

**Faculty Assembly
Administrator Evaluation Committee
Annual Report
2006-2007**

Members: Michael Bahr, Mary Ann Coker, Robert Harris, Elizabeth Sampson, Donna Taliaferro, Fred Willman, Helene Sherman, chair .

The committee met five times during the Spring, 2007, semester, including January 25, February 6, March 4, April 4 and April 11. The purpose of the work was to produce an administrator evaluation survey for all campus deans by the end of the semester.

After examining sample instruments from other universities and from previously submitted evaluation forms from the provost and chancellor, the committee met to draft an appropriate form that could be distributed to campus faculty and staff members. Members of the campus' staff could participate in the evaluation, as explained by Tim Farmer though staff, as a group, is not specifically identified to be included in the assembly committee by-laws. The committee designed its form with the objectives that it apply to the deans' responsibilities as identified on available job description information, be of moderate length to include necessary categories and allow for open ended as well as Likert type responses.

The role of the committee was discussed. It included responsibilities to

- a) gather data.
- b) analyze data.
- c) report summarized and submitted to the steering committee; this committee would be the only group to see raw data.

It was agreed that the committee would submit the survey to the steering committee but not seek specific approval for the instrument from the faculty assembly.

The committee met with Mary Fowler, representing the campus Instructional Technology office, to discuss the issues related to on line evaluation form construction process distribution. Issues of anonymous submissions and separation of responses into categories of full time faculty, staff and part-time/adjunct faculty were considered. It was agreed that:

- a) all campus deans would be evaluated, regardless of their responsibility for faculty or the fact that they

are not responsible for faculty to supervise. It was also decided that

b) all faculty and staff would be allowed to assess any campus dean because of the many types of campus interactions.

c) respondents could submit any evaluation one time only

d) all results would be anonymous

e) results would be sent to the Senate/Faculty Assembly steering committee, which could then send the results to the Provost

The form was completed in early April after much editing and discussion. User directions were composed by the committee and approved by Tim Farmer. The single sign on and password requirements prevented anyone from submitting more than one evaluation of any one administrator. The form, included below, was sent to all campus, faculty and staff members on April 22 via a link to a web site and remained on line for one week. Helene Sherman worked with staff from the Instructional Technology center to construct a report of results that was sent to the committee for its review. All data was organized by dean. For each dean, the responses were listed by respondent category. Open ended comments were grouped for each response and for the survey as a whole, with no identification by sender. The completed survey was then sent to the steering committee on June 3, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,
Helene J. Sherman, Chair

**Administrator Evaluation Instrument
Spring, 2007
Campus Deans**

Please indicate your employment status:

- _____ Full-Time Faculty
_____ Staff
_____ Adjunct and/or Part Time Faculty

The purpose of this evaluation is to allow faculty and staff the opportunity to provide input on the performance of the dean. The evaluation focuses on the dean's responsibilities associated with leadership, administrative competence, interactions with faculty/staff/students, and

related areas. By completing this survey, you will provide valuable information that will be used in assessing the dean's job performance. The Administrator Evaluation Committee will provide the aggregated information to the University Assembly.

Please use the following scale to click on your selected response for each item. You may also include written comments throughout the survey as well as on the final two items that assess the dean's strengths and limitations. Your responses to this survey are anonymous.

Please use the following scale to click on your selected response for each item. Your constructive comments are a valuable part of this process.

Thank you for completing this evaluation.

- 4 Highly Satisfied**
- 3 Satisfactory**
- 2 Needs Improvement**
- 1 Unsatisfactory**
- U/E Unable to Evaluate**

1. Communication skills	4	3	2	1	U/E
A. Responds in a timely and effective fashion to faculty concerns					
B. Seeks input on important issues in a timely manner.					
C. Represents the views of the unit to appropriate groups throughout the campus					
D. Creates and supports an atmosphere of open communication					
E. Is a good listener and encourages and respects faculty input and opinions					
F. Speaks, writes and presents effectively					

Comments:

2. Interactions with faculty and staff	4	3	2	1	U/E
A. Provides timely feedback to faculty and staff					
B. Is fair and objective					
C. Holds the faculty and staff accountable					

D. Promotes a favorable environment for individual professional development					
E. Rewards individual accomplishment					
F. Promotes faculty and staff recruitment and retention					
G. Fosters diversity, equity and a supportive work environment					

Comments:

3. Interactions with students	4	3	2	1	U/E
A. Handles student problems and concerns appropriately					
B. Is accessible to students					
C. Participates in students' activities					
D. Encourages students to participate on his/her advisory panel					

Comments:

4 Administrative competence	4	3	2	1	U/E
A. Provides effective financial management and utilization of existing resources of the unit					
B. Gains an appropriate share of the University's resources for the unit					
C. Demonstrates fairness in personnel issues, including grievances with faculty and staff					
D. Makes administrative decisions, which facilitate improvement of the College's Undergraduate and Graduate academic programs					
E. Successfully obtains financial and other support from the external community					
F. Implements strategies for enrollment, retention, and recruitment management					

Comments

5. Personal Qualities	4	3	2	1	U/E
------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	------------

A. Responsive to constructive criticism					
B. Is calm and even tempered under pressure					
C. Accepts responsibility for decisions					
D. Demonstrates integrity/ethics					

Comments:

6. Leadership	4	3	2	1	U/E
A. Is able to facilitate needed changes as appropriate					
B. Encourages individual thought and supports new ideas from faculty, staff, and students					
C. Implements timely, innovative, workable solutions to difficult problems					
D. Delegates responsibilities fairly and appropriately					
E. Understands and consistently articulates visions as needed					
F. Utilizes shared governance in decision making					
G. Works effectively with other campus administrators					

H. Inspires and motivates faculty and staff to excel in achieving the university's mission.

Comments:

7. Teaching	4	3	2	1	U/E
A. Promotes an institutional culture of excellence in teaching					
B. Encourages curriculum development					
C. Supports new instructional methodologies and technology					

Comments:

8. Research/Creative Works	4	3	2	1	U/E
A. Promotes a culture of excellence in research and other scholarly contributions					
B. Provides adequate financial support					

for research and creative works					
C. Maintains an ongoing program of research or creative works					

Comments:

9. Service/Outreach	4	3	2	1	U/E
A. Promotes a culture of excellence in outreach and public service, in the St. Louis region					
B. Seeks and creates partnerships and/or external development					
C. Supports faculty participation in service to the university, community and professional organizations					

Comments:

10. Dean's overall effectiveness					
---	--	--	--	--	--

OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS: REPLY IN BOX PROVIDED

1. What would you describe as this administrator's greatest strength? Please provide an example.

2. What change or adjustment do you think is most needed in order for the Dean to improve performance?

Comments and Suggestions for improvement of this evaluation form or process.