	0.96
The board assures that district plans are responsive to community needs.	2.83	3.02	0.19
The board has adopted and monitors the implementation of the district's strategic, educational and facilities master plans.	2.61	3.20	0.59
The board sets annual goals or priorities in conjunction with the Chancellor and monitors progress toward them.	2.94	3.63	0.69
Average for Grouping #1	2.72	3.26	0.55
Grouping #2: Policy Role			
The board clearly understands its policy role and differentiates its role from those of the Chancellor and college staff.	1.69	2.69	1.00
The board assures that the district complies with relevant laws, regulations and accreditation standards.	2.42	3.19	0.77
The board's policy manual is up-to-date and comprehensive.	2.22	2.83	0.61
The board relies on board policy in making decisions and in guiding the work of the district.	2.09	2.83	0.74
Average for Grouping #2	2.11	2.89	0.78
Grouping #3: Board-Chancellor Relations			
The board maintains a positive working relationship with the Chancellor.	3.14	3.24	0.10

	2011 (n=36)	2012 (n=110)	Difference Score
The board clearly delegates the administration of the district to the Chancellor.	2.14	3.00	0.86
The board sets and communicates clear expectations for Chancellor performance.	3.08	3.17	0.09
The board regularly evaluates Chancellor performance.	3.03	3.50	0.47
The board periodically reviews the Chancellor contract to assure appropriate support and compensation.	2.91	3.44	0.53
Average for Grouping #3	2.86	3.27	0.41
Grouping #4: Community Relations and Advocacy			
Board members act on behalf of the public and citizens in the district when making decisions.	2.47	2.74	0.27
Board members are active in community affairs.	3.50	3.44	-0.06
The board advocates on behalf of the district to local, state, and federal governments.	3.03	3.29	0.26
The board actively supports the district's foundation(s) and fundraising efforts.	2.67	3.29	0.62
Average for Grouping #4	2.92	3.19	0.27
Grouping #5: Educational Programs and Quality			
The board is knowledgeable about the district's programs and services	2.64	3.05	0.41
The board is knowledgeable about the educational and workforce training needs in the community	2.61	2.83	0.22
The board has established expectations or standards that enable it to monitor the quality and effectiveness of the educational program.	2.39	2.83	0.44
The board regularly receives and reviews reports on institutional effectiveness.	3.14	3.20	0.06
The board is appropriately involved in the accreditation process.	2.28	3.39	1.11
The board understands and protects academic freedom.	2.92	2.93	0.01
Average for Grouping #5	2.66	3.04	0.38
Grouping #6: Fiduciary Role			
The board assures that the budget reflects priorities in the district's plans.	2.11	2.93	0.82
Board policies assure effective fiscal management and internal controls.	2.00	2.95	0.95
The board regularly receives and reviews reports on the	3.47	3.76	0.29

	2011 (n=36)	2012 (n=110)	Difference Score
financial status of the institution.			
The board reviews the annual audit and monitors responses to recommendations.	3.03	3.32	0.29
The board adopts and monitors the implementation of a facilities master plan.	2.97	3.44	0.47
The board has provided appropriate direction for seeking external funding.	1.97	2.52	0.55
The board maintains an adequate financial reserve.	1.97	3.37	1.79
The board acts timely and decisively on current fiscal data trends in order to ensure short term and long term financial solvency.	1.58	3.00	3.00
Average for Grouping #6	2.39	3.16	0.77
Grouping #7: Human Resources and Staff Relations			
The board's human resources policies provide for fair and equitable treatment of staff.	2.25	2.85	0.11
The board has established and follows clear parameters for collective bargaining.	2.74	3.15	1.21
The board has and follows protocols regarding communication with college employees.	1.94	2.76	0.73
Board members refrain from attempting to manage employee work.	2.03	2.83	0.80
The board expects and supports faculty, staff, and student participation in college decision-making.	2.86	2.76	0.76
Average for Grouping #7	2.36	2.87	0.51
Grouping #8: Board Leadership			
The board understands its roles and responsibilities.	2.00	2.76	0.68
The board expresses its authority only as a unit.	2.08	2.73	0.02
Board members understand that they have no legal authority outside board meetings.	2.71	2.93	0.79
The board regularly reviews its code of ethics or standards of practice and has a policy on addressing violations of the code.	2.14	3.02	0.80
Board members uphold and comply with the board's code of ethics.	2.22	3.02	0.91
Board members avoid conflicts of interest and the perception of such conflicts.	2.11	2.76	1.31
Board members annually file a statement of economic interests.	3.17	3.28	0.47

	2011 (n=36)	2012 (n=110)	Difference Score
Once a decision is made, board members uphold the decision of the board.	2.81	3.23	1.23
Board discussions and relationships reflect a climate of trust and respect.	2.00	2.55	0.55
Average for Grouping #8	2.36	2.92	0.56
Grouping #9: Board Meetings			
Board meetings are conducted in an orderly, efficient manner.	3.11	3.20	0.37
Board meetings and study sessions provide sufficient opportunity to explore key issues.	2.83	3.10	0.16
Agenda items provide sufficient information to enable good board decision-making.	2.94	3.32	0.11
The board understands and adheres to the Brown Act.	3.21	3.54	0.31
The board maintains confidentiality of privileged information.	3.23	3.51	0.09
Average for Grouping #9	3.06	3.33	0.27
Grouping #10: Board Education			
New members participate in a comprehensive orientation to the board and district.	3.42	3.41	0.16
Board members participate in trustee development activities.	3.25	3.51	0.84
The board evaluation process helps the board enhance its performance.	2.67	3.41	0.83
The Board measures its accomplishments against board goals.	2.58	3.39	0.41
Average for Grouping #10	2.98	3.43	0.45
Grouping #11: Criteria Derived from Policy			
The board believes it derives its authority from the community, and that it must always act as an advocate on behalf of the entire community.	2.63	2.85	0.82
The board clearly defines and articulates its role.	2.03	2.68	0.18
The board creates and maintains a spirit of true cooperation and a mutually supportive relationship with its Chancellor.	2.50	2.95	0.62
The board always strives to differentiate between external and internal processes in the exercise of its	2.33	2.71	0.38

	2011 (n=36)	2012 (n=110)	Difference Score
authority.			
Trustee members engage in a regular and ongoing process of in-service training and continuous improvement.	2.81	3.24	0.99
Trustees come to each meeting prepared and ready to debate issues fully and openly.	2.25	2.78	0.04
Board members vote their conscience and support the decision or policy made.	2.74	2.88	0.66
Board behavior, and that of its members, exemplifies ethical behavior and conduct that is above reproach.	2.22	2.71	0.08
The board endeavors to remain always accountable to the community.	2.63	2.83	0.50
The board honestly debates the issues affecting its community and speaks with one voice once a decision or policy is made.	2.33	2.95	0.50
Average for Grouping #11	2.45	2.86	0.41
Grouping #12: Accreditation Standards			
The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution.	2.83	3.26	0.32
The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.	2.94	3.21	0.58
The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions.	2.63	2.98	0.20
Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole.	2.78	3.21	0.99
The board advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.	2.22	2.95	0.32
The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.	2.63	3.15	0.48
The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.	3.83	3.60	0.57
The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating	3.03	3.48	1.09

	2011 (n=36)	2012 (n=110)	Difference Score
procedures.			
The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.	2.39	3.05	0.02
The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.	3.03	3.43	0.94
The governing board's self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.	2.49	3.31	0.85
The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.	2.46	3.23	0.35
The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.	2.88	3.44	1.15
The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district.	2.29	2.79	0.50
In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.	2.86	3.41	0.66
The board regularly reviews the mission statement.	2.75	3.23	0.20
The board adopts policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or worldviews.	3.03	3.21	0.52
The board has adopted personnel policies that are available for information and review. Such policies are equitably and consistently administered.	2.69	3.05	0.36
The board has a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes.	3.21	3.36	0.51
Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution.	2.85	2.90	0.11
Average for Grouping #12	2.79	3.21	0.42

Appendix B
2012 Board Self-Evaluation Results
Faculty, Staff, and Administrator Comparison of Means

	Faculty (n=59)	Classified or Confidential (n=36)	Administrator or Manager (n=15)	Total (n=110)
Grouping #1: Mission and Planning				
Board members are knowledgeable about the culture, history, and values of the district.	3.32	3.25	4.00	3.48
The board regularly reviews the mission and purposes of the institution.	3.21	3.08	3.64	3.29
The board spends adequate time discussing future needs and direction of the district	3.17	2.83	3.36	3.12
The board assures that there is an effective planning process and is appropriately involved in the process.	3.00	2.92	3.45	3.10
The board assures that district plans are responsive to community needs.	2.89	2.83	3.45	3.02
The board has adopted and monitors the implementation of the district's strategic, educational and facilities master plans.	3.06	3.17	3.45	3.20
The board sets annual goals or priorities in conjunction with the Chancellor and monitors progress toward them.	3.67	3.25	4.00	3.63
Average for Grouping #1	3.19	3.05	3.62	3.26
Grouping #2: Policy Role				
The board clearly understands its policy role and differentiates its role from those of the Chancellor and college staff.	2.68	3.00	2.36	2.69
The board assures that the district complies with relevant laws, regulations and accreditation standards.	3.00	3.00	3.73	3.19

	Faculty (n=59)	Classified or Confidential (n=36)	Administrator or Manager (n=15)	Total (n=110)
The board's policy manual is up-to-date and comprehensive.	2.83	2.83	2.82	2.83
The board relies on board policy in making decisions and in guiding the work of the district.	2.89	2.83	2.73	2.83
Average for Grouping #2	2.85	2.92	2.91	2.89
Grouping #3: Board-Chancellor Relations				
The board maintains a positive working relationship with the Chancellor.	3.53	3.42	2.55	3.24
The board clearly delegates the administration of the district to the Chancellor.	3.50	3.00	2.18	3.00
The board sets and communicates clear expectations for Chancellor performance.	3.17	3.00	3.36	3.17
The board regularly evaluates Chancellor performance.	3.37	3.33	3.91	3.50
The board periodically reviews the Chancellor contract to assure appropriate support and compensation.	3.28	3.33	3.82	3.44
Average for Grouping #3	3.37	3.22	3.16	3.27
Grouping #4: Community Relations and Advocacy				
Board members act on behalf of the public and citizens in the district when making decisions.	2.63	2.58	3.09	2.74
Board members are active in community affairs.	3.44	3.33	3.55	3.44
The board advocates on behalf of the district to local, state, and federal governments.	3.28	3.25	3.36	3.29
The board actively supports the district's foundation(s) and fundraising efforts.	3.21	3.42	3.27	3.29

	Faculty (n=59)	Classified or Confidential (n=36)	Administrator or Manager (n=15)	Total (n=110)
Average for Grouping #4	3.14	3.15	3.32	3.19
Grouping #5: Educational Programs and Quality				
The board is knowledgeable about the district's programs and services	3.00	2.50	3.73	3.05
The board is knowledgeable about the educational and workforce training needs in the community	2.78	2.42	3.36	2.83
The board has established expectations or standards that enable it to monitor the quality and effectiveness of the educational program.	2.89	2.75	2.82	2.83
The board regularly receives and reviews reports on institutional effectiveness.	3.06	3.25	3.36	3.20
The board is appropriately involved in the accreditation process.	3.44	3.17	3.55	3.39
The board understands and protects academic freedom.	2.68	3.08	3.20	2.93
Average for Grouping #5	2.98	2.86	3.34	3.04
Grouping #6: Fiduciary Role				
The board assures that the budget reflects priorities in the district's plans.	3.06	2.67	3.00	2.93
Board policies assure effective fiscal management and internal controls.	2.83	2.75	3.36	2.95
The board regularly receives and reviews reports on the financial status of the institution.	3.72	3.67	3.91	3.76
The board reviews the annual audit and monitors responses to recommendations.	3.17	3.33	3.55	3.32
The board adopts and monitors the implementation of a facilities master plan.	3.28	3.50	3.64	3.44

	Faculty (n=59)	Classified or Confidential (n=36)	Administrator or Manager (n=15)	Total (n=110)
The board has provided appropriate direction for seeking external funding.	2.42	2.58	2.64	2.52
The board maintains an adequate financial reserve.	3.61	3.08	3.27	3.37
The board acts timely and decisively on current fiscal data trends in order to ensure short term and long term financial solvency.	3.11	2.83	3.00	3.00
Average for Grouping #6	3.15	3.05	3.30	3.16
Grouping #7: Human Resources and Staff Relations				
The board's human resources policies provide for fair and equitable treatment of staff.	2.89	2.33	3.36	2.85
The board has established and follows clear parameters for collective bargaining.	3.33	2.67	3.36	3.15
The board has and follows protocols regarding communication with college employees.	2.61	3.00	2.73	2.76
Board members refrain from attempting to manage employee work.	3.28	2.83	2.09	2.83
The board expects and supports faculty, staff, and student participation in college decision-making.	2.42	2.67	3.45	2.76
Average for Grouping #7	2.91	2.70	3.00	2.87
Grouping #8: Board Leadership				
The board understands its roles and responsibilities.	2.94	2.75	2.45	2.76
The board expresses its authority only as a unit.	2.72	2.92	2.55	2.73
Board members understand that they have no legal authority outside board meetings.	2.89	3.42	2.45	2.93

	Faculty (n=59)	Classified or Confidential (n=36)	Administrator or Manager (n=15)	Total (n=110)
The board regularly reviews its code of ethics or standards of practice and has a policy on addressing violations of the code.	3.11	2.92	3.00	3.02
Board members uphold and comply with the board's code of ethics.	3.05	2.83	3.18	3.02
Board members avoid conflicts of interest and the perception of such conflicts.	3.00	2.67	2.45	2.76
Board members annually file a statement of economic interests.	3.33	3.18	3.27	3.28
Once a decision is made, board members uphold the decision of the board.	3.47	3.00	3.09	3.23
Board discussions and relationships reflect a climate of trust and respect.	2.82	2.17	2.55	2.55
Average for Grouping #8	3.04	2.87	2.78	2.92
Grouping #9: Board Meetings				
Board meetings are conducted in an orderly, efficient manner.	3.50	3.25	2.64	3.20
Board meetings and study sessions provide sufficient opportunity to explore key issues.	3.00	2.92	3.45	3.10
Agenda items provide sufficient information to enable good board decision-making.	3.00	3.50	3.64	3.32
The board understands and adheres to the Brown Act.	3.67	3.33	3.55	3.54
The board maintains confidentiality of privileged information.	3.61	3.42	3.45	3.51
Average for Grouping #9	3.36	3.28	3.35	3.33
Grouping #10: Board Education				

	Faculty (n=59)	Classified or Confidential (n=36)	Administrator or Manager (n=15)	Total (n=110)
New members participate in a comprehensive orientation to the board and district.	3.33	3.58	3.36	3.41
Board members participate in trustee development activities.	3.44	3.58	3.55	3.51
The board evaluation process helps the board enhance its performance.	3.22	3.42	3.73	3.41
The Board measures its accomplishments against board goals.	3.17	3.42	3.73	3.39
Average for Grouping #10	3.29	3.50	3.59	3.43
Grouping #11: Criteria Derived from Policy				
The board believes it derives its authority from the community, and that it must always act as an advocate on behalf of the entire community.	2.72	2.92	3.00	2.85
The board clearly defines and articulates its role.	2.83	2.67	2.45	2.68
The board creates and maintains a spirit of true cooperation and a mutually supportive relationship with its Chancellor.	3.44	2.92	2.18	2.95
The board always strives to differentiate between external and internal processes in the exercise of its authority.	2.94	2.75	2.27	2.71
Trustee members engage in a regular and ongoing process of in-service training and continuous improvement.	3.33	3.08	3.27	3.24
Trustees come to each meeting prepared and ready to debate issues fully and openly.	2.78	2.83	2.73	2.78
Board members vote their conscience and support the decision or policy made.	2.95	2.42	3.27	2.88
Board behavior, and that of its members, exemplifies ethical behavior and conduct that is above reproach.	2.89	2.50	2.64	2.71
The board endeavors to remain always accountable to the community.	2.89	2.50	3.09	2.83

	Faculty (n=59)	Classified or Confidential (n=36)	Administrator or Manager (n=15)	Total (n=110)
The board honestly debates the issues affecting its community and speaks with one voice once a decision or policy is made.	3.06	3.00	2.73	2.95
Average for Grouping #11	2.98	2.76	2.76	2.86
Grouping #12: Accreditation Standards				
The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution.	3.06	3.42	3.36	3.26
The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.	3.19	3.33	3.09	3.21
The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions.	2.94	2.92	3.09	2.98
Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole.	3.25	3.25	3.09	3.21
The board advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.	2.94	3.00	2.91	2.95
The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.	3.24	2.92	3.27	3.15
The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.	3.35	3.58	4.00	3.60
The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.	3.53	3.08	3.82	3.48
The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.	3.06	3.08	3.00	3.05

	Faculty (n=59)	Classified or Confidential (n=36)	Administrator or Manager (n=15)	Total (n=110)
The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.	3.35	3.42	3.55	3.43
The governing board's self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.	3.29	3.27	3.36	3.31
The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.	3.29	2.91	3.45	3.23
The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.	3.53	3.36	3.36	3.44
The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district.	3.06	2.91	2.27	2.79
In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.	3.53	3.18	3.45	3.41
The board regularly reviews the mission statement.	3.41	3.18	3.00	3.23
The board adopts policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or worldviews.	3.06	3.27	3.36	3.21
The board has adopted personnel policies that are available for information and review. Such policies are equitably and consistently administered.	3.12	2.82	3.18	3.05
The board has a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes.	3.53	2.91	3.55	3.36
Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution.	2.88	2.91	2.91	2.90
Average for Grouping #12	3.23	3.14	3.25	3.21

Appendix C
Board of Trustees Feedback
Comparison of 2011 and 2012 Means

Statement	2011 (n=7)	2012 (n=5)	Difference Score
Board members are knowledgeable about the culture, history, and values of the district.	4.33	4.60	0.27
The board regularly reviews the mission and purposes of the institution.	4	4.60	0.60
The board spends adequate time discussing future needs and direction of the district.	3.33	4.60	1.27
The board assures that there is an effective planning process and is appropriately involved in the process.	2.83	4.20	1.37
The board assures that district plans are responsive to community needs.	2.83	4.40	1.57
The board has adopted and monitors the implementation of the district's strategic, educational and facilities master plans.	2.83	4.20	1.37
The board sets annual goals or priorities in conjunction with the Chancellor and monitors progress toward them.	3.5	4.60	1.10
The board clearly understands its policy role and differentiates its role from those of the Chancellor and college staff.	3.29	4.20	0.91
The board assures that the district complies with relevant laws, regulations and accreditation standards.	3.14	4.80	1.66
The board's policy manual is up-to-date and comprehensive.	2.71	3.80	1.09
The board relies on board policy in making decisions and in guiding the work of the district.	3.29	4.20	0.91

Statement	2011 (n=7)	2012 (n=5)	Difference Score
The board maintains a positive working relationship with the Chancellor.	4.29	4.60	0.31
The board clearly delegates the administration of the district to the Chancellor.	4	4.20	0.20
The board sets and communicates clear expectations for Chancellor performance.	3.86	4.60	0.74
The board regularly evaluates Chancellor performance.	3.71	4.60	0.89
The board periodically reviews the Chancellor contract to assure appropriate support and compensation.	3.57	4.60	1.03
Board members act on behalf of the public and citizens in the district when making decisions.	4.14	4.60	0.46
Board members are active in community affairs.	4	4.40	0.40
The board advocates on behalf of the district to local, state, and federal governments.	4	4.60	0.60
The board actively supports the district's foundation(s) and fundraising efforts.	3.14	4.40	1.26
The board is knowledgeable about the district's programs and services.	3.43	4.20	0.77
The board is knowledgeable about the educational and workforce training needs in the community.	3.71	3.60	-0.11
The board has established expectations or standards that enable it to monitor the quality and effectiveness of the educational program.	3.14	3.20	0.06
The board regularly receives and reviews reports on institutional effectiveness.	3.43	3.60	0.17
The board is appropriately involved in the accreditation process.	2.86	4.60	1.74
The board understands and protects academic freedom.	3.14	4.40	1.26

Statement	2011 (n=7)	2012 (n=5)	Difference Score
The board assures that the budget reflects priorities in the district's plans.	4	4.40	0.40
Board policies assure effective fiscal management and internal controls.	3.43	4.40	0.97
The board regularly receives and reviews reports on the financial status of the institution.	4.29	4.80	0.51
The board reviews the annual audit and monitors responses to recommendations.	3.67	4.60	0.93
The board adopts and monitors the implementation of a facilities master plan.	3.86	4.60	0.74
The board has provided appropriate direction for seeking external funding.	3.29	3.80	0.51
The board maintains an adequate financial reserve.	4	4.60	0.60
The board acts timely and decisively on current fiscal data trends in order to ensure short term and long term financial solvency.	3.86	4.60	0.74
The board's human resources policies provide for fair and equitable treatment of staff.	4.14	4.00	-0.14
The board has established and follows clear parameters for collective bargaining.	4.29	4.20	-0.09
The board has and follows protocols regarding communication with college employees.	3.57	4.00	0.43
Board members refrain from attempting to manage employee work.	4.29	3.80	-0.49
The board expects and supports faculty, staff, and student participation in college decision-making.	4.57	4.60	0.03
The board understands its roles and responsibilities.	4.14	4.40	0.26
The board expresses its authority only as a unit.	4	4.40	0.40

Statement	2011 (n=7)	2012 (n=5)	Difference Score
Board members understand that they have no legal authority outside board meetings.	4.14	4.20	0.06
The board regularly reviews its code of ethics or standards of practice and has a policy on addressing violations of the code.	3	3.80	0.80
Board members uphold and comply with the board's code of ethics.	4	3.40	-0.60
Board members avoid conflicts of interest and the perception of such conflicts.	4.29	4.00	-0.29
Board members annually file a statement of economic interests.	4.43	4.60	0.17
Once a decision is made, board members uphold the decision of the board.	4.29	4.40	0.11
Board discussions and relationships reflect a climate of trust and respect.	4.29	4.60	0.31
Board meetings are conducted in an orderly, efficient manner.	4.14	3.80	-0.34
Board meetings and study sessions provide sufficient opportunity to explore key issues.	4.29	4.40	0.11
Agenda items provide sufficient information to enable good board decision-making.	4	4.00	0.00
The board understands and adheres to the Brown Act.	4.29	4.60	0.31
The board maintains confidentiality of privileged information.	4	4.20	0.20
New members participate in a comprehensive orientation to the board and district.	4.14	3.60	-0.54
Board members participate in trustee development activities.	4.14	4.00	-0.14
The board evaluation process helps the board enhance its performance.	4	4.60	0.60

Statement	2011 (n=7)	2012 (n=5)	Difference Score
The Board measures its accomplishments against board goals.	3.43	4.60	1.17
The board believes it derives its authority from the community, and that it must always act as an advocate on behalf of the entire community.	4	4.60	0.60
The board clearly defines and articulates its role.	3.71	4.20	0.49
The board creates and maintains a spirit of true cooperation and a mutually supportive relationship with its Chancellor.	4.29	4.60	0.31
The board always strives to differentiate between external and internal processes in the exercise of its authority.	3.86	4.20	0.34
Trustee members engage in a regular and ongoing process of in-service training and continuous improvement.	3.71	4.00	0.29
Trustees come to each meeting prepared and ready to debate issues fully and openly.	4.43	4.00	-0.43
Board members vote their conscience and support the decision or policy made.	4.14	4.00	-0.14
Board behavior, and that of its members, exemplifies ethical behavior and conduct that is above reproach.	4.17	4.00	-0.17
The board endeavors to remain always accountable to the community.	4.29	4.60	0.31
The board honestly debates the issues affecting its community and speaks with one voice once a decision or policy is made.	4.14	4.40	0.26
The institution has a governing board that is responsible for establishing policies to assure the quality, integrity, and effectiveness of the student learning programs and services and the financial stability of the institution.	4.43	4.40	-0.03
The governing board adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the chief administrator for the college or the district/system.	4.29	4.60	0.31
The governing board is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions.	4.43	4.80	0.37

Statement	2011 (n=7)	2012 (n=5)	Difference Score
Once the board reaches a decision, it acts as a whole.	4.43	4.60	0.17
The board advocates for and defends the institution and protects it from undue influence or pressure.	4.43	4.60	0.17
The governing board establishes policies consistent with the mission statement to ensure the quality, integrity, and improvement of student learning programs and services and the resources necessary to support them.	4.17	4.60	0.43
The governing board has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.	4.43	4.80	0.37
The institution or the governing board publishes the board bylaws and policies specifying the board's size, duties, responsibilities, structure, and operating procedures.	3.86	4.60	0.74
The governing board acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws. The board regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.	4	4.20	0.20
The governing board has a program for board development and new member orientation. It has a mechanism for providing for continuity of board membership and staggered terms of office.	3.71	3.40	-0.31
The governing board's self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.	3.14	4.20	1.06
The governing board has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.	4	4.60	0.60
The governing board is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.	3.71	4.60	0.89
The governing board delegates full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable for the operation of the district.	4.29	4.40	0.11
In multi-college districts/systems, the governing board establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.	3.86	4.00	0.14
The board regularly reviews the mission statement.	3.71	4.20	0.49

Statement	2011 (n=7)	2012 (n=5)	Difference Score
The board adopts policies on academic freedom and responsibility, student academic honesty, and specific institutional beliefs or worldviews.	3.86	4.20	0.34
The board has adopted personnel policies that are available for information and review. Such policies are equitably and consistently administered.	3.57	4.00	0.43
The board has a written policy providing for faculty, staff, administrator, and student participation in decision-making processes.	3.86	4.40	0.54
Through established governance structures, processes, and practices, the governing board, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution.	4.29	4.20	-0.09