

REPORT ON THE 2004 FACULTY EVALUATION OF DEANS AND DEPARTMENT HEADS/CHAIRS

**Senate Administrator Evaluation Committee
August 10, 2004**

Committee Members

David Bransby, Agronomy & Soils, Chair, 844-3935, bransdi@auburn.edu
Dwayne Cox, Library, 844-1707, coxdney@auburn.edu
Ann Janer, Clinical Pharmacy Practice, 844-8343, janeral@auburn.edu
Herb Rotfeld, Marketing, 844-2459, rotfehj@auburn.edu
Paul Starr, Sociology, 844-5049, starrpd@auburn.edu

PROCEDURE

The committee met several times late in 2003, mainly to: 1) review the questionnaire that was used in 2002 and make any necessary changes; 2) decide on which administrators were going to be evaluated; and 3) determine how the evaluation would be administered.

Changes to questionnaires

Several administrators have emphasized that the main purpose of the survey should be to help them improve their performance. Therefore, Bruce Gladden, past chair of the committee, specifically indicated to department heads/chairs in his transmittal letter with results of the 2002 survey that "... although you are under no obligation to do so, you are certainly encouraged to share your results with your department as a whole and to discuss the evaluations in a constructive manner". To investigate the extent to which administrators used the results from the last survey in attempts to improve, the following questions were added to questionnaires:

Deans' Questionnaire

Attempts to Improve

13. My Dean met with faculty following the last evaluation in 2002 to discuss results of that evaluation and how improvements could be made.
14. There has been some improvement in the performance of my Dean since the last evaluation in 2002.

Department Head/Chair Questionnaire

Attempts to Improve

31. My Department Head/Chair met with faculty following the last evaluation in 2002 to discuss results of that evaluation and how improvements could be made.
32. There has been some improvement in the performance of my Department Head/Chair since the last evaluation in 2002.

Administrators to be evaluated

The committee decided to evaluate only department heads/chairs and deans (the same group of administrators that had been evaluated in 2002) again in 2004, and to evaluate upper administrators, associate deans and other

administrators in 2005. This decision was taken mainly because asking faculty to complete more than two evaluations at any one time would likely result in a reduced response rate, and further alteration of questionnaires would be needed to evaluate administrators other than department heads/chairs and deans.

Survey procedure

Arrangements were being made to conduct the survey electronically, but several faculty expressed strong concern about confidentiality associated with this procedure. Therefore, a mail-out survey was administered. Instructions, questionnaires and scan sheets were mailed to all tenure-, clinical- and research-track faculty at the end of April, with a return date of May 14, 2004. This was done by CopyCat. A total of 1,156 packets were mailed. The fact that department heads/chairs were included in this list was an oversight. Forms sent out covered 13 deans (5 of these were interim) and 62 department heads/chairs. Faculty were asked to evaluate these administrators, regardless of whether they were acting or interim, and of how long they had been in their positions.

Analysis and interpretation of results

In order to maximize confidentiality, only the committee chair was involved in analysis of results. Following scanning of the scan sheets, results were tabulated, subjected to limited statistical analysis, and summarized. Written comments were typed separately in a single list for each administrator. Responses of A. Strongly agree, B. Agree, C. Neither agree nor disagree, D. Disagree, and E. Strongly disagree, were assigned values of 4, 3, 2, 1 and 0, respectively, for the analysis. Therefore, a score of 2.0 indicates a neutral response. Scores above the mean plus one standard deviation from that mean are considered outstanding, while those below the mean minus one standard deviation are considered poor.

Distribution and use of results

Results for individual administrators are not made public. Department heads/chairs received results of their evaluations and copies were sent to their dean and the Provost. Deans also received their own results, and copies of these were sent to the Provost. This report will be presented to Senate and posted on the Senate web site. All original documentation from the survey will be deposited in the university archives. In cover letters deans department heads and the Provost were encouraged to study results, discuss them with faculty to receive suggestions for improvement, and develop and implement plans for improvement before the next survey about 2 years from now. Deans and the Provost were also encouraged to use the results when making salary adjustments, and to seriously assess administrators who had received very poor evaluations.

RESULTS

Return rate

Out of 1,156 packets that were mailed out, 412 were returned. This amounted to a return rate 35.6%, which is almost identical to the response rate achieved in 2002, and well above the rate of 20-30% observed at most universities. However, not all the returned packets contained evaluations for both a dean and a department head/chair. Therefore, return rates for each of these categories was slightly lower than the overall return rate: 31% for deans and 33% for department heads/chairs.

Deans

Number of departments, number of faculty in each college, and response rates for the evaluation of deans are presented by college in Table 1. Obviously, scores cannot be provided without revealing the identity of the administrator.

Table 1. Response Rates for Deans

<u>College</u>	<u># of Departments</u>	<u># of Faculty</u>	<u>% Response</u>
Pharmacy*	3	43	53
Agriculture	8	146	45
Veterinary Medicine	3	88	39
Forestry and Wild Life	1	31	39
Architecture, Design & Constr.	3	43	37
Education	5	82	34
Business	6	78	32
Human Sciences	3	41	32
Liberal Arts	12	225	24
Engineering	8	149	21
Science and Mathematics	<u>6</u>	<u>142</u>	<u>20</u>
Totals	<u>62</u>	<u>1,068</u>	<u>31</u>

*Nursing and Library omitted from table.

Overall response rate = $332/1068 = 31\%$

Mean of average scores for all questions for 13 deans = 2.69.

(A = 4; B = 3; C = 2; D = 1; E = 0: An average response of C or 2 is neutral)

Standard deviation = 0.45.

Number of highly rated deans.

Mean plus one standard deviation = 3.14

There were two outstanding deans with scores above the mean plus one standard deviation.

Number of poorly rated deans.

Mean minus one standard deviation = 2.24

Scores for two out of the 13 deans fell below the mean minus one standard deviation.

Two deans had a majority of respondents disagree or strongly disagree that they should be retained.

Mean scores for each question across all deans are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Mean Scores for Each Question, all 13 Deans.

<u>Question #</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Question #</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Question #</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	2.6	6	3.0	11	2.9
2	2.7	7	2.9	12	2.8
3	2.8	8	2.5	13	1.4
4	2.6	9	2.3	14	1.9
5	2.8	10	2.7	15	2.6

Mean score, all 15 questions, all 13 deans = 2.57
 Standard deviation = 0.42
 Mean minus one standard deviation = 2.15
 Mean plus one standard deviation = 2.99

General strengths of deans

Questions with good scores (equal to or above the mean plus one standard deviation).

Question # 6: My Dean presents my college/school in a positive light (average score = 3.0).

Question # 7: My Dean fosters excellent relationships with constituents and the general public (average score = 2.9).

Question # 11: My Dean maintains accurate and current student, staff, faculty and financial records (average score = 2.9).

General weaknesses of deans

Question with poor scores (below the mean minus one standard deviation).

Question # 13: My Dean met with faculty following the last evaluation in 2002 to discuss results of that evaluation and how improvements could be made (average score = 1.4).

Question # 14: There has been some improvement in the performance of my Dean since the last evaluation in 2002 (average score = 1.9).

Department heads/chairs

Data for the evaluation of department heads/chairs are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Response Rates and Scores for Evaluation of Department Heads/Chairs

<u>College</u>	<u># of Depts.</u>	<u># of Fac.</u>	<u>% Response</u>	<u>Mean score*</u>	<u>SD**</u>	<u>Mean – SD***</u>
Pharmacy	3	43	49	2.90	0.95	1.95
Agriculture	8	146	47	2.53	0.71	1.82
Veterinary Medicine	3	88	43	2.63	0.92	1.71
Arch., Design & Constr.	3	43	42	2.67	0.55	2.12
Education	5	82	35	2.86	0.72	2.14
Business	6	78	33	3.27	0.83	2.44
Human Sciences	3	41	29	3.26	0.47	2.79
Forestry & Wild Life [#]	1	31	29			
Liberal Arts	12	225	27	2.75	0.76	1.99
Engineering	8	149	27	2.89	0.49	2.40
Science and Mathematics	6	142	25	2.28	0.75	1.53
Library	3			2.67	0.58	2.09
Nursing [#]	1	5				

[#] Results for Forestry & Wildlife and Nursing are not provided because they consist of only one department.

* Mean of average scores for all questions for all department heads/chairs in each college.

** Standard deviation of mean score.

*** Mean minus one standard deviation.

Overall response rate excluding Library and Nursing = $357/1068 = 33\%$

Mean of average scores for all questions for 62 heads/chairs = 2.77.

(A = 4; B = 3; C = 2; D = 1; E = 0: An average response of C or 2 is neutral)

Standard deviation = 0.45.

Mean plus one standard deviation = 3.22

There were 12 department heads/chairs (19%) who obtained scores above this value and had at least 3 faculty evaluate them*. However, all of these had a relatively low number of evaluations (mostly 3 to 6).

* Assessments that involved only one or two evaluations were not considered reliable, and therefore, not included.

Mean minus one standard deviation = 2.32.

There were 13 department heads/chairs (21%) who obtained scores below this value and had at least three faculty evaluate them. However, when this analysis was conducted by college (thus taking into account differences in means among colleges), 8 heads/chairs (13%) obtained scores below the mean minus one standard deviation. Nine heads/chairs had a majority of respondents disagree or strongly disagree that they should be retained, but two of these received less than three evaluations.

Average scores for all 31 questions across all 62 department heads/chairs are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Mean scores for each question, all 62 Department Heads/Chairs

<u>Question #</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Question #</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Question #</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Question #</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Question #</u>	<u>Score</u>
1	2.8	7	2.6	13	2.5	19	2.7	25	2.3
2	2.8	8	2.4	14	2.5	20	2.7	26	2.8
3	2.7	9	2.5	15	2.9	21	2.9	27	2.5
4	2.8	10	2.7	16	2.9	22	3.0	28	2.6
5	2.7	11	2.7	17	3.0	23	2.7	29	2.4
6	2.6	12	2.4	18	3.0	24	2.6	30	2.4
								31	2.2
								32	2.1
								33	2.7

Mean score of all 33 questions and all 62 Department Heads/Chairs = 2.64

Standard deviation = 0.22.

Mean plus one standard deviation = 2.86

Mean minus one standard deviation = 2.42.

General strengths of department heads/chairs

Questions with scores equal to or above the mean plus one standard deviation.

Question # 15: My Department Head/Chair handles paperwork promptly (average score = 2.9).

Question # 16: My Department Head/Chair resolves matters of facilities, services, reports, and regulations in a reasonable way (average score = 2.9).

Question # 17: My Department Head/Chair maintains accurate and current student, staff, faculty and financial records (average score = 3.0).

Question # 18: My Head/Chair maintains an effective and supportive departmental staff (average score = 3.0).

Question # 21: My Department Head/Chair exhibits trust and respect for colleagues (average score = 2.9).

Question # 22: My Department Head/Chair is generally positive and expresses pride in the accomplishments of others (average score = 3.0).

General weaknesses of department heads/chairs

Question with scores equal to or below the mean minus one standard deviation.

Question # 8: My Department Head/Chair assists in the development of each person's talents (average score = 2.4).

Question # 12: My Department Head/Chair facilitates obtaining grants and contracts from outside funds (average score = 2.4).

Question # 25: My Department Head/Chair guides curriculum, outreach, and research development (average score = 2.3).

Question # 29: My Department Head/Chair provides opportunities and encouragement for both new and mature faculty to improve outreach activities (average score = 2.4).

Question # 30: My Department Head/Chair provides opportunities to improve research activities (average score = 2.4).

Question # 31: My Department Head/Chair met with faculty following the last evaluation in 2002 to discuss results of that evaluation and how improvements could be made (average score = 2.2).

Question # 32: There has been some improvement in the performance of my Department Head/Chair since the last evaluation in 2002 (average score = 2.1).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

- 1) The response rate for this survey was 35.65%: similar to that obtained in 2002, and above that observed in most other universities.
- 2) The survey was effective in determining differences in faculty responses among administrators, colleges, and survey questions. Therefore, it provided useful information.
- 3) General strengths of both deans and department heads were in office management (which is also a great tribute to our administrative staff) and projecting a good image of their colleges and departments to constituents.
- 4) The most distinct general weakness was failure to specifically make attempts to improve performance relative to results of the last survey.
- 5) Faculty identified two deans and at least seven department heads/chairs (11% of the total) that were very weak, and the deans and Provost were asked to carefully assess these cases.
- 6) Even though there are concerns among faculty about confidentiality of online surveys, it is recommended that the committee seriously consider conducting future surveys electronically.