MEMO

DATE: February 24, 2011

TO: Dean Paul B. Bell, Jr.
College of Arts and Sciences

FROM: Committee A, School of Library and Information Studies:
       June M. Abbas
       Rhonda Harris Taylor

RE: Attached Report of the Evaluation of the Director of the School of Library and Information Studies

As the two members (other than the Director) of the Committee A of the School of Library and Information Studies, we are submitting the results of the annual evaluation (2010) of the unit's faculty and staff of the administrative effectiveness of Dr. Cecelia Brown, Director of the School. This report consists of:

- A 2-page summary of the procedures used for the evaluation process
- A 2-page narrative consisting of a tabulation of the means from the submitted evaluation instruments, with a summary of the instrument comments and conclusions from Com A
- The original evaluation instrument submissions, some of which contain comments

To help maintain confidentiality, we have not retained either electronic or print copies of the evaluation instrument submissions; attached are the only copies.

The Director's Summary Report of Annual Faculty evaluation is being submitted with those of the unit's other faculty members.
Annual Evaluation of the Administrative Effectiveness

of the

Director of the School of Library and Information Studies (SLIS)

For Calendar Year 2010

Procedures

The Faculty of the School of Library and Information Studies (SLIS) is currently composed of:

The Director (full professor)

2 full professors other than the Director

3 associate professors

4 assistant professors (two based in Tulsa)

1 term instructor

The staff of the School of Library and Information Studies (SLIS) is composed of:

1 Coordinator of Admissions/Academic and Student Support Services

1 Admissions Secretary

1 Administrative Assistant

Committee A has three (3) members, including the Director. For the evaluation of the administrative effectiveness of the Director for 2010 (her appointment in the fall of 2010), the two members of the Committee, other than the Director (Professors Abbas and Taylor), facilitated the faculty and staff evaluation of the Director via the following procedures:

1) Drs. Abbas and Taylor sent to SLIS faculty and staff members via e-mail, a copy of the evaluation form (which consists of the points for evaluation listed in the January 20, 2011 letter from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences). The deadline for submission of the evaluation form was listed as Tuesday, February 8, 2011. Faculty were instructed to return the completed instrument in a sealed envelope.

2) February 7, 2011. Dr. Abbas reminded SLIS faculty, during a regularly scheduled faculty meeting, of the February 8 deadline for the evaluation form.

3) February 9, 2011 through February 16, 2011. Results of the evaluation forms that were received were tabulated by Drs. Abbas and Taylor, who then reviewed the tabulated results and the comments on the evaluation forms and provided the attached means of responses for each questions and the attached summary of comments and conclusions from Com A (constituting the narrative).

4) February 17, 2011. Director received results of the evaluation form/summary (narrative evaluation) and a copy of the original instrument via e-mail.

5) February 24, 2011. Drs. Abbas and Taylor discussed the results of the evaluation form/summary (narrative) with the Director.
The 13-question Likert-type instrument asked for responses on a numerical scale from 1 (very ineffective) to 5 (very effective) about performance in the 11 areas highlighted in the letter from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences (that instructed the evaluation process). These areas were:

Overall leadership; Goals as Director and success/progress in attaining; Positive and negative changes in unit’s academic programs (graduate and undergraduate); External funding success; Fiscal management; Personnel management; Management of day-to-day activities; Effectiveness in maintaining diversity; Effectiveness in creating supportive climate and providing training/channels of communication regarding issues of discrimination and harassment; Effectiveness in creating/maintaining transparency; Involvement of students in unit activities/governance.

In addition, Com A included a section for comments.

The survey’s cover memo noted that comments could be sent directly to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences.
Director Evaluation 2010
School of Library and Information Studies

N=8 returned surveys

Q1. Providing overall leadership for SLIS.
Mean score: 4 (6 of 8 responses)

Q2. Establishing goals as chair and success in, or progress toward, attaining these goals.
Mean score: 4 (6 of 8 responses)

Q3. Effecting positive change in the SLIS academic programs, including the BAIS, the MLIS, and the MSKM.
Mean score: 4 (4 of 8 responses) and Mean score: NA (4 of 8 responses)

Q4. Improving external funding, including grants, contracts, and private giving.
Mean score: NA (5 of 8 responses)

Q5. Improving relationships with external constituencies, including alumni and professionals.
Mean score: 4 (4 of 8 responses)

Q6. Managing the fiscal resources of SLIS.
Mean score: NA (6 of 8 responses)

Q7. Managing personnel, including implementation of the University’s Affirmative Action plan as it relates to the unit.
#3 = 2  #4 = 2  #5 = 1, and NA = 3
Mean score: NA (3 of 8 responses)

Q8. Managing day-to-day activities of the unit.
Mean score: 4 (5 of 8 responses)

Q9. Achieving and maintaining ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity among faculty, staff, and students of the unit.
Mean score: NA (5 of 8 responses)

Q10. Creating a supportive climate for all members of the unit.
Mean score: 4 (5 of 8 responses)

Q11. Providing appropriate training and channels of communications regarding issues of discrimination and harassment.
Mean score: NA (5 of 8 responses)

Q12. Creating and maintaining transparency regarding access to unit information, participation in unit governance, and input into unit decision making.
Mean score: 4 (4 of 8 responses)

Q13. Involving students and the Student Advisory Committee in unit activities.
Mean score: 4 (5 of 8 responses)

Comments: N=3 of 8 returned surveys

Summary of comments: Overall the comments were positive and respondents acknowledged that while Dr. Brown is new to the position and therefore it might be difficult to judge, comments indicated “confidence” and “optimism” in Dr. Brown’s abilities as Director and for moving the unit forward. Other comments reflected that 1) Dr. Brown struggles with balancing the needs of the unit with the expectations of CAS and OU; and 2) current governance and decision making is perhaps not as transparent as wanted.

Conclusion: Overall, the comments and rankings on the instrument are positive and optimistic, reflecting confidence in the Director’s leadership. All of the means are 4s (other than those that are N/A). The N/A means probably represent the fact that since the Director has held the position for only 6 months, it is premature to attempt to draw conclusions about long-term effectiveness from the rankings and comments.