

**SURVEY WRITTEN COMMENTS
OF DISTRICT EMPLOYEES**

Survey of District Employees Regarding the Board of Trustees - 2013

List of Comments from 357 responses

7. Comments: The Board of Trustees, administrators, faculty, staff, and students work together for the good of the institution through established governance structures, processes, and practices.

You ask me this 10 years ago, it would be different and more positive answer. The last several years have been completely the opposite. There is lack of team work, team leadership and communication between management and classifieds has gotten very bias and unprofessional. I do believe we can change and we can do it together. The three locations have grievance process but the District Office needs to expand and work more on transparency.

Without having attended any meetings, not sure I can add any input here. I do know that it does take time to make change at a great school like ours! Sometimes, I wish changes could be made simply faster.

While the Board, faculty and staff have made impressive strides in their collaboration in recent years; there has been insufficient transparency in the decision making of the District's senior leadership. The District Leadership has not practiced collegial consultation with faculty, as required by state law.

We have an excellent Board of Trustees

We give our college presidents tremendous responsibilities, yet it seems like every small request needs Board approval. Many things can't be done because the time required to get Board approval is excessive. It would seem like our presidents could be given some responsibility to approve some moderate level of expenditures.

We don't work as team. The major of board members do not value or support management. You give mixed messages and are hard to understand. We don't know what your real goals are expect to get reelected. Give us clear policies to follow, stop micro managing, and hold employees accountable (all of us including faculty).

I am happy to see you asked for our opinion in this survey. That is a step in the right direction.

We as a whole have had some difficult years with loss of great people due to retirement the new hires coming and then leaving us worse off than before and to all the great people we have left here I feel we have put such a burden on them because of their knowledge and well not being able to bring certain positions up to speed I fear their leaving will have a burden that all of us who are just getting to really know what it takes to run this operation smoothly will not be able to step up in the time of crisis

Visits to campuses by Trustees and District administrators is very infrequent, expect for Trustee Prinsky.

Varies depending on administrators involved. Some policies are being standardized now which will be an improvement.

Unclear and self serving

Too much funding spent on Admin and managerial positions, not enough on maintaining full time faculty and facilities. The conditions in science buildings at GWC are deplorable and have not been significantly improved despite many contacts with Janet Houlihan, Jerry Marchbank and others.

Too much focus on micromanaging college employees and too little focus on external issues for the good of the order.

To avoid retaliation, I prefer not to disclosure any details. All I can say is that decisions with no sense at all are made by the Board to hide the wrong doing of some employees.

This is the most dysfunctional organization I have ever experienced. A large aspect and this dysfunctionality is an unholy, unethical relationship between at least one board member and union leadership. There is an apparent and egregious lack of ethics by one board member who uses the bully pulpit and Machievellian politics to get his way - akin to a spoiled child. This Board member calls others unethical, while it is he who behaves unethrally. Why the rest of the Board does not censure this member for the good of the District and the community and tax payers it serves, is a mystery to me. Because of the lack of appropriate leadership and positive example by the Board, the rest of the District suffers in its ability to get meaningful work done - it devolves to a massive internal power struggle. Unions are too strong and designated leaders are handcuffed in their ability to lead.

This is an issue that needs work because when people at Coastline try to identify ways that information is disseminated

to them they are hard pressed to point to specifics. The Classified Senate is currently making a concerted effort to include reports from meetings attended at the District-level and to solicit input from the Classified body on issues that require feedback.

This District used to be amazing, student centered, a place people felt fortunate to work. It has changed for the worse and continues to do so. I don't know a happy person in their job. Ideas are not well thought out. Administrators are NOT held to standards and dealt with, they are not trained, it's a "Good Ole Boys Club" mentality. People are actually talking highly qualified applicants out of working or applying for jobs in this District because it's so bad.

There seems to a lot of misperception among all groups as to the intent and purview of the board, administration, faculty and staff. I consistently hear "rumors" of the board's intent and nothing materializes yet the perception of the board not fully supporting campus decision making still exists. That said, I believe there has been a recent shift in campus perception (too soon to tell if it will continue) under the Dr Prinsky's leadership of the board. I am hopeful that we can move forward and dispell misperceptions to work together collaboratively.

There is too much micromanaging of some issues, such as monies and rights already granted contractually. BOT meetings and committee meetings might be more well-attended if there was better communication to ALL of the employees.

There is the appearance of collaboration, but CCCD is not a place where the interests of the groups mentioned here are heard.

There is little transparency and it appears that the board is out of touch with what really happens on the campuses and what the faculty and programs are facing.

There is a disconnect between district employees and what is happening on campus. Input from staff on campus must be considered, and is often not. I am referring to day to day issues that the district makes decisions about that have a serious negative outcome on the campus. With major polices our input is taken but not the day to day stuff dictated by the district staff.

There are trust issues and transparency issues within the colleges and the District itself. Lack of communication is a problem. Even with the economy looking up, employees feel unheard and devalued.

There are many gaps in the line of communication. There are also many decisions made by administration and the board of trustees that need more faculty and student input.

The system looks a lot like the old Soviet Union, where the Board of Trustees must approve every small detail before it can be carried out. Board approval is a cumbersome process that takes months, so there is no flexibility to react in a timely manner to opportunities that may arise. The trustees can't possibly know the consequences of what they are approving, and basically "rubber stamp" most items. The school system would function far more efficiently if decisions were entrusted to managers closer to the ground, who have authority to operate within certain limits.

The structure is not fully efficient. Many of the board items that are scheduled to be approved should be approved in-house. Many of these items are time-sensitive and require immediate action. Waiting for a board meeting delays the process.

The recent IT reorganization demonstrates how the Board and Administrators are not currently practicing the shared governance that is established by our college mission.

The processes and practices keep changing.

The IT reorg has not demonstrated the concept of "working together." The disorganized process has caused long term damage to the organization.

I have no idea why they would Y rate employees. While this did not happen to myself, I work with these rightfully demoralized people. Just when nearly half a billion dollars comes in from measure M with a massive new construction list, wages are cut for just this department. I have no idea how you can fix this.

The general feeling is that the Board does what it wants regardless of any input it receives from the Colleges. The Colleges feel "micromanaged" and this was even pointed out during the accreditation review results.

The faculty are well aware of numerous problems, but the communication does not seem to be occurring. If it is, the communication is clearly ineffective.

The established governance structures, processes and practices need an overhaul. While the Chancellor and top administrators are leading us in the right direction and inspiring confidence, I wouldn't say that everyone works together. I wouldn't say they really communicate together, much less work together. The "established...structures, processes, and practices" continue to create a lot of inefficiencies, roadblocks to change, confusion and low morale.

The District level needs improvements

The district does not have a comprehensive governance structure, individual committees are one way and discussion and dialog are limited and decisions are top down.

The current environment fostered by this board is the most ineffective I have ever seen in more than 35 years of service to the District. Cooperation is non-existent, draconian and counterproductive policies are adopted without any input from any constituency groups, and 'student success' seems to be totally forgotten.

The current chancellor, president, vice-president, dean and other top administrators have repeatedly acted in ways that are detrimental to the college and the reputation of the college in the community, as well as being disrespectful to at least one department chair. See more comments under # 21. One example was when the president brought someone from an adult ESL school to the Le Jao Center to talk about the possibility of them running classes there without consulting with or informing the ESL chair. In contrast, an earlier president asked for the ESL chair's input before the Le Jao location was decided upon because it was recognized that having easier access for ESL students would serve the community and the college better.

The Chancellor and Vice Chancellors often seem to be dictating what the colleges in the District should be doing. There is a real lack of participatory governance!

The Board works for the Board. If they really cared about the schools and the students they would not be dragging their feet on these very serious failures of accreditation. These are issues the Board has long been aware of, but they think themselves better than every one else, and above the law. Now everybody, especially students, are going to end up paying the price.

The Board tends to micro-manage the campuses and the chancellor thereby hindering and slowing processes.

The Board seems to be more concerned with established governance structures processes and practices than the student. Offering an education path and services to students is lost in the avalanche of rules, regulation, paper work and meetings. The District seems to have plenty of money to meet their needs while the Faculty are making do without. Before more rules and regulations are established the question should not be is this for the good of the institution, the question should be is this for the good of the student.

The Board of Trustees makes decisions arbitrarily and does not allow district and campus administration enough autonomy to do their jobs. They foster a climate where individuals of all employment classifications are afraid to speak up out of fear of losing their jobs.

The Board needs to set policies not try to run the colleges like they have done in the past. Each college has administrators that were hired because of their supposed abilities to lead the college. Let them do their jobs.

The Board majority does not follow its own policies.

The Board does not communicate with Classified Constituents enough; decision making is left to administrators and faculty. Classified employees have tremendous insights which are not tapped. In addition to the formal board meetings, why can't the board meet with campus communities informally- town hall style meetings or something of that nature.

The board approval process is convoluted, labor intensive, and not timely from an operational standpoint. Standard operating procedures are not clearly defined and articulated to the campuses.

The Board and the district could improve in this area. Many of the policies and practices of the Board seem arbitrary. There also seems to be an effort to micromanage and concentrate power at the district office level. The Board should delegate more of the daily management down to its local executives. If it doesn't trust the local executives, then maybe

<p>it needs to hire better local executives.</p>
<p>The board and the district administrators seem to think they are kings and beyond reproach. There should be a very close examination of all the jobs at the district and campus level to see if any is working..</p>
<p>The Board and some administrators do not see the value of classified employees. We are the back bone of each college/district. The Board increases the pay of the President's and V.P.'s while refusing to give a cost of living to classified. We get threatened with lay-offs unless we keep quiet. The Board wastes money with additional legal counsel which is unnecessary. They also pad their own salary with longevity pay and travel which both are not necessary. Classifieds have no funds to go to conferences and are looked upon as the step-children of the District. You hire admistrators at the District who clearly show</p>
<p>The amount of time it takes to get even very simple items, such as conference attendance, approved by the BOT interferes with the work of the colleges.</p>
<p>The administration has lost sight that we are an educational institution and is heading the district in the wrong direction. Their concern does not seem to be the quality of education but more about the bottom line. In particular the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources has created an antagonistic environment with dedicated faculty and seriously lowered morale. The Chancellor does not really seem to have a holistic "vision" for our district.</p>
<p>I would like the Board to ensure the administration keeps quality education as the top priority of this district.</p>
<p>The Chancellor openly ridicules instructional programs at the colleges and tries to implement programs without consulting or seeking support from faculty.</p>
<p>Some structures (processes) need to be put in place. There have been times that processes have not been followed with a reason given of time constraints.</p>
<p>Some policies and procedures seem very cumbersome and could be streamlined eg: professional expert contracts, purchasing procedures</p>
<p>Since I have been here there has always been a disconnect between district and the outside of district.</p>
<p>Shared governance at the college level is working well at Coastline. However, it appears that the board has been micro-managing the Chancellor, the district and the college presidents for a long while. This practice has undermined these positions, setting them up for failure.</p>
<p>Since Dr. Prinksey has stepped into the position as board president, there has been a marked improvement with all stakeholders working more closely together for the betterment of our district, and ultimately the students we serve.</p>
<p>Rhetoric and practice often do not coincide. On a regular basis, substantive decisions are made without adequate input from, and discussion with, faculty.</p>
<p>Policies need to be updated as per the ACCJC instructions and the Board of Trustees should have acted upon the recommendations 6 years ago.</p>
<p>Orange Coast College is treated as the "fair-haired child" and gets most of the perks and benefits. GWC is usually a distant second. Can't speak for Coastline.</p>
<p>On several occasions I have witnessed the BOT's blatantly disregard established district policies and procedures that have been developed by a shared governance process, particularly in the area of hiring.</p>
<p>The Chancellor has no interest in shared governance and, instead employs a top-down approach to management. He is also condescending and unapproachable.</p>
<p>On issues where these bodies have clearly defined goals on which they all agree we play well together, absent this agreement on goal or disagreement over an implementation plan - the distractions often impede us from working together in a cooperative and collaborative manner, and struggles to impact outcomes emerge.</p>
<p>No shared governance going on whatsoever.</p>

Needs much improvement with emphasis on the "good of the institution."

More transparency

It's common knowledge that there is division in the rank of the board members. "As long as you have 3," is a comment that I have hear for years from admin and faculty. It is also a source of concern that the board micro-manages campus activities rather than set specific policy guidelines and allow campuses to implement as best suits the individual campus. Honestly, meeting board dates for so much as a campus workshop has become a joke. "We better ask the board if we can have cookies."

Its all going into the toilet at a rapid pace.

It seems excessive and possibly limiting that certain things - like funding for certain types of student club events - needs to be approved by the board, when the board is so far removed from the actual activities of the club that their approval ends up being literally a rubber stamp and requiring a level of forethought on behalf of students is onerous. I read some of the board guidelines when I began working for the district, and was surprised that it appeared the board was violating its own policies, a suspicion confirmed by the accreditation report.

It is a top down heirarchy, not a team or lateral decision making body. Those of us at the bottom are not part of the decision making process - just the "receivers" of the process. Support staff that makes the "system" and classes work are not respected or supported enough. The attention has been on hiring upper management - from the "outside", who don't know how we function. They bring their own ideas and set of values and impose them on us causing great disruption. We are waiting for them to move on elsewhere to higher positions using their new policies created at CCCD as the "highlight" of their careers.

It feels often that the BOT do not understand that the faculty's comments are for the good of our students - and that that is where our input into the above is centered.

Is there a questions here?

In so much as I find this to be a false statement

In recent years the board has had a tendency to delve to much into management issues rather than sticking to its charge of setting polciy for the college district

In general I am quite pleased with the members of the Board of Trustees. The leadership of GWC, however, needs much to be desired. I would like to see a greater appreciation of the academic aspect of the college and enhanced recognition of faculty achievements. The impression I get is that most administrators (except, perhaps, for Janet Houlihan and a few others) are out for themselves (either power or self-protection) and not for the students or faculty. I have seen the president go his own way against recommendations by faculty that would redound to the benefit of the college as a whole, and I am not aware of his inner circle challenging him. He once made a remark that led me to infer that he used his power over them to intimidate them into supporting his positions rather than scrutinizing them with a critical eye. One result is that the morale of the college among those who care is about as low as it was with Phil Westin. Hence initiative and excellence are stifled.

If people do not get what they want via the established process, they try to make an end run to the administration or the board. This is successful much of the time, rendering the process mute.

If it weren't for the accreditation warning, I don't believe the attitude of the Board of Trustees would have changed toward working together as a cohesive unit for the best interest of the District.

I think there is a lack of communication between many of those groups but especially between the BOT and everyone else. I have seldom seen a trustee on campus unless it was for a special event (same for the chancellor). It would be nice to have trustees come to the campus and see what it's really like in the "trenches".

In the few BOT meetings I attended, it also seemed that there was a lack of communication and even dislike between board members. The chancellor always looks bored/disinterested.

I think some of the faculty are just interested in a pay check. They don't seem to work 40 hours a week.

I know that the BOT should not get involved in the day to day operations of the Colleges, but there is lack of leadership throughout all the campuses. Some administrators are working very diligently, but some are just figureheads. This also

<p>goes for the District. In short, we need stronger leadership. Students are also aware of this, from the comments I hear.</p>
<p>I have witnessed some hostilities. hum?</p>
<p>I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.</p>
<p>I have never seen the agendas for Board or Committee meetings</p>
<p>I feel it is intimidating to provide my feedback to my boss. I don't feel comfortable.</p>
<p>I don't think that the governance structures are followed. I don't think that constituents are given enough time with the BOT.</p>
<p>I do not believe the BOT is transparent in many decisions. I also believe that they have been self-serving in some cases, such as the case of hiring an attorney that has ties with one of the Board members.</p>
<p>I do not believe that the Board and the other employee groups work together. This is not a new issue but a long-standing issue. It is not uncommon to hear someone ask what the board policy or processes are and to hear the response "I don't know".</p>
<p>I do not believe that Coastline has shared governance. Actions have been taken which harm the mission of the college, though I do not blame the Board. In fact, more harm might have been done without the Board's leadership.</p>
<p>I consistently see the Chancellor, Dr. Jones, and other BOT members, at college-wide events at OCC interacting with the staff and students.</p>
<p>I believe the campuses have an established and transparency structure. I do not believe the Board has the same.</p>
<p>I believe the approval process makes some innovative practices difficult because the board wants to approve even small expenditures. It is difficult to attend conferences because of the delay in getting on Board agendas</p>
<p>I believe that, at times, administrators try to do an end run around shared governance.</p>
<p>I believe that most of the BOT makes no effort to understand the existing governance structures, processes and practices. I believe that interference by the BOT has driven out many knowledgeable and talented educational leaders with the Coast District. The replacements hired at the highest levels have been questionable and seem to be more interested in kingdom-building than in building our District's reputation in the community.</p>
<p>I attended a Board meeting last year and witnessed some Board members be disrespectful and rude to faculty and student speakers. It was embarrassing to see Board members working on their ipads, reading through unrelated notes, and basically ignoring the speakers, especially the student speaker.</p>
<p>I am thankful we have a common sense Board that uses wisdom, financial discipline and common sense to governor CCCD.</p>
<p>I am shocked by the lack of action concerning issues of accreditation.</p>
<p>I am not knowledgable about the Board of Trustees policies and procedures. I feel the administrators, faculty and staff on our campus work very well together however for the good of the students</p>
<p>I am new to the district so I should not judge.</p>
<p>I am concerned about what the accreditation report states regarding the Board's working relationship with our campus administration. The Board was cited for this in the last two accreditation studies.</p>
<p>Hiring practices are questionable.</p>
<p>Governance policies are not transparent and often leads to negotiations to address the non-transparency.</p>
<p>From my experience, there is very little if any working "together" with the BT. There is little transparency or reaching out for information or comments concerning issues. Decision making process by the BT is not transparent. As far as "the good of the institution," decisions have tended to be skewed toward Coastline College rather than the district. Rational decision-making process doesn't exist.</p>
<p>From my experience, it seems that the Board is often working seaparate from (and in the worst cases, opposition to), rather than with the constituent groups at the campus level.</p>
<p>Except when an arbitrary decision is made to cut lab pay.</p>
<p>Everyone has their own self-interest at hand. Faculty and staff contracts are abused. Contracts are purposely written with no clear definition of terms that leaves room for various party members' interpretation. This leaves room for</p>

minimal work being done, and room for many to cheat claiming of hours work, type of work etc. Students lose out in the end. You have hard working faculty working extra hard to pick up the slack of other faculty. The same goes with classified staff and hourly staff. Hourly staff are not given enough privileges and are often the doormats of FT and PT faculty and of FT classified staff. Serious steps need to be made to change these long overdue out of date and vague contracts for Faculty, Staff, and Management. We also need to look at our hiring practices. Due to the generic requirements, and vague screening process, many weak candidates are often pushed to the next level for screening or interviews, when they do not meet the ideal needs of the specific position. Hiring committee members waste their time having to screen and interview unlikely candidates for positions. This leads to much time and money wasted for the District. This also leads to the wrong personnel being hired, which causes a whole cycle of high employee turnover ratio and employee transfer requests.

Elected officials must be held accountable to both constituents as well as staff. Top down management works best when there is a hands-on understanding of all staff duties.

Does the BOT find out from students how dis-satisfied they are with the quality of services at GWC, mainly in the area of counseling, financial aid, and availability of classes. These are the very existence of the college.

Consolidation and micro-management is interfering with instruction. The district seems to forget that we exist to educate students.

Communication with faculty in decision making processes is somewhat lacking. In some cases decisions are presented to the faculty after the fact rather than allowing for prior discussion and faculty input.

Communication is disjointed. Many instances of duplication of projects. Morale at all time low on campus.

Coastline College received an Accreditation recommendation that the Board needs to improve in this area, and I agree with that recommendation.

Board overextends its area of supervision, decision and governance.

Board hires personal friends and companies that suit their own interests

Board does not seem to understand accounting.

Board of Trustees is too involved in the operations of the colleges. This increased bureaucracy causes delays in getting approval for needed student items and delay in processing contracts.

Board doesn't care about employees.

At the faculty level, at least, there is no interaction between the colleges. Every tiny thing seems to need approval by the BOT, causing a lot of paperwork.

As a faculty member I do not feel that in any way I have the backing of most board members. I am tired of being treated like a child. for example the recent insistence that faculty get permission from an administrator before teaching controversial subject matter. This undermines the notion that faculty are experts in their field and assumes that we can't be trusted to make responsible decisions about what to teach and how to deliver it.

Any attempt or past shared governance is non existent.

Administrators, faculty and Staff all have some very good ideas that would benefit the district as a whole. In my, not always informed of all sides, opinion I would like to see the Board of Trustees give the ideas real credence instead of just dismissing them right away. I also believe that most of us love our jobs and we are always willing to do our part as long as it is fair and just.

Administrators are running everything and telling the board lies that it is all going well and it is not. All the re-orgs that have been going on throughout the district are fly by the seat of your pants re-orgs. The administrators says this is going to happen and the changes they want to happen like moving people within the district or re-classifying them happen; but the plan on how all the work is going to get done has never been discussed or decided. As a member of the Financial Aid Team that was moved to the district back in February I have much to say about this. We are still fumbling out way on how to do what it is this re-org wanted to happen. We are several months behind where we would have been if we had been left as it was. I am sure that the student are not getting better service because of this re-org, which in theory was a good idea but the planning on how it was to happen never occurred and there is inter fighting and control issues that are



leaving the students in the cold.
Administration tends to work in a silo and does not adhere to established administrative procedures and agreements.
Accreditation problems plainly state there is a problem.
The amount and degree of what needs to be approved by the board is counter productive.
A couple BOT do not trust management so there is not a working relationship that is built on trust.
50 staff positions were approved in June, where are the faculty hires, we are a college?
My observations are that the Board allows all the groups to share their thoughts; however, works primarily with the administrators in making decisions ignoring the input of the other groups.

8. Comments: The Board of Trustees is an independent policy-making body that reflects the public interest in board activities and decisions.

Still can use improvement. There are too many private meetings and behind the doors meeting which violates the Brown Act. Meetings need to be more open and no more closed sessions.
A diversity of perspectives are represented on the Coast Colleges' Board. The activities and decisions of the Board do indeed reflect the public interest.
The Board represents a range of interests
To much influence by unions and special interest groups. The flip flop on hiring only union shops for measure "M" money was very dishonest. Giving stipends for furlough days that were not worked makes no sense and is a gift of public funds. If we needed furloughs then the money should go to help in the classroom and support services. A terrible mixed message.
I wish I could have some insight to give but sadly I cannot and perhaps that's just a small part of our overall problems. I wish one day I will be able to understand more about the process to be a part of the cure I will never give up hope that we will move into smoother waters.
Our Board has maintained basic standards of decency (at least since Ruiz left) and solvency and has been prudent with public funds when compared with other districts in California.
What does this mean. No clarity.
Decisions are frequently made without including opportunities for key individuals to provide input. This frequently results in poorly thought out policies and procedures that are forced on campus employees.
It does not appear that the public interest is of paramount interest to this Board of Trustees, largely due to internal Board politics and constituency (union) input. The Board, due to the undo influence and antics, and fillerbusting, of one particular Board member, is largely inwardly looking and meddling in operational issues. Ideally, a Board of Trustees would be outwardly looking, serving the community at large and students - not unions.
Historically, it has been perceived that certain board members are making decisions that personally benefit them or groups they are affiliated with.
I'm not sure how often or how frequently public interest is measured.
Self interest is evident.
Yes, they certainly are independent of any input from faculty. Additionally, there is an overriding opinion among most faculty and many classified staff and managers that the district chancellor is not faculty-friendly, has a top-down approach to management, and alienates faculty. Yet, it seems as though the BOT is either ignorant of this reality or indifferent. This creates a tremendous divisiveness between the campuses and the district/BOT.
Again, how can the Board of Trustees make decisions with the best interest of those they serve when often they seem "out of touch."
Decisions made by the Board are not always in the best interest of the students, faculty, staff and community.
I think the Board of Trustees has been controlled mostly by members that are looking out for the interests of the teacher's union, and not the general public. There is a conflict of interest with the retainer of legal council for the Board that is squandering large sums of money that could be be put to better use elsewhere. I believe that the infusion of funds from the latest bond measures will be used to reward unions and not to solve the overspending problem that has gotten the district into trouble in the past.
Not true!
I don't know that I can honestly state that the Board reflects public interest. It feels more like personal interests.
It seems to me the Board of Trustees has gone too far beyond "policy-making" and claimed influence well beyond their purview.
The Board member fail to operate as a board as a whole and individual members express independent decisions. Members are biased toward constituent groups and advance their own agendas.

The board seems to be mostly interested in the financing of Lipton and associates by wildly excessive legal mumbo jumbo, often re-evaluating recurring contracts over and over to increase billable time for Mr Lipton. Policy making seems to be a convenient screen for endless delays and wasted money on meaningless 'oversight'. This 'oversight' has not prevented graft and corruption, as can be seen by endless legal issues with contractors over Measure C projects.

They have no interest in what anybody wants but their own egos.

The Board tends to personalities and personal issues into decisions.

Reflects public interest or reflects the ego of a few Board Members?

The Board does not. Its agenda is what each board member wants. If they would reflect what the public wanted we would be the number one district in the U.S.

Individual members (Patterson, Moreno) represent their own interests.

Some issues that require more scrutiny sail through while others that are completely within the bounds of the appropriateness.

The Board strays too often from its role of policy making into areas of micromanagement. It also seems to pay too much attention to local micromanagement issues, but paradoxically does not seem to hold the district level executives as accountable as they should be. Furthermore, there have been recent commercial entanglements that have been of questionable value to the long-term interests of the college, the public, and the educational mission.

contempt for the classified workers. Especially the people you have negotiating our contract with our union. I've heard about how they say "take it or leave it" and "it you don't like it, go somewhere else". Why not hire people who actually care about us like Gene Farrell? It appears that the Board hires their own lynchmen to do their dirty work. After 24 years I am disgusted...

It is time for the BOT to buckle down and work toward meeting the accreditation requirements that the commission has set for us. This will reflect the public interest.

Some Board members are sensitive to community needs and others are not. It appears that some of our Board members simply do not care about the community.

The two female members of the Board truly make an effort to be well informed about how well college programs meet the needs of students, and they show an interest in student success by attending scholarship and graduation ceremonies.

It is unclear how the decisions of the Board reflect the public interest.

How do they solicit this information.....what the public interest is?

Look to the Accreditation team's recommendations in regard to the effectiveness of the board and its policy making.

The Board works too closely with Teachers Union to be completely unbiased in all decisions.

My perception is that some trustees are more concerned with their own personal image and reputation than they are with the district and its individual campuses.

In a political process, there are many different competing public interests - so this is an ideal - is seldom achieved by any Board. This is not necessarily a criticism of this particular board - it is simply a fact. Policy-Making is also a murky concept, often defined in the eye of the beholder. Delegation of authority needs clarification followed by a commitment to have ongoing clarification of the agreement, once it is clarified.

How about letting the presidents run their campuses?

Board activities and decisions seldom appear to reflect the public interest.

I can't speak for the public at large, but from my students, I hear that that some are being well served. Those who can fast-track from high school to transfer. However, those who are working full-time, middle-aged+, or requiring basic skills are not being equitably well-served as I see it.

Most of us have a pretty bad impression of this board, their actions/lack-of-action, hiring attorneys, etc.

Employees and students are part of the "public". Many (and probably most of us) live in the District's area. We want

the top rated community college system around and have great competent people in the system to accomplish that. There is no need to go outside our community to hire "experts", who don't know our community. We want safe, clean, newer functional buildings, newer modern equipment and supplies and the best instructors. I would like to see more of the businesses, universities and local organizations involved and interacting with our colleges.

Is there a questions here?

I don't know how often board members talk to those that elected them to determine their opinions.

They have proven to be a self serving Board until the recent change in the Secretary of the Board and being more outward focused. However, I believe that if the warning by the accreditation committee did not take effect - the Board of Trustees would have continued on their mission of whatever suits their personal interests best.

Taxpayers are still paying on Measure C and now Measure M. The future is classes on line.

The public consists of students and their families. Their interests are not always foremost in decision-making.

I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.

I don't feel board members are in-touch with the employees.

I believe that the BOT reflects mostly the interests of the District administration.

Really? Is this what the Board is supposed to do?

I am not sure where the Board of Trustees gets feedback from the community members on decisions. I understand that the Board has some independence on making decisions, but I wonder on bigger issues where the Board gets feedback from the community.

I am a voting member of this community and do not always feel the students, staff or faculty are the best interest of the Board.

They are independent but I don't believe they represent any interests but their own, certainly not the public's interests.

Unacceptable should be the rating but was not a choice. It is in the public interest to have institutions with clean accreditation reviews but the board continues to shirk its responsibilities in this area.

I am new to the district so I should not judge.

Just because they were necessarily elected officials doesn't mean that there personal opinions reflect the constituency. Have they ever gone out and done town hall meetings?

The District empowers Faculty and Staff that file grievances and cause problems, often letting them have their way or choosing to settle, instead of firing people that need to be fired. This encourages others to follow pursuit, and over empowers employees to be "untouchable", unable to be fired.

The Board received an Accreditation recommendation in 2007 that it needed to update its policies; it is still behind. It needs to improve in this area.

The BOT, for the most part, supports the unions to the detriment of the public and students.

Just minor league politicians who know next to nothing about the colleges they "oversee."

Student needs are not being met. Support services and instructional support take back seat.

The board doesn't think about the public interest it only thinks about what the accreditation team wants. I understand that they determine if we continue to operate, but what happen to the community college helping the community. This is supposed to be where older employed students go to get new or enhanced training, but all we can focus on is retention and how many transfers we have.

I would like to see the Board take a broader look at what is in the best interest of students. For example, it has been stated by management that the recent reorganizations (Financial Aid and IT) are in the best interests of students. That does not seem to be the case since it takes much longer to get IT help.

I believe the public would be concerned with the amount of funds spent on legal counsel if they had any idea. Along with that, the monies spent on that beautiful building and staff appear to be a misuse of funds.

Most in the public sector have no idea of what you do.

The public interest at times seems to be personal interest

The Board micro-manages the chancellor and vice chancellors. If the Board wants to be in charge, fire senior management, save a lot of money, and be in charge.

I'm not sure I am interpreting this question correctly; however, the Board appears to be too money conscious. I know that times are tough and that fiscal decisions may not be the most popular; however, too much emphasis is placed on money rather than a holistic approach to our core objective: educating students.

With money being an issue, we continually take away from the classroom; however, the Board then has the audacity, for example, to give large raises to Administrators. That one still resonates a bad taste - when students are being turned away, when no one else has gotten raises in years, when we are not replacing classified staff, etc., etc., etc.

9. Comments: Once the Board of Trustees reaches a decision, it acts as a whole.

While Mary and Dave seem to understand this the others do not.
very political they serve themselves
Too much interference with daily operations of the colleges by various Board staff.
This is often not the case.
They frequently disagree, and some Board members express open disapproval of joint decisions after they have been finalized. One Board member even attempted and "end run" with the Accreditation team, criticizing their report without the approval of the other members.
There is still descension in the ranks, they members of the Board really do not like each other much.
There has always been an unacceptable and embarrassing amount of infighting. There are board members who should stop and realize they are there to serve the needs of students and not their own egos.
The needless, time-consuming infighting among the board members is tiresome and laughable, if it were not for how much this wastes energy. Even if the BOT comes to decisions, it often is an arduous task for the board to get there. Several board members are rogue and tend to use their position as a personal platform.
The letter by one board member regarding his displeasure with the accreditation proceedings proves this point.
the board tends to be lead by one or two and he/she trys to press the others into compliance.
The Board needs to value the opinion of instructors and staff more.
The Board is generally split in decisions 3-2. There needs to be more consensus.
The board is doing a crap job and causing as many problems as anything esle.
The Board is clearly divided and doesn't try to hide it.
The board is always fighting and not behind closed doors, this does not portray a board that acts as a whole. Individual board members act on their own to outside entities without other board members knowing. Does this sound like a Board of Trustees that reaches a decision and act as a whole?
The Board has always been split and until the recent change in motivation and what appears to be a sense of ethics coming into play they do NOT act as a whole in any way.
Some members act for themselves. It's time that the Board does act as a whole and not with personal agendas.
Some board members appear to be satisfying personal agendas.
So it appears.
Seems like Jerry Patterson runs the show.
Pressure to comply is placed on members that don't agree with a couple very aggressive members.
On several occasions Board members fail to act as a whole. The recent letter to the DOE illustrates the issue but is not an isolated case.
Obviously not.
Not when one trustee sends out a letter that the other trustees don't even know about let alone agree with!
Not convinced that the individual members are willingly operating 'as a whole'
No, certain Board members undermine the decisions made by the Board as a whole. The Board also frequently changes its mind after it has already taken a vote and given direction.
No the board is split and some people need to retire.
My observation over the years is that depending on the issue, and the vote it can vary. Again no particular reflection on this immediate board, the country as a whole is somewhat polarized, and this board reflects that reality. On issues that are clearly 6/0 there are few issues that are contentious from the get go and decided 3/2 - no matter who is on which side - the contentious issue seems to resurface again and again - sometime subtly and sometimes overtly.

<p>Laughable, to say the least! The latest fiasco brought about by Patterson and his foolish letter to the Accreditation team is clear evidence that this board is broken beyond repair. If this District is in jeopardy of losing it's accreditation, it is solely on the heads of the Board, and should be call for a recall action.</p>
<p>Just look at the Daily Pilot article. The Board is splintered.</p>
<p>It was shocking to discover that a board member wrote a letter on District letterhead that seemed to indicate the opinion of the board regarding our accreditation report.</p>
<p>It is common knowledge that the Board is very divided and divisive.</p>
<p>It appears that the board is spilt into two camps...those who are committed to serving students and those who are self-serving.</p>
<p>Infighting and apparent nastiness of BOT members to one another has been the most damaging element of recent Board activity and actions.</p>
<p>I know that this is true. However the Board needs to follow through. For example if the board needs states something needs to be done by end of October, then they need to be sure to follow up and stick to the requirements as announced.</p>
<p>I have not witnessed the process, only suffered the consequence.</p>
<p>I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.</p>
<p>I don't understand the statement. What does "whole" mean - an undivided Board or the Board follows through with each decision? What if it is a bad decision?</p>
<p>I don't think I even need to comment on this item.</p>
<p>I don't know how this can be true, especially with the most recent incident of a Board member sending a letter to the Accreditation Committee without even consulting with the rest of the Board members!</p>
<p>I don't know enough to distinguish between good and outstanding in terms of whether the board acts as a whole, but I've been pleased with this board ever since Lorraine Prinsky came on board (yuk yukâ€”sorry: it just happened!). I like the positive attitude of everyone I know on the board (LP, JP, MH, KM) and I think that all the members on it value higher education and sincerely wish to help students in their decision-making.</p>
<p>I don't believe I have been to enough BOT meetings to have formed a first-hand opinion.</p>
<p>I do not seem to remember the Board reaching a decision and how they react.</p>
<p>I am not sure if the Board does act as a whole, or if various members of the Board act independently.</p>
<p>Historically, it's perceived that there has been three against two on most issues. The same three people have consistently turned things in the direction they want it to go while nearly half of the representation that may have a lot of support behind them, are unable to move things in another direction.</p>
<p>Despite lengthy (unfocused at times) discussion, reason usually prevails.</p>
<p>Current example of Trustee Patterson's unilateral letter to DOE, with its contents was unacceptable. Where was a whistleblower or other trustee when this behavior was going on? The billings by Rutan & Tucker should be refunded if what was alleged is true.</p>
<p>BOT sometimes making a decision without the information from faculty and staff.</p>
<p>an oversite body has exceeded its mandate in attempting to enforce unanimity on democratically elected community college district boards of trustees. There is nothing illegal nor improper in having divergent viewpoints represented on democratically elected public bodies.</p>
<p>Again, no clarity no meaning.</p>
<p>Again, although divided, once a decision has been reached, the Board sees that action/stance through.</p>
<p>According to a letter recently written by one Board member appealing the accreditation warning, upon which a special Board meeting was held, he stated the Board does not act as a whole.</p>

10. Comments: The Board of Trustees advocates for and defends the district as a whole and protects it from undue influence or pressure.

Accreditation warnings
Again the self-interest plays a role in how money is spent and decisions are made.
Again, no clarity no meaning. What is the purpose or meaning of any of this?
Again, the Board has sometimes made commercial or other agreements that seem of little benefit to the district. For example, the outcome of the sale of KOCE was terrible, and seemed more for the benefit of others rather than the best interests of the district. It also sometimes has shown favoritism in supporting and defending some people while punishing others for the same behaviors. I would point out the treatment of the late Richard Porter, former VP of Student Services of Golden West College as a particularly egregious example of this.
Again, the perception is that certain board members act only in their best interest or those they are affiliated with. Due to this, the perception is that they do not advocate and defend the district.
As state before, this district is more interested in feathering the bed of Lipton than providing services to the citizens of Orange County. Patterson, specifically, should be recognized for bringing in a member of his law firm, Lipton, at a considerable cost to the district. This blatant conflict of interest should be under investigation by a Grand Jury, especially with the history of Lipton and his activity with Ventura Community College District.
Board is out of touch with the daily operations of each campus. They could advocate for better policies and procedures. Would like to see even more vision in terms of technology and infrastructure. Personnel Services is a mess and access to fundamental information is lacking. Would like to see the board address these issues. The "district" is these big behemoth that people are reluctant to question and that should change. We should all have an understanding of our roles.
Board members defend their own interests and those of senior "leadership" instead of acting for the best of the whole district.
Does not reflect district needs/interest but personal agendas.
Get rid of Lipton. He has served his purpose and is now milking the district dry.
I believe that the Board has good intentions and does look out for the best interests of the District and it's Colleges.
I don't have the information to be able to comment. The Board seems like it will usually protect itself regardless of the impact on employees (eg. Obama Care).
I feel that the recent unilateral action by one board member to write to the federal dept of education was very damaging to district
I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.
I hope so. . .
I lay many of the issues we currently face in this district at the feet of our leadership. The letter written by Jerry Patterson to the Dept of Education in regard to our warning status is a black eye to our entire organization. We need to own our problems and take steps to correct them.
I think the Board has been unduly influenced by public employee unions in the past, often at the expense or risk to the district.
I was sorry that for so long a horrible application system for full time jobs had continued to be used by which so many qualified part time faculty fell through the system because of the configuration of the online application. I even called Personnel twice and was told misinformation that led me to fill in the application incorrectly, and when I fought to get the situation settled before a final decision was made for the position I was applying for, I truly was "blown off" by personnel like it was tough luck on my part, when I had called Personnel twice for advice to fill in the application as the application system suggested I do. (no other way to describe it). I will say that per my complaints to the Board of Trustees, which my issue never should have gone so far, were followed up on. But how many potential people were lost to a flawed application system? There are only hopes that other such systems are not in

activity for the campus by which others are also hurt unnecessarily.
I would feel better if the Board were more focused on the "big picture" and less on the details. I feel like the Chancellor and Vice-chancellors have a bigger role in directing the Districts agenda than the Board does.
I would not entirely agree with this statement. My honest opinion is the Board defending the District or themselves to stay on the Board.
If they look at the decisions made, can they honestly say they were not influenced or pressured by the chancellor? Has the evidence really been uncompromised through misinterpretation? I have see less than open, honest decision making by the BT especially when it comes to funding issues and expansion plans.
I'm not aware of any issues where the Board protected the district from undue influence or pressure.
In most cases I agree that Trustees advocate for and defend the district as a whole. This happens most frequently when they have full agreement on the issue or pressure. However when they lack a unified position, then harmony of purpose can be disrupted. Again this is not uncommon for a politically elected board, when they are divided on what action might serve the district best. And some of these over the years have interfered with our primary purpose of serving students, or may have had a negative impact on the the districts reputation for a short term gain.
It appears that many board members are more self-serving and looking out for personal interests before the best interests of the district and each campus.
It appears that there are outside influences that weigh heavily into the decision-making of some of the board members.
It seems the district receives more negative light than protection from the Board.
My impression is that is does.
No - the chancellor is doing things that are not in the best interest for the mission of the colleges and its staff. The BOT seems to turn a blind eye to some of these goings-on. They ultimately have the power there.
No central planning that I can detect.
no communication on this
No, there is way to much influence from employee unions
No. The Board looks out only for itself and does not even follow standard ethical practices.
Nonsense, if the Board was interested in the District, there would be no learning center in either Garden Grove or Newport Beach. The Board looks out for itself, if the rest of the community enjoys some benefit, that is just an unexpected bonus.
Not at all. I think this is a wide-spread opinion on all three campuses. At this time, the fact that GWC has several District-related recommendations in our Accreditation warnings is negatively and obviously contributing to my opinion of this subject.
Not externally focused - too busy micromanaging.
Not sure what this question is asking - protects the district from undue influence or pressure from whom? The Board does advocate and defend the District but as a whole, does not trust the leaders it has hired to do their jobs. There is undue influence on the Board by union constituency and one bullying board member.
one or two members of the board fight other members in the public newspapers. these members have had the District sued. caused friction with other organization, public and private. same has given speeches and written letters that are embarrassing to the District, faculty, students and staff.
Patterson tries to push his agenda even though it is not in the best interests of the students or District.
Pressure can sometimes be internal. This is a big district and difficult to know all the details at each site and each program. Yet, the Board is asked to vote on every little item and check. Who do you depend on to give you information? I don't see District decision makers coming to our campus to talk to us before making decisions that totally affect us. The Chancellor has set up a committee of manager advisors, but that too is very remote from our grassroot view point. Also, I hope you do protect us from politicians and special political interest groups.

Several BOT members bring their own agenda and are the outside influence.
Some members do and some do not.
Some on the board do this, others do not.
The Board continues to support a chancellor that does not seem to have the colleges best interests in mind. He has lots of ideas but rarely executes them so there is a lot of wasted time in going to meetings where nothing is ever going to happen. He also does not support the faculty and colleges as individuals.
The board looks out for itself. They are not doing anything beneficial.
The Board of Trustees do not defend the district as a whole they protect what is best for them as an individual or administrators. As a classified staff we use to loving working here now all anyone can talk about is when they are going to retire. Everyone knows the date and how many days it is till they can retire. It never use to be like this. Not sure if the faculty feel the same way or not, but it seems like it because everyone is retiring as soon as they can.
The Board of Trustees is doing a good job listening to all sides and taking them into consideration. There still needs to be more clarification of some decisions being made. While this might be a Board of Trustees, the campuses are in fact faculty driven.
The Board of Trustess advocates for themselves only under the guise of what is student focus. However, with their personal motivations and personal political actions for gain at play it is more times than not for their own betterment or what suits their needs best.
The Board seems more concerned about money than the district's responsibility to students, faculty, and employees.
The BOT doesn't have enough knowleged of how the individual campuses operate or what they need. As such, it's impossible to advocate for the district as a whole.
The BOT has improved over the past 3 years. They have brought accountability somewhat back to District governance and fiscal issues have been addressed competently.
The BOT, for most members, protects itself before working for the district. This is evident by the lawyer that gets paid an exorbitant amount of money to "protect the Trustees." Prior to this BOT, there was not a lawyer solely for the protection of the BOT.
The District empowers Faculty and Staff that file grievances and cause problems, often letting them have their way or choosing to settle, instead of firing people that need to be fired. This encourages others to follow pursuit, and over empowers employees to be "untouchable", unable to be fired.
The fact that I am unable to evaluate the last 3 questions I think says a lot. Perhaps the board needs to reach out more, market themselves as proactive advocates.of the district AND its colleges. I think people often see the district as "big brother" who makes decisions without really finding out what the issues are at the colleges. Example: the whole 28 hour/week for hourly employees mess
The members of the CCCD Board, are sincerely committed to the best interests of their constituents; they understandably differ on what those best interests are. The Board members are effective guardians of the public interest and they conduct themselves in a dignified and professional manner.
There is a large disconnect between what administration wants and what faculty can do. For example, the District and the College are seeking to internationalize. That means more international students and more revenue. However, these students come in unprepared and are put into classes they are not ready for. They need more language support classes and overall support from the colleges.
There is too much reliance on the Mr. Lipton's input on matters that are not pertinent to his expertise.
this is a key area to be reviewed with great care an foresight into all our futures
This is a very strange question that seems designed by the board to defend its previous actions.
To a fault, the District governs for the District. The District should be dissolved allowing the college campus' to operate individually. The District Office and administration is a costly, slow, wastefull entity of repetition and a



burden to campus operation and instruction.
Too many cliché.
Trustee Patterson should have thought of this statement before he embarrassed the District with his letter. He is self-serving and will continue to hamper this District from forward progress.
Undue influence or pressure? Is this one of those statements "don't confuse me with the facts"
Unfortunately, the Board has earned a reputation as epitomizing "undue influence or pressure." The perception may begin to improve with these types of exercises as a start. The BOT has to know the district "as a whole" before it can defend it. I have often heard comments of low morale as employees don't think anything will change because even if we get strong leadership like we have now, the Board will drive him out as they have other Chancellor's. I don't know the facts behind that but I've heard it more than once and at different locations in the district.
Usually the board defends the district as a whole, however, there are definite divisions among the board and appear to be the same regardless of the issues.
We have almost been sanctioned because of the Board of Trustees
We hear at the college level.....they consult with counsel (legal) than with faculty.

11. Comments: The Board of Trustees 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.

We keep cutting programs and services which ultimately does not provide for quality learning programs. We do not replace full-time faculty to the point we are are running a risk of falling below the 50% law and getting fined. We are experiencing way too many "take-aways" which affects morale. Because of the shortage of classified staffing, offices just close and lock their doors during "normal working hours." Employees no longer answer their phones or there are no employees in the department to do so.

Again, no clarity no meaning. What is the purpose or meaning of any of this? How do you spell gobbledygook?

Again, the BOT's lack of knowledge of daily operations on campus prevents the Trustees from supporting student programs and services.

Board is focused on self promotion, not student learning or support services.

Board is reactive and makes few efforts to truly innovate or make the district outstanding.

Board members are not always fully informed about programs within the colleges that promote student success, and they are not always well informed enough to support the quality and integrity of learning programs.

Board policies are outdated and desperately need review and modification to reflect current ED Code and Title 5 requirements. We are also deficient in having board policies in areas where we are supposed to have board policies. We also wait until the last minute to develop new board policies when new regulations go into effect which does not allow for district-wide participation in their development.

Budget constraints and ignorance of the real issues facing the colleges is what I see.

Budget development process is not consistent with quality, integrity, and program/service improvement. Department funding does not appear to be tied to performance or outcomes.

But there is a pervasive chasm between Board thinking and what's really happening on campuses, This is such a typical problem in governance.

Can't lead when top level admin's takes raises and no one else gets one. "Market Value" should not be a concept only for top level administrators.

Class sizes at the different campuses are wildly inconsistent and out of control. Is it in anyone's best interest to have average class sizes of 73 students for some departments? Is this a number that students will love to hear? Some classes of this size, when provided with additional support, are acceptable - but this should certainly not be the norm. It is bad for the students and the professors, and most importantly it greatly impacts the quality of education.

College administration is too top heavy with Chancellors, vice-chancellors, etc. What do these people really do besides collect a check? I teach 60 - 70 students every semester as a part-time instructor and I never see their influence or the benefits of their efforts.

Except when funding sources for the ASOCC are abruptly shut down or cutback.

Existing District policies are worfully outdated and there is no real process for establishing policies.

For all the reasons earlier, the integrity is lacking and for that, there isn't optimization for quality and improvement of the programs and services. The organization does not reflect the district's and the colleges' strategies.

From the little I know, I'd say that given our limited resources, the board is doing a commendable job of promoting student growth, though I personally don't know enough to cite achievements in this area that one might describe as "outstanding." I do think that the administrators in general, to include (based on my observations) the president of GWC and chancellor of CCCD, receive more money than the value they contribute, but I suppose that there are political considerations which allow that waste to occur. Still, it is a bit disheartening for some to see us pay such high prices for poor-to-mediocre performance. I'd rather see the funds go into programs that foster academic excellence.

I also believe that the Board does well in this area with Board Policies, procedures and guidelines.

I believe that the BOT wants to support the goals of the Mission statement but sometimes falls short. Sometimes

because of budget reasons but sometimes because of the Districts inability to understand the true mission of the colleges.
I believe the BOT adjusts whatever policy to suit its needs of the moment
I cannot think one thing that would not function better without the boards existence.
I commented on this above--before anything that we as employees need to deal with is changed, we must be consulted.
I don't feel or believe that they could even tell me what the Mission of the Coast Community College District is or what it means to us.
I don't know. On campus we are expected to align expenditure and hiring with the college mission, which is selectively adhered to. The district leadership in terms of mission are not clearly expressed.
I feel they are out of touch with the reality of teaching community college students "in the trenches." The fact that they would approve raises for themselves and upper management (college Presidents) last year when the colleges were facing severe budget cuts, loss of sections, etc., tells me their focus is not on quality education or shared governance, but rather is selfish and shortsighted. I have little if any confidence in the Board's ability to lead our District.
I guess they do. if only they would stop at policy and stay out of the rest of the day-to-day operations.
I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.
I realize the budget has been bad the last couple of years, but I think those of us who work in student learning programs and services don't feel we have the necessary resources to help students achieve success.
I really do not agree with this statement. It seems the opposite. The policies sometimes hinder us from serving our students better because of lack of resources.
I was surprised from reading the report that the SLOs were not being addressed enough at Golden West, that even after the report was posted, no meetings were called to address the matter and make us aware of the situation. Even the faculty meeting did not press the issue. Cuesta College has had a terrible time being accredited, and it seems this point is not driven home to those who should be concerned. Long Beach City College had a wonderful presentation on SLOs at their faculty meeting this year.
I'm not sure centralizing services at the district will help our students at all. I'm pretty sure we have more managers than we need in some areas yet some colleges have deans with oversight of more programs than they can count. Some balance is in order.
Inconsistent amongst the three campuses.
It has been my observation that the students and the communities surrounding our three campus are the last concern of the administration at the district or even at the campuses. Their chief concern is perpetuating the myth that they are doing wonderful things for the communities and creating incredible opportunities for the students. They go very little past their own self-serving interests.
It's policies are out of date and because of that we are on warning. Having an ACCJC warning in no way ensures the quality and improvement of student learning.
I've seen board items allowed to be submitted past the deadline from some employees and not for others. There needs to be a uniform district policy of enforcing deadlines and that needs to come from the top.
Many new policies are too specific and impact certain individuals instead of providing a framework. For example -- the policy that states the board will hire the chancellor, vice chancellors and presidents -- and one administrator at Coastline.
Money seems to trump this mission. The Board in general seems to have a skewed view of this mission, an odd way of prioritizing what programs and services get money, and often seems out of touch with campus life and realities.
Money spent on legal counsel = less funding for faculty. Board intrusion into presidents ability to run their schools and the amount of minutia requiring approval is counter productive. Oversight is one thing, micromangement another.

<p>More often the policies reflect the majority's interests rather than the students.</p>
<p>No!! Too many managers have been hired at high salaries, especially at the District level. Our student supply budget was cut in half and we were told it would be restored plus Lottery funds this year. But, it did not happen. We got the same half budget as last year. Our equipment is old and falling apart. Prices are increasing to repair and replace supplies and equipment. Even the new people who have been hired at my level have all been hired at a higher level and for 12 mo. I am the lowest paid person in my job and only 11 months--and have higher education than most. Our building is unhealthy and has old outdoor bathrooms, which need more cleaning. Faculty, staff and students deserve clean bathrooms. More M&O staff are needed. They do a good job with what they have. Attend to these issues before hiring more Dist management. Your goals will be achieved faster this way.</p>
<p>No. The Board of Trustees need to listen and hear what is being said with all bargaining table. I am not sure if in fact all sides are taken into consideration. Morale is low and rights are being violated.</p>
<p>Nonsense, if the Board was following the Mission Statement, we would be hiring faculty, not staff. Jim Moreno would not be posturing with the Unions so they would support him for County Supervisor.</p>
<p>Orange Coast College's mission statement is supported by a dedicated staff of Faculty, Administrators and classified, who put the students first and do their best to offer a quality educational experience . It is hard to see the Board of Trustees intent.</p>
<p>Out of touch.</p>
<p>Policies are outdated and out-of-touch. They are also either too vague when more guidance is really needed or too proscriptive in other areas, such as infringing upon academic and personal freedoms. Obviously the ACCJC recognized this.</p>
<p>Policies need to be reviewed and updated on a regular cycle</p>
<p>Policies need to be updated.</p>
<p>Quality and integrity of services/resources are not consistent with mission statement.</p>
<p>Resources necessary to support students is lacking the necessary personnel to provide quality service.</p>
<p>Right now, the colleges are being asked to quickly approve of Board policies that have hastily been revised by one of the Vice Chancellors--just to try to meet the accreditation deadlines. The revised policies seem to try to centralize decision making in the District rather than allowing the individual colleges in the District to do things differently. The Board policy on curriculum is one good example. Each college has its own curriculum process and should be allowed to continue instead of having the District dictate how we approve curriculum..</p>
<p>Since all 3 colleges got a warning about accreditation, it is my belief that some members of the Board of Trustees must be failing in their jobs. Each college is outstanding, and should not be facing possible loss of accreditation.</p>
<p>Support services and instructional support take a back seat to administration hires and raises. BOT have no clue to truth of what is occurring at campuses. Recommend BOT visit each campus and be available to employees to hear what is really going on, instead of relying on the administration "communication tree", which is not always honest about how things are going.</p>
<p>The board does not address a number of policies that need to be written.</p>
<p>The Board has failed to maintain and review policies.</p>
<p>The Board, largely due to one over "controlling" Board member gets in the way of ensuring quality, integrity and improvement of student learning programs - there is very little focus on establishing policies that can assist in ensuring excellence in teaching and ensuring the accountability of faculty in getting that job done. Although, we have many, many wonderful, fully dedicated and engaged full time faculty, it is a disgrace that there are still so many full time faculty members that are not held accountable to working a full 175 days a year for the tax payer paid salaries they earn. A full time faculty earns almost 3X what a part time faculty earns, and yet, many get away with working less than 100 days a year, even less than 80 days in some cases, piling up their classes on two days a week and then not participating on other days in college life or otherwise being available to students. The administrative</p>

capacity of this District has dropped to an unacceptably low level, and yet the Board resists the hiring of managers and put enormous pressure on colleges to reduce the number of VPs to only two. The bottom line is that teaching happens in the classroom, and the District needs the support of the Board to only hire and retain excellent faculty. The Board needs to support the negotiation of new contracts that ensure accountability and if they cannot be negotiated, the Board needs the resolve to take the process through Impasse.

The BOT establishes policies that it does not follow as documented in the latest citation from the accreditation body. The BOT ignored the prior to recommendations from the accreditation agency and this lead to the district being placed on warning status.

The BOT needs to focus much more (some members do already) on putting the needs of the good of students and quality education first; the teachers are the best ones to inform the BOT in this regard.

The district seems unwilling to follow the ed code, unwilling to follow the labor code and unwilling to correct grievous mistakes made in it's dealings with faculty and staff. The latest affront involves IT staff members reorganized in such a sloppy, unprofessional way, that formal complaints to state and federal labor agencies have had to undertaken just to get any recognition of mistakes on the part of District. With the very expensive Lipton and his business partner Patterson overseeing this fiasco, why did they not act to stop this travesty before it led to this? Probably due to the wonderful profit potential of several lawsuits taken against the District.

The lack of support for online instruction is one example of the disconnect between the campus and the district. We do not need more IT managers, we need more support for instruction and students.

The resources necessary to support them....is where i would disagree.

There are a number of Board Policies that enable the colleges to meet these objectives.

There are not enough full time faculty to properly support the students.

There is so much more that can be, and should be, done. Bigger leaps need to be entertained and taken; more focus on student success and resources and less on politics and "targeting" certain individuals that is allowed to go on. Great people have been lost while tyrants remained to the detriment of our institution due to Board action, or lack thereof.

This is something that the BOT and administrators at all the colleges should review. It appears that it is easy to forget that we are a community college district whose primary mission is three-pronged: CTE, basic skills, and transfer. Unfortunately, the emphasis is on the latter despite federal and state guidelines. It would be great to have a mandatory meeting for all managers where the mission statement is reviewed and discussed.

Uneasy about the quest for income generating ventures which center primarily on the internationalization of the campus. So blinded by these "opportunities" that are pushed by certain administrators that we have forsaken our integrity and cheated our in district students of the resources to support them. These "recruitment" ventures and impromptu site visits from international visitors are diversion and time drainer.

While administrative salaries and perks remain intact or grow, programs that support instruction and student learning are trimmed or eliminated.

While for the most part the policies of the Board are reasonable and consistent, there are instances where the Board has instituted or attempted to institute policies that are overly restrictive and micromanaging. Educational policies and those dealing with educational resources need to empower the faculty to excel and to innovate. They need to respect the academic freedom of the faculty and to trust that the faculty, as experts in their field and as professional educators, can also act independently to ensure the quality and integrity of the educational programs.

While the Board may feel that the policies are consistent with the mission statement, often what is needed to support student learning programs and services takes a back seat to other interests (financial, expediency, etc.)

Would work if personal agendas were left at the door.

Yeah, right.

12. Comments: The Board of Trustees has ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity.

<p>Educational quality - don't necessarily agree. Legal matters - yes. Financial integrity - needs improvement</p>
<p>Board of Trustee does adhere to the quality and legal matter and financial integrity.</p>
<p>Board Policies are outdated and need to be revised. Also, BOT need to be more connected to employees, not just administrators. BOT shouldn't depend on administrators and the unions to measure what is going on with employees.</p>
<p>BOT is missing opportunities to operate the district with more business efficiency and does not take advantage of all opportunities to increase revenue.</p>
<p>But what are kind of real accountability is there when the District office is top heavy with administrators who haven't seen a classroom in ages?</p>
<p>By law the BOT has the ultimate responsibility for educational quality, legal matters and financial integrity, the question is how well do they carry out that responsibility.</p>
<p>Current budget planning is top down and not tied to any form of Program Review or Comprehensive Planning.</p>
<p>Delegation problems. Tends to micro-manage.</p>
<p>Educational quality has been significantly undermined by top administrators. See # 7 and 21</p>
<p>Educational quality? All the district cares about is money and numbers.</p>
<p>Even the obvious is not attended to. Perhaps the Board does not have the correct and accurate information or even does not get the information at all to easily resolve some of these issues.</p>
<p>Financial Integrity is in question when classified take pay cuts while board members and other Administrators are getting raises.</p>
<p>I believe the BOT has overstepped into the day-to-day operations to the point where it is interfering with the ability of those who are responsible for educational quality to do their jobs effectively.</p>
<p>I believe they have tried to take on these responsibilities.</p>
<p>I believe this is legally correct.</p>
<p>I disagree on the matter of educational quality. I don't believe Board of Trustees should have (if they do have) ultimate responsibility for educational quality.</p>
<p>I don't see a question here. This is a fact, isn't it?</p>
<p>I don't see how the board feels they act with integrity when one of the board member's friend is responsible for the legal matters of the district and is paid an extreme amount of money for rarely doing anything. It is frustrating to know that the board approved raises for the Chancellor, Presidents and Vice Chancellor's while the rest of us took furlough days and one of the Vice Chancellors was delivering the news about furloughs yet getting an 8% raise.</p>
<p>I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.</p>
<p>I have not been with the district long enough to properly evaluate.</p>
<p>I think it can greatly improve on the financial integrity by being more transparent on how funds are being spent.</p>
<p>I think it would be prudent for Board members to visit various education programs and resources at each of the campuses to see what hand what is need to maintain the educational quality. It is very important for the Board to protect the District legally, but at the present time, the Board legal advisory appears to be running the Board, and often puts forth opinions that go beyond legality. The Budget of the Coast District is more complicated than it needs to be; Budgets from other community college districts are easier to understand and don't have hidden agendas.</p>
<p>I think that "financial integrity" was compromised when the Board decided to give the presidents of the three colleges and other senior management raises during the budget crisis.</p>

<p>If the Board is responsible for the implementation of legal matter in education, they should have acted on the recommendations by the ACCJC the first time and not caused the individual campuses to be placed on warning.</p>
<p>If the first responsibility is education, where are the faculty hires?</p>
<p>I'm not sure if this question is asking whether or not I believe the BOT has this responsibility, or whether or not I believe the BOT is doing a good job in this area.</p>
<p>I'm not sure what you are responsible for exactly. I don't think you are responsible for educational quality. That lies with the department and buck stops with the president IMO</p>
<p>In many instances I have relied on the opinions and the decision making processes of the district office and I have found their responses to be very helpful.</p>
<p>Integrity in all areas needs improvement.</p>
<p>Isn't this a statement of legal fact?</p>
<p>If you want to know whether they are performing this function well, I can speak to that. It seems difficult to hold BOT accountable for classroom performance but certainly they are accountable for the elements that contribute to good performance, such as offering enough classes, hiring enough full time faculty so we have office hours, adequate resources for shared governance, student activities and club advising, a relationship with our library, knowledge of campus resources, ability and energy to participate fully in campus activities. etc.</p>
<p>It is not my responsibility to be an expert on the distinction between the legal roles and responsibilities of a Chancellor and a Board of Trustees under the arcane regulations governing a Californian community college district. However, I find it appalling that the desire of an oversight body to emasculate the powers of democratically trustees has been used as a pretext for threatening the continuity of an outstanding institution of higher learning that has provided excellent value to its community for 65 years.</p>
<p>Lack of adequate pre-planning and collaboration</p>
<p>Legal matters cost way too much.</p>
<p>many of these additional projects that employees ask for do not help students. Funding for many projects does little to increase student success. Most of the funding goes to paying salary to employees, especially faculty who are charged extreme rates because they are working outside of contract/overload. These do little for students and the costs heavily outweigh the benefits to students.</p>
<p>More obvious leadership is needed in these areas.</p>
<p>Not quite sure how to respond to this. Certainly the Board of Trustees plays a critical role in all these matters and it would be technically correct to say that it is "ultimately" responsible -- but this is also a shared responsibility with the colleges.</p>
<p>Oversight is nearly non-existent, with Measure C decisions taking place in a vacuum, hermetically sealed off from public view. From an educational perspective, the District is on a wildly disorganized course of 'Consolidation' that directly impacts instruction, yet no faculty have been involved with the process of implementing this so-called 'reorganization'</p>
<p>See comment in #11, please.</p>
<p>Some of the campuses have better resources and facilities than others - giving an unequal educational advantage.</p>
<p>Some of the financial reports do not gel with the State evaluations of numbers. Why? Additionally, some legal matters are not dealt with appropriately by the legal counsel of the board, who is viewed as a costly impediment, and not well versed in some areas.</p>
<p>That is not a question; that is their mission.</p>
<p>The Accreditation Warnings are an obvious need for improvement.</p>
<p>The Board is interfering in the ability of the District and colleges to ensure a positive accreditation by not adequately delegating authority and resisting the recommendations of the ACCJC. Stop cow-towing to one rogue Board member.</p>

<p>The Board needs to ask more questions of management. It appears that often times management does not share "the whole story."</p>
<p>The Board relies too much on outside legal help to make decisions.</p>
<p>The BOT' responsibility is to set strategic direction and overall polices for the good of the community and students. The operations of the district and the college should be left to the Chancellor and the Presidents</p>
<p>The CCCD reputation has been going down hill in the past few years and legal costs seem to be rising way above where they were in the past.</p>
<p>The District has been stable and financially secure.</p>
<p>The process is too slow</p>
<p>There is a conflict-of-interest on all legal matters.</p>
<p>They are elected to represent the areas they are from so that their interests are considered in the administrations decisions. The "ultimate responsibility" for the educational quality, legal matters and financial integrity should be in the hands of those trained in those things, hired, and paid a lot of money to carry out those functions. Again, not the Board's purview.</p>
<p>they are re-elected incumbents. the public as a whole have no idea who they are or what they do. unless one member has a news article written about the others. then the public has an idea of who they are? they are rubber stamps that don't know it? how could they delegate everything to the Chancellor and still be "ultimately responsible?"</p>
<p>They may have responsibility -- but they fail to act with integrity. For example, intentionally going into stabilization was not only stupid, it was completely and utterly unethical.</p>
<p>They might have this responsibility, but I do not think they are using it appropriately. The educational quality " since I have been in this district it has always been an issue for the students to get Math and English classes yet we have never focused on how to provide more for the student. These are the classes the students need to transfer and if they cannot get them from this district they will go elsewhere. Legal matters " I do not see where it is not a conflict of interest to have a lawyer or law firm associated with one of the board members. It looks like the good old boys club is doing favors for someone they know. Financial integrity " I do not understand why we have a lawyer at each board meeting this sound very expensive to have him hang around while things are being discussed that do not employ his abilities and a poor use of funds when the district is in a financial disaster. If something at a board meeting needs legal advice then the board should hold it for the next meeting and get the advice of legal between meetings. Again I see this as the good old boys club help their own make more money. I do not see where the board gets off approving furlough days in 2012-2013 and not making the district stick with the MOU they wrote and approved. Every year this district states that it is in a financial crisis, but at the end of each fiscal year there is always left over funds and we have one of the biggest reserves of many of the community colleges in California. The board may think that it is doing the employees a favor by giving the furlough day's monies back, but while the furlough days were happening employees were falling behind on bills taking out loans to cover their bills and where is the interest the district obtain off of our funds while we were paying more to sustain our current life style. The cost of living has gone up every year in California yet employees of this district gave everything they could during the financial situation the district was going through only to have more taken from them with the furlough days. The employees of this district have not seen a rise in 5 or 6 years yet we are expected to keep giving with no incentives and while administrators and board members were getting raises. The board is over the administrators and you need to ensure they are acting for the best interest of the district. For most of the administrators this is a stepping stone to something better while your staff and faculty are here for the long haul to better the student experience and ensure the best working situation.</p>
<p>This is a difficult assessment without definition of terms - and I think this is what the current board is struggling with Central to this question is a determination about the term ultimate authority - (1) If ultimate responsibility means that the Board establishes policies to assure educational quality, legal matters, and financial integrity and, (2)</p>

<p>delegates full responsibility and authority to him/her to implement and administer board policies without board interference and holds him/her accountable.</p>
<p>Clearly there are differences of opinion - and until this is resolved I think the District will continue to face challenges and unrest.</p>
<p>This is not a question that is answered good or otherwise. It is a statement of fact. They do not as a whole respect this.</p>
<p>this is really a true or false question do you think that question alone is a good example of what's wrong with you guys</p>
<p>This is the ultimate responsibility of the BOT, but they just are not that good at accomplishing this as a body.</p>
<p>This isn't a statement that can be called "Outstanding" or "Unacceptable". If this is the case, then the board has a lot to answer for. It seems backwards to me that the BoT has all of the responsibility, as they don't manage on a daily basis. In fact, they should NOT have ultimate responsibility for education quality: it should be placed on the Deans or, at worst, a college president because they manage the education at the level of delivery.</p>
<p>This question doesn't ask if they are performing up to their responsibility.</p>
<p>This statement is true, but the Board itself does not always seem to act in a manner consistent with its intent. For example, in financial matters, the Board is to reactive rather than proactive. In the fiscal crisis from 2008 to 2012, earlier action could have reduced the impact of the financial problems. Many of us at the local level were baffled at the policies coming out of the district at the time, which seemed to ignore the looming fiscal realities. Part of the blame lies with the Board's choice of chancellors, which have been particularly poor (in my opinion). The current chancellor, for example, seems to have almost no understanding of higher education or the policies of education in California. The Board acts through its agent, the chancellor. If the Boards wishes to live up to its obligations (its ultimate responsibility) then it must begin choosing better agents through which it can steward these responsibilities.</p>
<p>To me this is a yes-or-no answer. The Board either has ultimate responsibility or it does not. I think it does. But that includes, of course, the responsibility to seek and contemplate the counsel of the appropriate personnel, which of course includes those who are doing the teaching as well as members of the legal and accounting professions.</p>
<p>We are not getting the direction or support needed to do our jobs</p>
<p>We spend an exorbitant amount of money on legal fees which are unnecessary when we have someone in house who can provide the same information as a paid employee of the District with a license to practice law. We don't 'need' a District counsel for commas and punctuation correction.</p>
<p>why are spending so much money on outside legal counsel each year? Appears to be fiscally irresponsible and even a conflict of interests.</p>
<p>Would this were true. And when the institution is threatened from lack of leadership, responsibility, quality, integrity, what is the direct consequence for a job poorly done? Better if the Board of Trustees and District administrators jobs and top-heavy salaries be tied to directly to performance.</p>
<p>You don't have a clue what is going on in the classroom.</p>

13. Comments: The Board of Trustees acts in a manner consistent with its policies and bylaws.

Current BOT are perceived as politicians, not leaders in educational policy development.
Mostly this is so - but there are instances where this is not the case and these are at times troublesome.
"Do as I say, not as I do!" Yep, that's about it! "it's good to be king." you get to do whatever you want. when you want.
... In regards to the recent Accreditation.....this has not been the case..... some BOTs have not cooperated. SAD They are not above the LAW!
Already gave example in previous question that the BOT's continues to act in direct conflict with its own policies and bylaws.
BOT policies and bylaws need to review and updates with input from all district employees.
Considering the near nepotistic nature of the relationship of Lipton to the district, one must wonder what other, far more sinister arrangements exist. Only a deep audit would expose this. The prognosis is not good.
Everything acts in its own interests according to its own policies. What does this really mean to me or anyone else when they are looking at the board and what they do?
Hypocritical to expect compliance with Board policies and not accept accountability by an accrediting agency.
I do not know enough to comment.
I have heard they didn't quite fulfill some obligations and this deficiency has harmed our accreditation, for the second time. As someone who worked far too many hours to absorb SLO information and demands, create necessary structures, and assess all classes for an entire department, I feel gravely disappointed that I worried and worked so much while the BOT apparently did not.
I have never had the impression that any board member acted improperly or unethically.
I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.
I rated this as "good" due to the recent improvements. Under the leadership of Dr. Prinsky, I believe the board has been operating more consistently and appropriately.
I waver between "unacceptable" and "unable to evaluate." Based on the recent ACCJC visit, it's evident that the CCCD policies and bylaws are incomplete. The District and BOT have done little to no work to address this long-standing issue.
If they don't follow their own policies, they cannot act in a consistent manner.
If you do not know what the policies and bylaws are or how the Board works, because there is no transparency, then this question is difficult to impossible to rate.
I'm not aware of evidence to the contrary.
Needs more work. Again, the Board of Trustees is not taking into considering of all sides. The Chancellor are telling only half truth and the Board of Trustees need to stop using the Chancellor as the only resource. This is a school. Not a business operation.
Needs much improvement. Policies and bylaws are not kept consistent when they become inconvenient.
New policies being put in place are unclear, it appears the Board is unsure of the meaning of their new policies and the far reaching affects of implementing them. For example Part Time Faculty and Part Time employees. I think more review needs to go into the intent of the rule.
no, too much outside influence, decisions show a lack of understanding and integrity
Nonsense, the Board behaves like a bunch of oligarchs who see the District as their personal fiefdom.
not according to the accreditation evaluators.
Not always.
Not in a position to evaluate this.

Obviously they do not as delineated in the latest accreditation report.
Policies and procedures do not jive with day to day operations in the district.
Refer to District Recommendation 2 from the ACCJC warning letter
Some members do, some do not.
Someone needs to reign in Patterson.
The accreditation committee has answered this one correctly.
The board does not adhere to it's own policies and bylaws.
The Board interfered with the writing of the accreditation report by demanding changes in the language and content.
The Board of Trustees is only consistent in the fact that I know the Board will be split 3/2 in most votes; but at least now it is with a conscience.
The bylaws are out of date and many need to be improved with much more faculty staff and student input.
The polcies are so out of date and poorly handled, who can tell?
There is a lack of ethical behavior by one overly-influential, rogue, Board member who seems to operate from a personal agenda with a "do as I say, not as I do" approach. By calling others unethical, he seems to be trying to divert attention from his own unethical behavior which detracts from the image and integrity of the rest of the Board. Some of the finest individuals I have ever known serve or have served as administrators at this District and have been driven away from the District due to lack of support for administrators and lack of ethical behavior by a Board member - the breaches of confidences, libelous statements and actions etc.
There is a lack of follow thru of District Policies, etc. It starts at the top with perhaps a lack of understanding, knowledge of issues, etc. but filters down to the lower levels where things are a mess and getting worse.
They don't even HAVE a a set of policies that is acceptable to accreditation.
They may act in consistent with policies and bylaws, but these policies and bylaws have to many loop holes for them to work around.
To me, doing so is just doing one's job. As far as I can tell, the Board is following its own policies. But not having read the bylaws, I am not in a position to judge "outstanding." So I probably should have selected "unable to evaluate." Sorry. . .
What policies and bylaws? They are outdated and nonsensical.
Whatever. The captain of the Titanic was following his policies and bylaws as he hit the iceberg

14. Comments: The Board of Trustees regularly evaluates its policies and practices and revises them as necessary.

"Self improvement" initiatives by persons who are motivated by self interest and are guarding their positions is laughable.
Actually, the Board hires expensive consultants to do this, than rubber stamps what ever recs are made.
Although the board is taking action to update the district policies as a result of the ACCJC recommendations, they have not been regularly updated (some of them have revision dates from the 1980s).
Amount of paperwork needed to accomplish essential tasks is a little much. Most items should be created online in this day and age.
Ancient Board policies need updating.
Appears to have set timelines but does not meet them.
As long as this does not take up too much of the regular business time.
As noted in the ACCJC recommendations to the District.
As noted in the recent accreditation reports.
Board sent out other surveys which do not even provide the rationale for the changes.
Clearly this is not true, since they have been put on warning for their failure to keep policies up to date, even after previous warnings.
Clearly this needs improvement as recognized by the accreditation report.
Current Board policies are old, outdated, and in need of rewriting.
Didn't the ACCJC say that the Board is behind on their evaluation of policies and practices?
Goes through the motions only.
I don't believe I've heard of an evaluation process regarding policies & practices completed by the Trustees.
I have heard discussion of self-evaluations and policy reviews during Board of Trustee Meetings.
I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.
It is not my responsibility to monitor the frequency nor the efficacy of the Coast Colleges' Board's self-evaluations.
I understand that a process will be put in place once all Board policies and procedures have been revised or written.
If they do regularly evaluate its policies and practices it does not show because it seem if they revise these for something that happened with a past board member they leave loop holes for themselves.
It would appear that they do not since it is an accreditation finding for the college.
Jack Lipton is too involved. The administrators are hired to make decisions, write up reports and Board items but now they ask Mr. Lipton.
Just ask ACCJC.
Making progress, however in order to comply they have adopted a very aggressive time schedule that does not allow for thoughtful deliberation or the ability to cross check one policy against the changes in another. It is understandable, because of the changes in the Board office, that did cause some unavoidable delays.
More time needs to be spent updating policies.
Most policies have not be reviewed or updated in at least 10 years. A cycle needs to be put into place for annual policy reviews.
My understanding is that the Board has not done this, this is one of the problems pointed out by the Accred team.
Needs to seek more direct input on CCD policies dealing with Sexual Harassment and Discrimination.
No meet more times per year and work to update policies and then hold people accountable for them.
No! We would not be in the hot water we are in with the ACCJC if this was true. Thank you district.

No, the Board has not been regularly evaluating its policies and procedures. That is one of the reasons why the colleges received warnings from ACCJC and why there is now a big push to get the recently revised policies and procedures pushed through in a careless and hasty manner..
NO. We constantly come across confusing and/or missing policies related to every area of instruction. The BoT should be looking into their policies all the time. Also, the Accreditation team directly addressed the BoT's shortcomings in this area. Clearly, this is a widespread opinion.
Not aware that this is done based on comments from campus working groups and committees. Frustrated that campuses are not able to process needed policies for students when BOT doesn't have district policy done. Who is at fault, chancellor?
Not in a position to evaluate this - but am very glad that you sent this survey - wish this would happen more often.
Note recommendations from the last two accreditation cycles. The board has ignored the recommendations and chooses to fight the commission and department of education.
Only if they can benefit from it.
Our policies and practices are substantially out of sync with state requirements
Read the 2007 recommendations from the ACCJC. Has the Board of Trustees followed those recommendations? Have the policies and procedures been revised?
The accreditation committee has answered this one correctly.
The Board is split in many ways - too many to list in this brief space, but it can be safely said that this board will never be a cohesive whole, with student success as it's primary goal.
The procedural areas need to be updated. In addition, there are areas within the Ed. Code that rely on policies that have never been established. The board should survey all areas that need to rely on board policies. If some do not exist, they should be written.
There appears to be a considerable backlog of outdated policies and procedures. The Board is currently working to bring these up to date and should be commended for this.
There is currently an effort being made to do this very thing. It appears the process is very slow and may not meet the deadlines required for accreditation.
There should be more vetting with the public and District employees in regards to these policies, and these should be done with sufficient time for vetting.
They don't follow their own policies. The accreditation team in 2007 and 2013 clearly stated an unacceptable pattern of behavior.
They ignore the responsibility even after they have been repeatedly told they must attend to it.
They may do this BUT then they need to follow them.
They only revise and evaluate policies and procedures to gain more control over the District.
They say they do. they keep changing things.
They seem to be behind the times and cannot come to consensus when they need to act.
This area needs to be IMMEDIATELY attended to, or the colleges will not be removed from warning since the Board also received this recommendation in 2007.
This is based on the accreditation report. Plus I feel as if you are asking for our input on these policies--but you may ignore our input and are just doing it to say you are doing it. I say this because I have been on a few of the district wide faculty committees to give input---and our input was ignored.
We are on warning because this has not been done! Refer to District Rec 4 from the ACCJC warning letter.
We would know if they did.....we hear at negotiations.....interpretation of policy gets fuzzy.
Well...perhaps these need to be systematically reviewed.
you all really need to have more real world input to get the proper actions that will be of value to all of us as a whole.

15. Comments: The Board of Trustees 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.

BOT is perceived as business as usual. No new insights or goals identified and met seen from this group when new members are voted in.
Can't fully evaluate because Board Retreats are held off site and people are discouraged from attending.
Does it?
During a recent election a current board member ran unchallenged. I think the Board members should be asking why?
From the outside it appears that it is always the same people with the same OLD ideas. We need some fresh and new perspectives.
Gerrymandering of the current board was rather blatant, with one board member providing a huge level of campaign funds to help elect a board member that would be closely aligned with Patterson and his ilk. The current split on the board is due to this clear political manipulation.
I am unaware of this existing.
I am unaware of this program.
I have confusion about how to participate. Or perhaps with my other jobs, I am not able to attend orientations. I seem to find out about them after they have already happened.
I have never heard of this at my level of employment within this District.
I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.
I think that in some areas there is mentoring and training for new Board members. However, in the matter of participatory governance, it appears that more training is needed.
I would think this is in place and functioning but I don't know. Board Members are insular and want to remain in office. Getting re-elected appears to be important.
I'm unfamiliar with the content of this question and therefore unable to evaluate.
It is not my responsibility to have knowledge of the Coast Colleges' Board's professional development practices, nor do I have a need to know about its new member orientation.
Needs lots of work
Not in a position to evaluate board development orientation. Glad there are staggered terms of office.
Really? they don't choose what year they are up for re-election. i know of at least one going to training to learn to be a member. i know of at least one who didn't learn anything if he was trained. it is good, if it's true. is it true?
The Board of Trustees rewrites this every year to ensure that the President is handed off to one of the Board members who has a better bullying system over the other board members. The limit of service should not exceed two terms. Our Board of Trustees like our Federal and State Government employees stay long after they are effective leaders and in touch with what is needed versus what they personally need to gain from being a member of the Board of Trustees.
There definitely has been "continuity of board membership" but many are not sure if that's such a good thing.
They need to institute term limits.
Very little community outreach.
What did you say? What is a mechanism, is that a can opener? You told me nothing.
While I can't comment on orientation and development, continuity of membership is part of the problem. Elected officials in these types of positions are not elected by people who research them. We all know that names that are familiar are often chosen on a ballot simply because they are familiar.
Yes it is nice to see Board Members at various events.

16. Comments: The Board of Trustees' self-evaluation processes for assessing board performance are clearly defined, implemented, and published in its policies or bylaws.

Having an opportunity to complete this survey is certainly a step in the right direction for this Board. Hopefully, the comments submitted by District staff will be taken seriously.
Are they also in accordance to accreditation? The board of trustees may have their own policies; yet most of them do not help the schools comply with accreditation.
Are you joking? Its a bunch of arrogant people who don't know what is going on, making decisions they are not competent to make, and looking out to cover their own rears.
Get counseling as a group. Be nice to one another. Find new legal resources. When three hundred people show up to protest a BOT action, do not publicly dismiss their complaints.
have you been to a meeting? self-evaluation of politicians by politicians is an interesting idea. Are points given for NPD?
I am unaware of their self-evaluation process; but considering they continue to run for office - they are out of touch with their performance.
I applaud this new effort to gather input.
I believe this is the first survey that the BOT has sent out to constituents. This is necessary for a better assessment.
I believe this is true.
I do see that this is the start of the Board beginning to actually evaluate themselves. I will be interested in seeing what the results will be in a Board Meeting and if the Board will follow through.
I don't have any idea how this is done, except with this survey.
I don't know if there is a system for self-evaluation, but I think more emphasis should be put on outside independent reviews of performance.
I have found the Board Policy published. I am unclear on how well implemented the processes are.
I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.
I have not looked into this.
I was not aware there was a self-evaluation process. Do we have access to see the self evaluation and results of the Board performance?
My understanding is that self-evaluation processes need to be improved.
Need to be more transparent.
never seen any indication of self evaluation by board
No information
No. This needs updating. It is unclear and not transparent. Hello ACCJC.
Not at all. I was at an Academic Senate meeting just this afternoon, and not a single person there thought there were even self-evaluation measures in place, let alone that they were being used.
Not available to the public??? not aware. Transparency is not their strong point.
Not in a position to evaluate this. It would be good to have a copy of the policies and bylaws.
OK so why did you tell me this?
Probably, but I don't know. . .
Refer to District recommendation 3 from the ACCJC warning letter...
So glad to see that a 360 survey is being done. That shows a real attempt to be educated and make changes.
Self-evaluation needs to be one of several tools for evaluation.
I applaud the BOT for getting additional input
Sometimes the BOT plays too much politics.

The accreditation committee has answered this one correctly.
The board has NEVER self evaluated. This questionnaire is the first of it's kind.
The Board needs to follow its own procedures. This survey is a step in the right direction.
The Board's self evaluation policies and processes are scheduled to be defined, implemented and published by spring.
The BOT does not do a good job of evaluating themselves. The letter that went out to the ACCJC is a perfect example of how unprofessional and how immature the BOT is.
The new process is a great improvement and I congratulate the Board for its initiative. Yet to be seen if it will lead to any long lasting changes.
The survey instrument is only being sent out due to the findings of the accreditation team.
The wolves guarding the hen house.
There is an effort and there are good board members, but until they cut out the cancer amongst them, their efforts to self monitor are largely ineffective.
This is a first.
This is outstanding if this continues to come to every employee, but if they are evaluating themselves I see the same old boys club continuing to do as they please.
This is the first survey I have been asked to complete. It's easy to self evaluate it's hard hearing what others might be saying.
This is the first survey regarding the board that I have seen during my employment at the District. If one was done prior, it was not given to all employees. If there is a self-evaluation process, I am not aware.
This is the first time I have seen such an evaluation. I believe in the past the Board self-evaluated. This is a step in the right direction.
This is the first time in more than a decade that I remember receiving such a survey. Faculty, staff, students, and community members should be evaluated on an annual basis of such matters.
This is the first time is has been clear.
This is the first time they have made themselves available to their clients.
This step of getting campus-based feedback has been a missing element to the self evaluation. I applaud the board for doing this and hope that this will be a continued part of their evaluation.
This survey is a great start, but this needs to be regularly done.
This survey is an example of improving the process - as is the revision of the policy and procedure itself
This was not done as per policy, according to the accreditation report.
What a joke!
While I have not been on long enough to give a full evaluation I think this survey reflects positively on the boards self evaluation process.

17. Comments: The Board of Trustees has a code of ethics that includes a clearly defined policy for dealing with behavior that violates its code.

again how could this even be answered when those of us working have no idea of the codes and conduct you operate in. what are your standards this might help us
As documented by Trustee Patterson's letter, Howald, Ruiz, and others should have been taken to task.
Clear unethical actions by one board members have not been effectively dealt with.
Clearly they believe themselves above any requirement to act ethically.
Does Trustee Patterson know there is a code of ethics?
Ethical behavior by some Trustees is questionable.
From what I've learned, you've done a fine job of cleaning up the criminality of the past. Kudos to you!
Has anyone considered the relationships between Trustees and vendors? Trustee Patterson and Trustee Moreno seem to have several conflicts.
Historically, problem administrators have been promoted because it is too expensive to remove them.
I am unaware of a BOT code of ethics.
I believe this is true.
I do not have knowledge of the Coast Colleges' Board of Trustees code of conduct.
I don't know the specifics of the "code of ethics" but clearly it needs another look.
I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.
I have read the poicy and it appears to cover the topic completely.
I suggest you print the code of ethics with this question.
It does appear that the legal counsel having ties to a board member is troubling in regards to this question.
I was not able to locate information on the District website on the topics of behavior or code of ethics. The search function on the District website needs improvement. It is generally impossible to locate even the simplest things using the search feature.
If they do, we wouldn't know about it. Again, not something that campus faculty would be able to readily obtain.
It has a code of ethics but do they deal with behavior when it is violated - not well.
Maybe it is not ethics, but some trustees are very rude and treat each other very poorly. That behaviors are examples for the whole district and now it is okay to treat each other disrespectfully.
NEEDS ADJUNCT IMPUT
no, needs improvement
OK since the double-dipper departed.
Really, than how did Armando escape censorship for so long?
Recently a board member violated that code (in many faculty opinions)
Recently updated and is intended to resolve some of the issues, so it will be interesting to see it through a full cycle. recently their have been some events that may have called for stronger action by the board - however I have high hopes that the Board will model for us all a higher standard of ethical behavior.
Should be more clearly advertised to employees.
Since the board continues to waste money on shaky construction projects and questionable legal advice, one must conclude that ethics take aback seat.
The board expects employees to adhere to codes of ethics while ignoring them.
The Board is not transparent in many issues, including the code of ethics.
The Board may have a policy, but members use their position for political gain.

<p>The issues that were outlined in the letter that was sent to the ACCJC by Trustee Patterson, clearly shows how their is a non-existent code of ethics that applies to those in power. There are too many things that our own BOT have gotten away with.</p>
<p>Then the board needs to use it</p>
<p>There doesn't appear to be ~ and another issue that has not filtered down and thru upper to mid level management.</p>
<p>There is likely a policy, no sanctions have occurred.</p>
<p>There is room fro improvement</p>
<p>There is some knowledge of hiring practices and awarding contracts that are clearly legal, but questionable.</p>
<p>They do not deal with aberrant behavior.</p>
<p>This is a matter of contention with the board and has been discussed at board meetings in August and September. The revised code should be published for all and should be reflective of all policies regarding ethics for all groups.</p>
<p>Though there is a district policy about nepotism, it was not enforced with regards to BOT.</p>
<p>Three out of five of the Board of Trustees must not truly understand the code of ethics. Calling each other out for violations when they perform the same actions without a blink of an eye. I don't believe that any BOT member should be meeting unilaterally with any union president or constituency group. That can only be construed as self serving. They should be setting the example not avoiding the spotlight when it is shining directly upon them.</p>
<p>Why do I care? Give me some connection or meaning.</p>
<p>Yes they do, and they ignore it from time to time.</p>
<p>Yes.</p>
<p>Your kidding right? The college is like a small city, some of the students have issues and some of the employees have issues. This is to be expected with a workplace of this size. Where is the clearly defined policy posted? Who enforces the clearly defined policy?</p>

18. Comments: The Board of Trustees is informed about and involved in the accreditation process.

<p>Significant progress during this accreditation cycle. Still things to be worked out - but clearly the board has been informed and involved. Again everyone will have a better idea, after we complete our progress report and have a visit.</p>
<p>Absolutely not informed to the perceptions of a warning to the community, future students, potential new hires. After the site visit team's public meeting one trustee told me - "this is ok because they can't un-accredit the District " that was such a naive statement. At that time he seemed to have no idea that not following up on the District recommendations would hurt the campuses!</p>
<p>Again, I refer back to the 'dueling letters' by the majority of the board, vs. Patterson and his one supporter, Moreno. These two, along with Lipton have seriously damaged the District, and may lead to serious problems.</p>
<p>All three colleges keep Board of Trustees in the loop. The Board of Trustees need to be more proactive in the accreditation process and help the schools.</p>
<p>As described previously, most of us worked our behinds off in an hysterical frenzy in response to the last accreditation, yet it was all for naught because the BOT didn't take it as seriously as the faculty and staff did.</p>
<p>Being involved in the process should not include having sections of the accreditation report dictated; the colleges should be able to each view the Board independently.</p>
<p>But the actions of one Board member is hampering the District's ability to comply with ACCJC standards.</p>
<p>By most accounts at the moment, our accreditation has been jeopardized by the failures of the Board itself. Apparently there were findings in the 2007 accreditation regarding the outdated nature of policies and procedures at the Board and district level. The finding required the review and updating of policies and procedures. It appears that no action was taken on this finding, and therefore we now find ourselves in jeopardy. The Board needs to ask itself "how could this have happened? Have we failed in our fiduciary duty?"</p>
<p>currently, my opinion is, they are seen as confrontational with/by the accreditation officials. but that's just one person's opinion. time will tell.</p>
<p>Even though they caused the district to be on warning? Informed about and involved in , but, not very well.</p>
<p>I am concerned that the Board was cited in the last two accreditation studies and has made no attempt to remedy the citation.</p>
<p>I believe that the letter that Mr. Patterson wrote to the Accreditation Committee was highly inappropriate and shows a great lack of understanding on his part of what his role on the Board should be. It appears very self serving, and not as serving of the public.</p>
<p>I believe they should be informed; but should NOT be involved since we are in this mess due to their over reaching authority and their insisting that individuals involved in the process follow their lead and not provide honest answers to the accreditation committee.</p>
<p>I don't believe that the BOT is very informed about the urgency and weight that these important accreditation matters have, since they have not taken care of any. The BOT has several employees that report directly to them. No other college in the state has this!</p>
<p>I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.</p>
<p>I think it is the Board of Trustees, and not the performance of any of the colleges, that is endangering our accreditation.</p>
<p>I think it needs to be abundantly pointed out the colleges get accredited not the district. The support (fiscal, personnel and otherwise) needs to be directed at the colleges not at district. I can tell you that this is not what the impression is at the colleges. We desperately need more faculty (to do things like run departments and write accreditation reports) there is a complete lack of this kind of support at district. In fact all that has been seen (from BOT agendas) is an increase in administrator etc hiring at district. Unacceptable!</p>
<p>I think the BOT has been slow in implementing and understanding the accreditation process. I would say the same about the District Administration.</p>

If involvement means living up to what is expected of them, they have failed over the past 6+ years for not creating and implementing the findings from the accreditation body.
If the Board had been informed and involved in the accreditation process, the colleges would not have been placed on warning or had additional items added to their repetitive warnings.
If they were, district would not have been warned AGAIN, especially with what BOT is NOT doing.
If they were, they would have acted well before now.
I'm unsure if the Board is actually receiving accurate and full information.
In my mind, this is the worst offense. If the BoT was more informed about and involved in the accreditation process, the colleges would not be shouldering the burden of their obvious shortcomings and/or failures.
It is common knowledge that the BOT did not follow through with its obligation to work on the previous accreditation visit recommendations. As a result of this, we are once again on accreditation warning. As we all know, this is bad for the District overall. Even people who are not part of the surrounding area are well aware of this, to our detriment.
It is informed but not involved
It was extremely demoralizing for the campuses to work so hard, and then have the warning issued because the district failed to do its part. The district should be leading by example. Another example of the disconnect between the district and the campuses.
It's involved, but unresponsive to district recommendations cited by ACCJC
Most of them are fully aware and involved, in my opinion. However, Trustee Patterson certainly gave us a black eye!
My sense is that the Board was merely asked to "sign-off" on accreditation reports once those reports were completed.
My understanding is that the Board did not address or correct the items for improvement from previous Accreditation visits. I understand the District does not have to be Accredited does the district understand we do?
My understanding is the Board has been warned more than once about some of its own issues effecting accreditation.
Now the BOT needs to do their part to keep our district colleges accredited.
Obviously false since they failed to act on previous warnings and have put the entire district at risk.
ok
Probation
Stop micro management of the 3 schools. Stick to what you are suppose to do.
The accreditation process is problematic, so the Board isn't completely at fault for it.
The areas that have been addressed by the accrediting body include the district; these should have been paid attention to.
The Board Accreditation Committee was a step in the right direction. The District agreed-upon format that "each of the colleges would write identical text for Standard 4, but each could write its own evaluation" was, in the end, not honored, and the visiting team made note that Coastline's Standard 4 was written in a "guarded tone." The District/Board's dictating what should be written in a college self study was the "wrong" type of Board involvement. And in my opinion, it was not an honest self evaluation, which is the purpose of a self-study.
The Board and Board interfered with the college self evaluation reports and attempted to alter and change content.
The Board could be more effective at conveying a sense of urgency and concern about the current accreditation status of the Coast Colleges.
The board ignores recommendations from the accrediting body.
The board is slow to move on things.
The board's subcommittee on accreditation has shown the college's the support and respect the board has for the

process. One area of improvement may be how board feedback is included in the reports - as advisory or mandated?

The BOT has proven that it is a hindrance to the accreditation process as demonstrated by the non-compliances in the latest report.

The involvement of sending a letter by an individual board member regarding his displeasure with the process is so obviously unacceptable that I am still incredulous that this happened.

The lack of knowledge about the 2008 report on OCC is incredible! Hopefully they are better engaged.

The letter was embarrassing.

The two female Board members are following up with the necessary reports to address accreditation concerns. The other Board members have not shown this level of commitment to a positive accreditation outcome.

They are involved in the wrong way. Any problems with accreditation should be laid at their feet.

This is an area that was identified in the accreditation process.

To some extent, and this survey is a good start, as well as some of the study sessions of this summer.

Tries to be overly influential

We made every effort to make the Board understand accreditation issues and got nowhere. Findings reflect this clearly.

We saw from this last accreditation.....that this is not the case. BOT should be involved in serving on a steering committee to assure all campuses and district are working together...where needed.

Well, I know you're informed about the process. I don't know how involved you are. I do remember that one year a few of us lodged a few carefully considered complaints about the GWC president, and the evaluators, though they were polite to us and seemed concerned, in their report wrote up nothing that we had said. So if you don't get such comments from the accreditation committee, I don't know to what depth you can be informed about some of the factors that are significant.

While the Board was involved in the accreditation process, it micro-managed what was written about them. The colleges are accredited not the Board. The colleges needs the freedom to write whatever they deem appropriate in their own self study.

While the BOT may be informed and "involved" in the accreditation process, the perception is that they are actually clueless.

Why would that be? What is their background and training in those issues? What is their intimate knowledge of the campuses and all the changes going on in higher education?

With the accreditation, I am not sure why the Board has not followed up on the recommendations from years past. I believe the Board is aware of the process.

19. Comments: The Board of Trustees adheres to a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the Chancellor.

I believe that they have hired Chancellor's in the past couple of years with the intention that they would be able to have authority over them. Not for the best interest of the District or our Campus Community.
See comments below relative to general discriminatory hiring practices within this District. It is not uncommon, for example, to spend money to do "nationwide searches" to put, for example, the acting CCCD person into the position. Just another area of fiscal irresponsibility.
Again, in the past the BOT has not followed its own policy on Chancellor's evaluation.
Although a policy exists, it does not appear to be consistent with the needs and goals of the District and colleges. Many people throughout the District are very unhappy with the current Chancellor. His tenure has been marked by accreditation warnings and lack of progress,
Apparently, since the Board voted to extend the Chancellor's contract knowing about discontent related to the IT reorganization and the hostile environment created for employees.
Be that as it may, the Board hired another boner, what does he do except fly around, show up for photo ops, and try to turn the District into a for-profit model?
BOT renewed contract for 4 more years with what input? Not the districts....
Evaluating the Chancellor needs to be re-visited because many people who work here for many years are not pleased with the performance and where this District is heading.
Good process.
great job! And if the Chancellor does not comply with the wishes of the Board we get a new one. they see to it.
I am not aware of a policy that is defined.
I believe their could be improvement in the selection process of the Chancellor as well as Vice Chancellor and President positions.
I do feel as if our current Chancellor is doing an outstanding job, but I cannot say whether that is because of the Board's influence.
I don't believe this is happening to ensure the quality of the chancellor and vice-chancellor.
I don't know the details about the policy for selection, but it's results have been very poor for at least the last three chancellors.
I don't know what the policy is, but hiring from inside would have been better, especially in these difficult times. As a community member and employee, it would be good if I knew what that "clearly defined policy" was.
I have no information about what the Board does to evaluate Dr Jones.
I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation.
I have not witnessed the process.
I put "Needs Improvement" not because of the policy but because of what I hear about the way the person chosen seems to be working out, and I don't know if you're working to improve the situation--maybe you are. You sure got rid of KY in a hurry!
I would say that it appears that the selection process for a Chancellor does not seem to be effective.
I'm not convinced that this chancellor was a good choice. The actions he's taken so far convince me that he is more concerned with building his own reputation than in doing what is best for the District. The BOT's selection & evaluation policy seems to have been very flawed.
It is my understanding that this is under review and new policies are being developed.
Our current Chancellor is doing a lousy job. Should have picked a president of one of the colleges in the district, as has been done so often in the past, and with good results.
Our district has a reputation for a revolving door in the Chancellor's Office. We need to assess how we continually

hiring individuals not compatible with our culture.
That does not show in your current selection.
The board can't find good administrators.
The Chancellor has been a complete disappointment in every way. He has also failed as a Chancellor at other schools in the past. If the BOT had a policy for selecting the Chancellor, it failed. If they have a policy for evaluating him, we hope to see results in the near future.
The chancellor needs to be re-evaluated.
The entire unit should be held to a higher standard, both Board Members and the Chancellor need to have more detailed and transparent evaluation.
The fact that in a national search, the best chancellor that could be found was the president of coastline says that "no," they are not adhering to the selection and evaluation process.
The fact that our Chancellor receives extra funds for housing and transportation is absolutely unacceptable and a slap in the face to the rest of us who choose to live and work in So. Calif. (which is obviously expensive compared to many parts of the country). I prefer we hire a Chancellor who does not have to be financially subsidized in order to be committed to working in our area.
The faculty desperately need to vet any future Chancellors, as this role is incredibly important. There needs to be public forums for faculty to ask questions of the final candidates, and then provide feedback to the committee who selects the next Chancellor.
The procedure for selection is fine but why do we keep ending up with chancellors who want to privatize or monetize our public community college?
This needs lots of work
To the best of my knowledge.
We have had some excellent Chancellors, including the one we have now. But the perception is that the Board has had a lot to do with the loss of the really good leaders. It's unknown whether that is a result of the evaluation criteria or because the Board's control is out of bounds and they limit the leadership's ability to function effectively.
We need to seek our outstanding candidates that KNOW California and it's history....mission.... and policy....california culture (would help).
What is that policy? It certainly is not transparent. Faculty are not happy with the chancellor. He is rude. He patronizes people. He is such a progressive thinker that most people cannot relate to his "dreams" and circular one-sided dialogue. What happened to the district-wide community education task force? He disbanded it because HE wanted to and he was dishonest throughout the entire process. What has he done about creating the MOOC task force? Nothing. He is not trustworthy.
What is the process?
why does he get evaluated on every agenda?
With the degree of stratification in the current board, no fair evaluation of the Chancellor could or can be undertaken.
You dunderheads lost Dr. Currie. Don't get me going on that one!!!

20. Comments: The Board of Trustees delegates full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor to implement and administer board policies without board interference, and holds the Chancellor accountable for the operation of the district.

Delegation of authority remains a challenge - and must be resolved in a way that does not further jeopardize our accreditation standing. I believe well intentioned people are working to resolve these differences and have high hopes we will do so.

Again, how is this to be accomplished if the Board is not transparent in it's policies and procedures.

As per the ACCJC accreditation report.

By spring 2014 the Coast Colleges' Board plans to have delegated full responsibility and authority to the Chancellor, as required by law.

Can't see that has happened.

Does this mean the Board cannot direct the Chancellor, for example, to create a culture for the District that is humanistic nature? Or to create a culture of inclusion in processes?

However the Chancellor is not to be trusted! This is a huge problem!!

Ditto for the Vice Chancellor of Human Resources. In both cases they have contributed to a consistently low morale amongst faculty at OCC.

I am concerned that this many be what was cited in the last two accreditation studies

I am not able to evaluate this, but since there was an Accreditation recommendation about the Board employees, I suspect there may be a problem in this area.

I am not sure about this. The Chancellor reports to the board, so they have some supervisory responsibility. However, I have heard many complaints about the board micromanaging the colleges. Also, the District Lawyer, Jack Lipton, appears to have veto power over all important decisions and acts as a defacto board member, even though he is not elected.

I don't believe that the BOT gives the Chancellor full authority. But I also don't believe that the Chancellor understands shared governance practices. If I had to choose between the two entities I'd pick the BOT to make the right decision over the Chancellor.

I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation. I don't know much about this aspect of the college.

I hope that is true! His advisory committee composition seems not as comprehensive in reflecting the composition the of constituents. Wish he would spend more time on the campuses getting to know us, our cultures and needs.

I see the "Goals" of the Chancellor get further and further away from the stated goal by the Chancellor and District Administration on a regular and ever increasingly faster rate.

I would like a chancellor who believes in public higher education as an American institution, and one who believes a community college ought serve its community.

If chancellor was effective, we would have cleared accreditation. Shameful.

If the Board holds the Chancellor responsible, why do they have to weigh in on everything?

If the BOT would do this, the district and college would run much better. The Chancellor needs to be able to run the district without interference from the BOT.

The BOT is becoming more involved in operations, especially with its lawyer who must review every document. More and more routine items must now get board approval.

Interference seems to be a problem.

Is this honestly a question? The Board of Trustees refuses to give authority to anyone, let alone the Chancellor.

Isn't this why Chancellor Ding-Jo quit? She was unable to do her job and classified knew and heard that the BOT was in control and would not allow her to do her job.

It appears sometimes the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing.

No - the board interferes but expects accountability.
No one is responsible. When the board gets tired of a chancellor, he leaves with a golden parachute and goes somewhere else to fail.
No senior level manager is allowed to take responsibility or authority. Signing of agreements and administrative tasks are done by the Board.
no, stop mirco managing, set policy, then hold them accountable
ok
Perhaps this rating is inaccurate. So if you don't agree, then change it if you like. But at least it's consistent with my answer in 19!
Refer to District Recommendation #2 - No they don't.
See above.
That statement would be perfect were it true.
The Board has a reputation for interfering where they shouldn't.
The board has been micromanaging the district so tightly that the Chancellor could never function in an independent way.
The Board has not adequately delegated authority/
The Board seems to allow the Chancellor to do whatever he wants--the Vice Chancellors, too.
The Board's only employee should be the Chancellor. But the Board, in its overwhelming ego, interferes with and messes up large numbers of items within the district.
The BOT cannot delegate full responsibility to an incompetent Chancellor.
The Chancellor and VC's seem to be more than concerned about Board Members and their views as they make decisions.
The chancellor cannot be trusted. Therefore, if the BOT places trust in him, the BOT cannot be trusted.
The Chancellor has some unusable, extreme, un-vetted ideas that are not futuristic, but rather illogical and unsound. He needs to much more accountable to the faculty. That should be part of his accountability.
The Chancellor's Blog has not been updated in two years, so it is difficult to know what the Chancellor is doing.
The IT -reorg is a clear example of badly poor business conduct from the chancellor. Nothing was done with the IT personnel and he tells one person to do the re-org without checking with the talented IT staff. After July 1st, nothing has been done because there were no plan of attack for the changes so called changes. There was no business plan and it is not communicated. What happened to the penguins.
The percpetion on campus is that the board does not consistently delegates full responsiblity and authority to the Chancellor and that there is micromanagement creep by the board. Personally, I am not privy to the details to know what is actually occurring, but the perception is out there.
Then hold the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor accountable for what and where this district is going because it is not going in a good direction.
They micromanage and go around him.
They mircomanage as much as they can.
This does not happen.
This has not been the case in the past. I'm still waiting to see if this changes in the future.
This is a matter that needs to be resolved. The chancellor does not have the authority without board interference to administer the board policies and the operations of the district.
This is based on accreditation. Frankly I do not agree and feel the Board should have some right to get involved.
This is in question per the Accreditation team.

Unable to evaluate, however, at the BOT meetings I've been to the Chancellor seems bored, disinterested and somewhat hostile toward board members/trustees.

We could definitely streamline the approval process for many things if we didn't have to wait until board meetings.

Would be a true statement if you didn't try to push personal agendas at him and let him do his job.

You are joking right?

you know better. they sit on hiring committees now, or have a representative who sits for them, so that the Board itself has influence over who gets what job. many jobs. the Board has hired people without using HR. that's an appointment. i am sure they told the Chancellor when they told everyone else. they are not all bad yet there is interfrance in every aspect of operations. delegate? not the word i would use.

21. Comments: The Board of Trustees establishes a clearly defined policy for selecting and evaluating the presidents of the colleges.

<p>Much discrimination takes place with the hiring process in this District. Blatant comments regarding age discrimination and wanting "young blood" etc. are commonplace. Committees recommend their top 3 candidates and get over-ridden by an administrator who selects a person who is ranked towards the bottom of the recommendation listing.</p>
<p>Selecting is clear, and evaluation is under construction as one of the policies and AP under review currently.</p>
<p>Again, a policy must be in place, but it perhaps does not accurately reflect the needs and mission of the colleges and state guidelines. As an example, I believe that our President is not overly concerned with the mission of the California community colleges. Again, my suggestion would be a mandatory meeting where the CCC mission, the CCCD mission, and the respective colleges' missions are discussed and evaluated. Thank you for your time and concern.</p>
<p>Again, I don't know the details about the policies. However, many of the hiring policies have resulted in personnel choices that have been disappointing at best. One of the rumors that has gone around recently is that the Board tends to choose executives that are weak and that it can control more strongly. Again, back to the issue of micromanagement. While I can provide no supporting evidence regarding the truthfulness of this rumor, I would suggest that the Board do some deep introspection and ask itself "why have we really selected these people as our campus executives?"</p>
<p>As a part time faculty, I never received any type of evaluation, and should.</p>
<p>But you have done a great job! We have great administrators now--unlike years ago. I just do not know the process so I cannot comment on it.</p>
<p>Do not know this policy.</p>
<p>Good, thorough process.</p>
<p>How does this relate to me?</p>
<p>I am not aware of a policy for evaluating the presidents of the colleges, but I felt it was quite disheartening to see the comments from a recent letter from a board member to the U.S. Dept of Education.</p>
<p>I am not aware of this policy.</p>
<p>I don't believe the Board of Trustees has selected a campus President based on who is the best fit for each campus: OCC and CCC; but more in line with who they can control.</p>
<p>I don't know how or whether this is done.</p>
<p>I FEEL THAT PROGRAMS ARE BEING ELIMINATED. THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IS DESIGNED TO EDUCATE THE RESIDENTS IN THE COMMUNITY. SOME STUDENTS TAKE LONGER TO FINISH A PROGRAM THAN OTHERS. WE CAN'T GROUP EVERYONE TOGETHER.</p>
<p>I have not been at Golden West College long enough to give an accurate evaluation. Plus, I don't know much about this aspect of the college.</p>
<p>I have not witnessed the process.</p>
<p>I have served on a Presidential Hiring Committee. I believe they are fair and that they represent clearly defined policy.</p>
<p>I really do not know what this clearly defined policy is--but I know that I, and my fellow employees (some classified, some managers and some faculty), have never been asked to evaluate our own president, or the Board of Trustees, or the District Chancellor and Vice Chancellors. I think this District often ONLY chooses to use the evaluations of administrators and managers by those people they know will give them the answers they wish to hear. I love my job and I believe in my college and its students, but it is getting more and more difficult to believe in those given the authority to make decisions in the "best interest" of those they serve.</p>
<p>I think that the background and aims of our current President do not match the goals of our college constituents or</p>

<p>the district. To me, it seems fairly obvious that a candidate from a "for profit model" is not a good fit for a district as diverse as ours. I wonder why this was not a bigger consideration in the vetting process.</p>
<p>I think the policy is the same as for evaluating regular managers, so perhaps there needs to be a separate policy.</p>
<p>If that is true, than why has Coast had an embezzler, a drunk, and a coach with not academic background?</p>
<p>If there is not a policy, there should be, and it should be done often!</p>
<p>In my opinion the Board as a whole and the District is challenged by one Board member, Mr. Patterson, who does not have students and or classified employee's best interest at heart. He is power driven and has too many cronies in his pocket. He must go for the sake of students, staff and the District. He is the reason for my scores of " Needs Improvement".</p>
<p>Let them do their jobs.</p>
<p>Perhaps such a policy exists, but I am certainly unaware of it. From time to time approval of presidents' contracts are listed for approval, as Board agenda items. I've been a full-time faculty member for nearly a quarter of a century and have never been given the opportunity to provide input into the evaluation of the college president. Is that Board policy?</p>
<p>Perhaps your policy is good, but if you're evaluating someone like Wes Bryan and then keeping him in the position, I wonder how much accurate information you are garnering. A number of the more thoughtful members of the faculty and staff have wondered why you keep him on. Some are just biding their time, waiting to retire, because they've lost hope. So again, my criticism is perhaps wrong if it is too harsh on the process because of my disappointment with the outcome. But that poor leadership for so many years has had deleterious effects that will take years to overcome.</p>
<p>Recent College President choices seem to be acceptable</p>
<p>Compliant Presidents make good Chancellors. Disobedient Chancellors find work elsewhere. hum?</p>
<p>Since everything this board does is kept secret this question is meaningless.</p>
<p>Terrible decisions and appointments for the colleges in the district. CCC is stuck with a horrific president and VP Vince Rodriguez who are slowly destroying all employee morale and making decisions without discussion. Terrible decisions to have hired them and worst, keeping them employed. OCC and GWC are in similar situation with bad leadership.</p>
<p>The Coastline President makes very questionable decisions for the College. Leadership has steered the wrong way. Managers are leaving faster than ever. There was much questioning about the hiring of this president. Certainly not the most qualified person for the job.</p>
<p>The current president and other top administrators have not been open to pedagogically sound input from the ESL department chair concerning the ESL program. As a result, they've made very bad decisions that have been counterproductive to the college and harmful to people in the community. Many students have been needlessly hurt because of these bad decisions. I've personally witnessed this as an ESL professor. A few years ago, there was suddenly no access to low level ESL classes, so that these people couldn't enter and progress to higher levels and other programs within the college. The huge wait lists (300-400 at the beginning) and long waits to enter the ESL program (some people have waited a few years so far to enter the program) have been a significant disservice to people in our community and to the college. Please see the Little Hoover Commission's article, Linking Basic Skills to Student Success, for research validating what I've written.</p>
<p>The evaluation portion could be elaborated on.</p>
<p>The faculty desperately need to vet any future college presidents, as these roles are incredibly important. There needs to be public forums for faculty to ask questions of the final candidates, and then provide feedback to the committees who selects the next presidents.</p>
<p>The majority are very effective and well-liked.</p>
<p>Their policy for selecting presidents has yielded extremely disappointing results at all three colleges, but especially at</p>

Coastline.

Then you need to re-write these policies because again these administrators are not looking out for the best interest of the district they only care about their own individual stepping stone.

There is no transparency.

These policies were developed by a shared governance committee and seem to be working quite well.

They need to be out of the initial screening and interviews.

This trend of presidents looking for a better paying gig within their first year is not in the best interest of the district. If applicants show a history of job-hopping they should not be hired.

Too many problems with leadership that continues. Things not getting done and student issues not being addressed is not always about an SLOs or faculty. The leadership at the campuses is sorely lacking. Need more support staff and better treatment for the ones we have.

What is the policy? Once again, wish local candidates were given first choice. Where can we find all these Board of Trustee policies and agendas? Wish they were on each of our websites - maybe on the bulletin page where other resource links are listed. I would definitely read them.

Where are these policies.....again i think transparency is missing at the district level. Decisions made in a vacuum.

Why do committee members (leak) report the selected candidate was not even on the list of suggested finalists. This is a constant problem that needs to be addressed. This has been especially true with Vice Presidents and Deans supported by member of the Board of Trustees.