

Administrator Evaluation Survey Committee
October 8th, 2014
Report given to the Faculty Senate

The committee met on Thursday, September 25th with all members present. The convener was Rob Weiner. Also present was Jorge Morales and Todd Brashears. This committee is charged with oversight on the development, delivery and results of the survey of Texas Tech University administrators as assessed by the faculty. The objective of this meeting was to verify the instrumentation, timeline and procedures for this survey.

The committee had several questions as we evaluated the instrument. Those were directed to Mary Elkins, Unit Manager in Institutional Research in charge of Alumni, Course Evaluations and this project. A summary of those questions and answers are presented below.

1. Where are these results stored? If it is on Qualtrics, who owns that account and has access to the data?

The raw data is stored in Institutional Research's Qualtrics account and it is not available to anyone outside of the employees in our department that have security to view the results.

The reports for the survey are posted on our website and on the Faculty Senate website. Here is the link: <http://www.irim.ttu.edu/Administrator.php>. These public files do not include any comments. Comments are only provided in the report we send to the Provost and to the Faculty Senate.

2. Who determines (or how does the instrument) determine who has responses provided about them? For example, as a faculty member, do I get to evaluate my Department head, Dean, Provost, VPR, President, etc. or some combination of such?

In the beginning, there were two different surveys originally set up by the Faculty Senate. One that asks Faculty to evaluate their Chair, Dean and the Provost, and one that asks Faculty to evaluate Assistant and Associate Deans, Assistant Vice Provosts, Associate Vice Provosts and the Vice Provosts. Only the Chairs, Deans and Provost Survey has been deployed yearly. The Associate and Assistant Deans etc. survey has not been consistently deployed.

a) Survey to Evaluate Chairs, Deans and the Provost:

In order to evaluate the Chairs, Deans and the Provost, we set up three different surveys. Each set up to evaluate separate individuals.

Survey Number 1: Faculty evaluate their Chair, their Dean and the Provost.

Survey Number 2: Chairs evaluate their Dean and the Provost.

Survey Number 3: Deans evaluate the Provost.

b) Survey to Evaluate Associate and Assistant Deans, Assistant Vice Provost, Associate Vice Provosts and the Vice Provosts:

One survey was used to evaluate all.
We do not evaluate the President and VPT at this time.

3. **Should we include people such as Juan Munoz and Alice Young for those who have interaction with them?**

We currently do not evaluate anyone except Chairs, Deans, Provost, Associate/Assistant Deans and Vice Provosts, etc. . as outlined above, so Juan Munoz and Alice Young would not be included unless they fall into one of these categories. It would be up to the Faculty Senate to decide if other administrators should be included.

4. **Can we eliminate the neutral heading (the five point scale is ok, but we thought "neutral" might be seen as "no knowledge in this area") and add something such as "N/A" for categories where we have no personal knowledge?**

After consulting with Dr. Taylor, we would prefer to leave the 5 point scale with the neutral included but add an N/A to the end of the scale. Let us know if that will be acceptable.

5. **What happens with these results? Do the administrators see them in annual reviews? Are they used in that manner and are they available somewhere on the data warehouse?**

We not sure how the data is used once the final reports have been given to the Faculty Senate and to the Provost. They are organized for distribution to the Deans of each college but we have no knowledge if they are sent out to them. The reports that are sent to the Faculty Senate and Provost include all of the data and comments. The reports that are available on our website do not contain comments.

In addition to the responses provided above, Mary indicated that the large number of new faculty, chairs and deans might necessitate administering this survey in the spring to provide more validity of response.

Respectfully submitted,
Todd Brashears