Self-assessment for Doug Dykstra, Chancellor.

Part I. General comments regarding the responses to the leaders and governance structures perception surveys for the Chancellor.

This is my first GSIEC survey and although I have benefited from a honeymoon aura, I believe that the returns have provided me with some clear messages and direction for the future. In this regard I am pleased that the GSIEC process appears to be an effective method that may need some tweaks for the future, but certainly does not seem to require a major overhaul….my opinion.

It is gratifying to see a pattern of strengths recognized by both member and non-member survey results that recognized the Chancellor and the Chancellor’s office as an open, supportive place that both provides leadership when needed while also being receptive to ideas from the field.

Part II. Strengths revealed by the surveys.

Member responses represent those who report to me directly and they rate my office as being particularly strong in the following respects:

- Encourages me to bring forth ideas (5.0);
- Provides opportunities for me to bring forth ideas (5.0);
- Is receptive to my ideas (5.0);
- Values my ideas (5.0);
- Inspires confidence in others (4.8);
- Inspires others to achieve excellence (4.8);
- Is willing to pursue new and innovative directions (4.8);
- Supports fac/staff/students to work effectively toward mission, goals, etc. (5.0);
- Takes initiative to prepare the College for future success (4.8);
- Monitors progress toward planned mission, goals & objectives (4.8);
- Recognizes when a decision is required & acts effectively and expeditiously (5.0);
- Hears my needs (4.8);
- Values my needs (4.8);
- Works collectively and collegially for the good of the institution (5.0).

Note that all of the foregoing items averaged out at 5.0-4.8 on a 5 point Likert scale.

Non-Member responses did not rate either me or my office as highly as the members. The strongest responses for the following nine items averaged between 4.54-4.38 rating my office as being particularly strong as follows:

- Responds to my questions in a timely manner (4.54);
- Disseminates information in a timely manner (4.54);
- Makes known the procedures associated with working with this office (4.5);
- Takes the initiative to prepare the college for future success (4.53);
- Provides opportunities to bring forth ideas (4.46);
- Recognizes when a decision is required and acts effectively and expeditiously (4.4);
- Encourages me to bring forth ideas (4.39);
- Is receptive to my ideas (4.38);
- Monitors progress toward planned mission, goals & objectives (4.38).

Part III. Weaknesses revealed by the surveys.

The report of the GSIEC Survey instrument by members of the Chancellor’s Office has produced averages that include eleven items that stand out as the lowest scored items on a Likert Scale from 1-5 points
out of 47 items total in each survey. The eleven lowest scored items average out from the lowest item at 3.8 to seven items at 4.25 and others in between these bookmarks.

The eleven items aforementioned all have to do with collaborative decision making within the office including:

- Conducts meetings on a regular basis (4.0);
- Distributes agendas for the meetings prior to the meetings (4.2);
- Circulates minutes for the meetings after the meetings (3.8)
- Establishes a mechanism for students to provide input into the office’s decisions (4.0)
- Has a policy for participation and decision making that specifies how to bring forth ideas (4.25);
- Has a decision making procedure (4.25);
- Has a decision making procedure that results in effective planning (4.25);
- Has a policy for participation and decision making that specifies how to work together on planning (4.25);
- Has a policy for participation and decision making that specifies roles and procedures (4.25);
- Makes known the procedures associated with working together on planning (4.25);
- Allows staff to exercise a substantial voice in office budgeting (4.25).

The first step to addressing the foregoing concerns is to schedule monthly meetings for those faculty members and staff who are direct/indirect reports to the Chancellor. Heretofore the Chancellor has met every two weeks in face to face meetings with direct reports. I would continue these meetings, but to address issues such as the “intended process outcomes of the Chancellor’s Office, supplies budgets, facilities issues and other process issues the monthly meeting by all direct/indirect reports to the Chancellor would be conducive to addressing virtually all of the above listed concerns. This would include the issue of integrating student input into the Chancellor’s Office operations. I would seek brainstorming ideas from the monthly meeting about an appropriate means of providing this opportunity to accommodate student participation.

The initial meeting of the Chancellor’s direct/indirect reports would probably draw heavily from the items listed above for an agenda. As with all college governance issues the final decision on any items will be taken by the Chancellor in the light of advice provided by the staff with a commitment to a written response about any issue on which the Chancellor chooses to follow his own path rather than that recommended by the staff meeting.

The twelve low scoring items produced by non-members of the Chancellor’s Office range from 4.25 to 4.13 and they reflect a different set of concerns than the items adduced by the members of the Chancellor’s Office. Given the range of concerns reflected in these items responding may require occasional one-off types of response. The twelve items are as follows:

- Provides effective mechanisms for students to provide input into the decisions of the office (4.13);
- Provides effective mechanisms for faculty to provide input into the decisions of the office (4.17);
- Supports staff development (4.18);
- Inspires confidence in others (4.2);
- Provides effective mechanisms for staff to provide input into the decisions of the office (4.2);
- Regularly conducts assessment to ensure the leader’s integrity and effectiveness (4.2);
- Includes assessment results in Annual Assessment and/or Program Review reports (4.2);
- Regularly conducts assessment to ensure the office’s integrity and effectiveness (4.22);
- Inspires others to achieve excellence (4.23);
- Is receptive to my ideas (4.23);
- Maintains effective working relationships with relevant committees (4.23);
- Values my ideas (4.25).
The item about student input is a duplicate of an item adduced by the earlier survey results completed by members of the office and along with the item about faculty input as well as the item about staff input all three would be amenable to an agenda item for the first Chancellor’s Office monthly meeting to brainstorm appropriate responses. Perhaps Survey Monkey would be an appropriate vehicle for some items requiring input, and in other instances perhaps a request for input to the appropriate leadership position among students and faculty such as Student Government President and Faculty Senate tri-Chairs. However, additional techniques for involvement by the foregoing constituencies may be discovered via the brainstorm process. Receptiveness and valuing the ideas of others will also be placed on the agenda for Chancellor’s office monthly meeting to discover effective responses. However there appears to be clear linkage between institutionalizing input vehicles and the perception that the office is receptive and concerned about the ideas of others. Consequently resolving the input issue should also resolve the latter issues.

Likewise with the three items all of which have to do with conducting assessment of both the leader and the office as well as utilizing the assessment in program review. The linkage among these issues should be amenable to perceptual surveys that may be implemented each semester to determine the degree to which the leader and the office are achieving their intended process outcomes. Process outcomes need to be defined at the first Chancellor’s Office Monthly meeting and a survey developed thereafter for subsequent implementation.

The items about supporting staff development and inspiring others to achieve excellence may be addressed by the Chancellor’s recent commitment to supplement Staff Development funding for those faculty/staff who have been accepted to deliver papers, or chair breakout sessions at state, regional, national or international conferences.

Finally, a word about the methodology in selecting items to be discussed in this report. Items that average out above 4.0 would seem to be quite strong responses, but in the spirit of a commitment to a culture of continuous improvement I hope to be responsive to items in the range from 3.8 (admittedly weak) to 4.25. Given the above definition, a scan of the “admittedly weak items reveals that only three fall in that category. One at 3.8 and two at 4.0 as follows:

- Conducts meetings on a regular basis (4.0);
- Circulates minutes for the meetings after the meetings (3.8)
- Establishes a mechanism for students to provide input into the office’s decisions (4.0)

I am confident that all three of these items will be appropriately addressed. Moreover, this office will pursue appropriate solutions to the other items reported in this report in the spirit of a “culture of continuous improvement,” by utilizing the vehicle of collaborative review of our progress with these items during our monthly meetings.
## Part IV. Self-assessment Matrix for the Chancellor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Statement or Goal (1)</th>
<th>Measurable Outcome (1)</th>
<th>Changes Made as a Result (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monthly staff meetings with agenda, meeting notes and follow-up to be held by fac/staff direct reports to the Chancellor.</td>
<td>Agenda and meeting notes for meetings September thru May.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process Outcomes defined collegially by the Chancellor’s Staff Meeting.</td>
<td>Three to eight process outcomes published and data gathered on their achievement perhaps utilizing perceptual survey technique.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student, faculty and staff input mechanism determined and implemented by the Chancellor’s Staff.</td>
<td>One or more methods to gauge reaction to office decisions implemented and analyzed on an ongoing basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Complete the first two columns for the 2010 self-assessment.

(2) To be completed for the 2011 self-assessment period.