**Board Evaluation Survey Results**
The facilitator presented the ratings from the trustees’ survey, noting that five out of the seven trustees completed the survey. The survey covered board roles related to the strategic directions, board effectiveness goals, and ratings on the standard criteria used by employees. Participants noted the good scores on all items, particularly on board communication and modeling respect; the board’s focus on student success; board commitment to listening to faculty, staff and student perspectives; setting parameters for collective bargaining; and involvement in professional development. Since Board Priority #1 was not included on the survey, participants discussed that they are monitoring implementation through regular board reports (a summary was provided prior to the evaluation, and again at the meeting).

Board members also noted high scores on understanding the policy role; delegation to and support for the chancellor, support for planning, ensuring fiscal stability, regular review of and adherence to code of ethics, and effective board meetings.

Trustees discussed scores where more than half indicated “agree” rather than “strongly agree,” including trustee role in advocacy, roles related to workforce development, knowledge of educational programs, and monitoring planning implementation. Consensus appeared to be that the District staff were very effective in advocacy, and while trustees are more than willing to be involved, they did not want to set up processes that would impede the ability of district staff to respond. They discussed that the chancellor and staff had a “good pulse” on board opinion.

The facilitator presented the ratings from the employee survey, noting that they were lower than the trustees and lower than last year. The only difference between this year and last was collective bargaining contract issues; therefore it is very likely that those issues affected the ratings. It was noted that it is difficult to assess the ratings when they are likely due to disagreement with direction and decisions, rather than the criteria on the evaluation and role of the board.

It was noted that more reliable and valid data is gathered when the respondents are limited to those who regularly attend board meetings (i.e., administrators and constituency group leaders). The Board reaffirmed that it was more important to ensure that all employees had an opportunity to provide feedback on board performance.

The results of the board evaluation are reflected in the 2015-2016 Board Priorities (see attached).

**Trustee Listening Sessions**
Participants reviewed the notes from the Board of Trustees Listening Sessions at Saddleback and IVC, and discussed hiring processes, district and college administrative staffing levels, DRAC, Workday training, and conservation/water issues. Discussion resulted in requests for specific reports, which are listed as board tasks for 2015-2016, Priority #1. In addition, participants suggested that a listening session be held for administrators and managers from both colleges and district services.

*Notes prepared by Dr. Cindra Smith, Board Development and Facilitation*
Technology Services
Coordination, roles and responsibilities for IT at district services and colleges were discussed. Committee descriptions and membership lists were provided along with the job descriptions of the Vice Chancellor, Technology and Learning Services and Directors of Technology at each college. Discussion included the IT plan, the need for security controls, prioritization and response to requests for services. A report on the evolution and growth of IT will be made at a future meeting.

Board Meeting Start Times
The Board discussed maintaining a balance between fully addressing closed session items and its desire to honor the publicized starting time of the public board meeting. They agreed to schedule a 5:00 or 5:30 p.m. start time for closed session, depending on the time needed for the closed session agenda in order to start the public board meetings at 6:30 p.m. They agreed that items needing legal advice should be scheduled at the beginning of the closed session to use attorney time wisely.

Expectations for ATEP
Participants identified issues related to the development and timeline of ATEP. A full study session or special meeting regarding this issue will be held on June 22 prior to the regular board meeting.

Role of Board in District Labor Negotiations
The facilitator noted “best practices” for effective boards includes providing clear direction to the negotiating team, maintaining confidentiality, and NOT meeting individually with members of the negotiating groups and/or constituency leaders during the negotiation period. Participants discussed strategies to avoid inappropriate involvement and assure transparency.

Goal Setting and Next Steps
Members reviewed the 2014-2015 priorities and gave their suggestions on the self-evaluation surveys. Proposed changes are indicated on the “Proposed Board Priorities for 2015-2016.”

A report from the session will be posted on the District website, along with 2015-2016 Board Priorities. The board agreed that the priorities would be included on a future board meeting agenda for public review.

Notes prepared by Dr. Cindra Smith, Board Development and Facilitation