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 (2011) of the unit’s faculty and staff of the administrative effectiveness of Dr. Cecelia Brown, Director of the School. This report consists of:

- A one-page summary of the procedures used for the evaluation process
- A narrative consisting of a one-page 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 2011

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

4 associate professors (one based in Tulsa)

4 assistant professors (one 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 2011 (her appointment beginning in the fall of 2010), the two members of the Committee, other than the Director (Professors Abbas and Martens), facilitated the faculty and staff evaluation of the Director via the following procedures:

1) Drs. Abbas and Martens 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 6, 2012 letter from the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences). The deadline for submission of the evaluation form was listed as Wednesday, February 8, 2012. Faculty were instructed to return the completed instrument in a sealed envelope.

2) February 7, 2012. Dr. Abbas reminded SLIS faculty via email of the February 8 deadline for the evaluation form.

3) February 9, 2011 through February 10, 2012. Results of the evaluation forms that were received were tabulated by Drs. Abbas and Martens, who then reviewed the tabulated results and the comments on the evaluation forms and provided the attached means of responses for each question and the attached summary of comments and conclusions from Com A (constituting the narrative).

4) February 10, 2012. Director received results of the evaluation form/the summary (narrative evaluation).

5) February 24, 2012. Drs. Abbas and Martens discussed the results of the evaluation form/the 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, Committee 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.
N=11 returned surveys from 12 faculty and 3 staff = 73.3% return rate
* variance in total number of responses is due to either incomplete or out of scale scores received (one participant included midpoint scores of 3.5, 4.5, etc.)

Q1. Providing overall leadership for SLIS.
Mean score is split between 3, 4, and 5: 3 (3 of 11 responses); 4 (3 of 11 responses); 5 (3 of 11 responses)

Q2. Establishing goals as chair and success in, or progress toward, attaining these goals.
Mean score: 4 (4 of 11 responses)

Q3. Effecting positive change in the SLIS academic programs, including the BAIS, the MLIS, and the MSKM.
Mean score is split between 3 and 5: 3 (4 of 10 responses); 5 (4 of 10 responses)*

Q4. Improving external funding, including grants, contracts, and private giving.
Mean score: 5 (3 of 10 responses)*

Q5. Improving relationships with external constituencies, including alumni and professionals.
Mean score: 5 (5 of 10 responses)*

Q6. Managing the fiscal resources of SLIS.
Mean score is split between 4 and 5: 4 (4 of 11 responses); 5 (4 of 11 responses)

Q7. Managing personnel, including implementation of the University’s Affirmative Action plan as it relates to the unit.
Mean is split between 3, 5, and NA (each with 3 of 11 responses)

Q8. Managing day-to-day activities of the unit.
Mean scores were close: 5 (6 of 11 responses); 4 (5 of 11 responses)

Q9. Achieving and maintaining ethnic, gender, and cultural diversity among faculty, staff, and students of the unit.
Mean scores were close: 5 (5 of 11 responses); 4 (4 of 11 responses)

Q10. Creating a supportive climate for all members of the unit.
Mean score: 5 (6 of 10 responses)*

Q11. Providing appropriate training and channels of communications regarding issues of discrimination and harassment.
Mean score: NA (6 of 11 responses)
Q12. Creating and maintaining transparency regarding access to unit information, participation in unit governance, and input into unit decision making.
Mean score: 5 (4 of 10 responses)*

Q13. Involving students and the Student Advisory Committee in unit activities.
Mean score: 5 (7 of 10 responses)*

Comments included: N=4 of 11 returned surveys

Summary of comments: Overall the comments were positive and respondents noted that Dr. Brown is beginning to “grow into the position” in her second year. Specific comments focused on Dr. Brown’s expressed recognition of the individual strengths of each member of the unit, her attempts to build confidence in and productivity within the unit, and her perceived fairness and approachability as director. Areas suggested for her continued attention included: making efforts to increase transparency of decision-making through the timely dissemination of relevant information to the faculty, particularly about unit fiscal matters and course scheduling, and focusing on more concerted ways to actualize the vision, mission, and goals of the school, applied particularly to increasing the visibility of the unit within appropriate OU and state arenas.

Conclusion:

In Dr. Brown’s second year as director, the comments continue to be mostly appreciative and supportive of her efforts on behalf of the unit.

3 of the 13 measures on the instrument showed increased variation over last year’s rankings: Q1 (overall leadership), showed means evenly split among 3, 4, and 5, Q3 (effecting positive change), showed means split between 3 and 5, and Q7 (managing personnel) showed means split between 3 and 5.

4 of the 13 measures on the instrument showed increased variation, with an upward trend: Q6 (managing fiscal resources), Q8 (day-to-day management), and Q9 (maintaining diversity) showed means evenly split between 4 and 5.

5 of the 13 measures on the instrument showed improved means over last year: all of the means for Q4 (external funding), Q5 (improving external relationships) Q10 (creating supportive climate), Q12 (creating transparency), and Q13 (involving students) increased from 4 to 5.

1 of the 13 measures on the instrument continued to be reported as N/A: Q11 (training in avoiding discrimination and harassment).

We conclude that Dr. Brown’s performance as Director is further improving as she gains experience in her role, and that this is clearly recognized by the unit.