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X

**Mid-year report X Year-end report**

**Date:** August 20, 2019

**Committee Name**: Committee on the Evaluation of University Administrators

**Chair or Co-Chairs:** Rose Baker

**Meetings for the term/year**: In-person meetings of the full committee were held on November 16, 2018, and on May.15, 2019. Other communication conducted through email exchanges and one-to-one meetings with committee members at various times.

**Membership and Attendance** (year-to-date attendance record):

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Group Represented, committee office, if applicable** | **Name** | **Department or administrative unit affiliation** | **Term End**  **(if applicable)** | **Meetings Attended**  (F2F – Email) | **Meetings Absent (# Excused)** |
| Group I | Carmen Terry | WLLC | 2020 | 1 - 2 | 1(1) |
| Group II | \*Rose Baker | LTEC | 2020 | 2 - 2 | 0 |
| Group III | Srinivasan Srivilliputhur | MTSE | 2020 | 2 - 2 | 0 |
| Group IV | Adam Trahan | CJUS | 2020 | 0 - 4 | 2(1) |
| Group V | Elliot Dubin  Jihye (Ellie) Min | HTM | 2019 | 2 - 2  0 - 1 | 0  1(1) |
| Group VI | Barbara Pazey | TEA | 2020 | 1 - 2 | 1(1) |
| Group VII | Hong Wang | CHEM | 2020 | 0 - 2 | 2(1) |
| Group VIII | Barbara Cox | DANC | 2021 | 2 - 1 | 0 |
|  | Christy Crutsinger | VPAA |  | 2 - 1 | 0 |
|  | V. Barbara Bush or Sheri Broyles or Denise Catalano | UNT Faculty Senate Leadership |  | 2 - 2 | 0 |
|  | Jill Stover | FS Office |  | 2 - 2 | 0 |
|  | Kelly Donahue-Wallace | Chairs’ Academy |  | 2 - 1 | 0 |
|  | Stephanie Lindsey | FS Office |  | 1 - 1 | 0 |

\* Chair

**Accomplishments (including items submitted for review or approval to the Executive Committee or Faculty Senate):**

*Evaluation of Senior Administrators*

The survey of the UNT System Chancellor, UNT President, Provost, members of the President’s Cabinet, and selected senior administrators took place between mid-February and mid-March 2019. The data collected was used by the administration in their 360 evaluation protocol and reports in Spring 2019. The goal of this survey was to rate the effectiveness of administrative performance, assess the level of confidence in abilities to perform the assigned role, and gather recommendations and suggestions for the improvement of performance.

Within the survey for each administrator (19 in total) evaluated were three representative activities to provide an example of how each directly works with faculty. The completion of the survey was expected to take less than 10 minutes.

Statements included in the survey:

UNT System Chancellor, Lesa Roe

Continuous enhancement of academic programming by UNT System universities

Key initiatives: strategic growth, research, inclusiveness, operational efficiency, and employee engagement

General oversight of 10,000+ employees and three UNT system campuses

UNT President, Neal Smatresk

Fosters and maintains public-private partnerships

Supports academic programs for research and education innovation

Improves processes and infrastructure for students’ positive experience at UNT

Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, Jennifer Cowley

Leads the development and supervision of the university’s academic programs and curriculum

Works in conjunction with deans and faculty representatives

Promotes faculty and student scholarship in collaboration with the Office of Research and Economic Development

Vice President for Finance and Administration, Bob Brown

Supports the university’s academic missions

Ensures the university’s financial well-being

Provides for a safe, secure, and technology rich environment for the campus community

Associate Vice President University Information Services, Allen Clark

Analyzes and recommends solutions for parking rules and regulations

Evaluates and ensures campus utilization of technology assets

Develops and shares communications plans with the university community

Associate Vice President for Facilities, David Reynolds

Oversees renovations and utility infrastructure upgrades

Evaluates and improves the effectiveness of real property and fleet

Develops and manages annual capital plan for campus revitalization

Interim Vice President for Research and Innovation, Narendra Dahotre

Promotes research, scholarship, and creative activities to expand the university’s research growth, breadth and impact

Oversees federally funded research projects and shared instrumentation facilities

Engages faculty, research scientists, students and external collaborative partners

Vice President for Student Affairs, Elizabeth With

Supports students with a wide array of intentional programs, services, and activities

Enhances student experience

Maintains facilities, provides services, and promotes programs for the campus community

Assistant Vice Provost/ Dean of Students, Maureen McGuinness

Oversees student services such as CARE Team, Clery reporting, and the Food Pantry

Evaluates and manages student support services

Oversees and encourages participation in the Center for Leadership and Service

Vice President for Equity and Diversity, Joanne Woodard

Champions equity, access, and engagement

Creates a welcoming campus community for all

Provides a safe zone for all

Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, Christy Crutsinger

Oversees Academic, Faculty, and Administrative Support

Leads strategic retention initiatives

Oversees leadership development and faculty evaluations

Vice Provost for Academic Administration, Terri Day

Serves as a member of the Talon Team for UNT process improvement

Oversees strategic planning for degree offerings, accreditation, and revenue impacts

Oversight of academic affairs policy changes and reporting

Vice Provost & Dean International Affairs, Pia Wood

Oversees international student and scholar services

Supports study abroad and global engagement initiatives

Serves as the senior international officer

Interim Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Success, Linda Holloway

Provides programming, services, and access to resources for faculty for success in teaching, scholarly, and leadership endeavors

Fosters recognition for faculty at local, national, and international levels for teaching, scholarship, and community outreach

Develops communication networks to help improve campus climate and to serve as an information source

Toulouse School of Graduate Studies, Dean, Victor Prybutok

Oversees the management and fiscal operations of the graduate school

Oversees graduate programs and development of post-baccalaureate academic programs

Develops policies related to graduate admissions, programs, and curriculum

Associate Dean of the Graduate School, Joseph Oppong

Supports the management and fiscal operations of the graduate school

Supports graduate programs and development of post-baccalaureate academic programs

Develops policies related to graduate admissions, programs, and curriculum

Vice President for Enrollment, Shannon Goodman

Improves quality, quantity, and diversity of UNT student population

Conducts effective enrollment management to balance quality and accessibility

Develops strategic enrollment strategies for sustainable enrollment growth

Executive Director for Learning Technologies, Patrick Pluscht

Supports and promoted open and shared educational resources

Supports and promotes innovative assessment of student learning

Evaluates and recommends policy development to support UNT and CLEAR goals

Chief of Police, Ed Reynolds

Oversees campus security to promote an environment that supports a safe learning environment

Provides professional service to all customers and problem-solving collaboration with UNT students, faculty, staff, visitors and the community

Serve as a model police department and a model department at UNT

Questions in the survey

1. Please select your primary affiliation. (This question is included to ensure if there are any problems with the safelink causing a session time-out and reset, the rechecking of the single answer is of little consequence.
2. Questions for the chancellor, president, and provost are more extensive than the questions for the other administrators to be evaluated.
   1. UNT System Chancellor
      1. Thinking about the performance of Chancellor Lesa Roe,rate the following questions as Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent, No Opinion, Do Not Know.
         1. Effectively articulates a coherent and realistic vision for UNT
         2. Provides transparent and effective leadership
         3. Supports faculty and the academic mission of UNT
      2. Do you have confidence in the Chancellor's abilities to perform her current role? Definitely yes, Probably yes, Probably not, Definitely not
      3. Based on your knowledge of the functions of the Office of the Chancellor, what actions do you recommend for the Chancellor to be more effective?
      4. What actions do you recommend the Chancellor to take to help improve the quality of life at UNT?
      5. What additional comments or concerns would you like to share with the Chancellor?
   2. UNT President
      1. Thinking about the performance of UNT President Neal Smatresk rate the following questions as Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent, No Opinion, Do Not Know.
         1. Provides transparent and effective leadership
         2. Effectively articulates a coherent and realistic vision for UNT
         3. Management of UNT’s resources
         4. Communication to faculty of UNT’s needs and opportunities
         5. Support of faculty and the academic mission of UNT
         6. Involvement of faculty in the assessment and planning of university operations
         7. Accessibility to the faculty
         8. Representation of UNT Denton to Chancellor
         9. Promotion of UNT to external constituencies
         10. Fostering of an environment for exemplary teaching
         11. Trustworthiness
         12. Fair treatment of people
         13. Fair treatment of people
      2. Do you have confidence in the President's abilities to perform his current role? Definitely yes, Probably yes, Probably not, Definitely not
      3. What two or three top priorities would you recommend to be addressed by the President in the coming year?
      4. Based on your knowledge of the functions of the Office of the President, what actions do you recommend for the President to be more effective?
      5. What actions do you recommend the President to take to help improve the quality of life at UNT?
      6. What additional comments or concerns would you like to share with the President?
   3. Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
      1. Thinking about the performance of of Provost and VPAA Jennifer Cowley rate the following questions as Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent, No Opinion, Do Not Know.
         1. Adequately consults the faculty before making important decisions
         2. Makes excellent administrative appointments
         3. Fosters cooperation among the colleges and schools that comprise the university
         4. Actively facilitates an environment within which teaching excellence can effectively occur
         5. Actively facilitates an environment within which scholarly excellence can effectively occur
         6. Treats faculty fairly
         7. Demonstrates trustworthiness
         8. Is accessible and approachable, when appropriate
         9. Establishes well defined goals
         10. Effectively communicates goals to the faculty
         11. Makes effective use of available resources
         12. Manages budgets in a transparent and effective manner
         13. Overall effectiveness as Provost and VPAA
      2. Do you have confidence in the Provost and VPAA's abilities to perform her current role? Definitely yes, Probably yes, Probably not, Definitely not
      3. What two or three top priorities would you recommend to be addressed by the Provost and VPAA in the coming year?
      4. Based on your knowledge of the functions of the Office of the Provost and VPAA what actions do you recommend for the Provost and VPAA to be more effective?
      5. What actions do you recommend the Provost and VPAA to take to help improve the quality of life at UNT?
      6. What additional comments or concerns would you like to share with the Provost and VPAA
   4. Each of the administrators selected to be evaluated from the President’s Cabinet and the senior administration will have the same questions asked about their performance and seek recommendations from the faculty.
      1. Thinking about the University Administrator’s performance for these activities, rate the following questions as Poor, Fair, Good, Excellent, No Opinion, Do Not Know.
         1. Effectively communicates strategic initiatives and objectives to the faculty
         2. Considers faculty input when developing strategic initiatives
      2. Please add any additional comments, suggestions, or concerns about this University Administrator

Printed reports were sent to all of the Senior administrators evaluated. Several sent email or printed letters thanking the committee and the Faculty Senate for the feedback from the faculty. Requests for meetings with the Faculty Senate leadership were requested to open communications with the Faculty Senate and faculty members. Table 1 depicts the response rates by college. Some respondents did not include their college. Reports to the administrators did not include any college information; all data were in summary.

Table 1. Response to Survey to Evaluate the President, Provost, and Other Senior Administrators by Affiliation

| Affiliation | Number of Respondents | Valid Percent of Total Responses | Number of Surveys Distributed | Response Rate of Surveys Distributed |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| College of Business | 25 | 8.3% | 103 | 24.3% |
| College of Education | 31 | 10.3% | 87 | 35.6% |
| College of Engineering | 25 | 8.3% | 86 | 29.1% |
| College of Health and Public Service | 36 | 12.0% | 67 | 53.7% |
| College of Information | 14 | 4.7% | 42 | 33.3% |
| College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences | 70 | 23.3% | 267 | 26.2% |
| College of Merchandising, Hospitality and Tourism | 13 | 4.3% | 28 | 46.4% |
| College of Music | 14 | 4.7% | 100 | 14.0% |
| College of Science | 28 | 9.3% | 109 | 25.7% |
| College of Visual Arts and Design | 17 | 5.6% | 52 | 32.7% |
| Frank W. and Sue Mayborn School of Journalism | 4 | 1.3% | 18 | 22.2% |
| Libraries | 14 | 4.7% | 39 | 35.9% |
| Other | 3 | 1.0% |  |  |
| Honors |  |  | 2 | 0.0% |
| New College |  |  | 3 | 0.0% |
| Toulouse Graduate School | 1 | 0.3% | 2 | 50.0% |
| No affiliation indicated | 6 | 2.0% |  |  |
| Total | 302 |  | 1,005 | 30.0% |

*Evaluation of Deans, Associate Deans, and Department Chairs*

On March 29, 2019, the survey was sent to the faculty to evaluate their deans, associate deans, and department chairs. This was very similar in format to the 2017-2018 survey to facilitate completion of the survey and the gathering of data to help further improve performance of the individuals and the programs. Reminders were sent to the faculty on April 5 and April 11. Printed reports with the survey outcomes and comments were sent individually to the deans, associate deans, and department chairs and their supervisors. Table 2 depicts the response rates by affiliation based upon the initial invitations to participate.

During the 2018-2019 school year, the Qualtrics surveys distributed to individual emails resulted in reset errors. This reset error was the result of the Microsoft Advanced Threat Protection (ATP) updates. The solution was that UNT ITSS had to whitelist the Qualtrics IP addresses. These values were provided by Qualtrics support. Further testing resulted in individual links from Qualtrics not having the reset error. The error was a popup message that would say, “Your session was outdated, but we have updated you to your most recent response.” A question was included on the first page because it was thought that the reset could be managed with this first page question. At least 128 respondents had the reset on the first page. Respondents indicated that a later reset impacted their open ended responses because it deleted the responses. After the reset, they entered text to indicate that the reset had happened and they shortened their responses. It is expected that the reset resulted in a number of not-completed surveys and in resends of invitations.

Table 2. Response to Survey to Evaluate Deans, Associate Deans, and Department Chairs by Affiliation

| Affiliation | Number of Respondents | Valid Percent of Total Responses | Number of Surveys Distributed | Response Rate of Surveys Distributed |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| College of Business | 44 | 9.4% | 104 | 42.7% |
| College of Education | 51 | 10.9% | 87 | 58.6% |
| College of Engineering | 37 | 7.9% | 87 | 43.0% |
| College of Health and Public Service | 51 | 10.9% | 75 | 76.1% |
| College of Information | 29 | 6.2% | 43 | 69.0% |
| College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences | 103 | 21.9% | 269 | 38.6% |
| College of Merchandising, Hospitality and Tourism | 16 | 3.4% | 28 | 57.1% |
| College of Music | 33 | 7.0% | 100 | 33.0% |
| College of Science | 46 | 9.8% | 111 | 42.2% |
| College of Visual Arts and Design | 31 | 6.6% | 52 | 59.6% |
| Frank W. and Sue Mayborn School of Journalism | 4 | 0.9% | 18 | 22.2% |
| Libraries | 23 | 4.9% | 40 | 59.0% |
| Honors | 1 | 0.2% | 2 | 50.0% |
| New College | 0 | 0% | 3 | 0.0% |
| Toulouse Graduate School | 1 | 0.2% | 2 | 50.0% |
| Total | 470 |  | 1,005 | 46.8% |
| Note: Initial distribution of surveys was 1,005. Due to the reset error, timed out surveys, and two faculty members not included in list supplied to the Faculty Senate office, 17 additional survey invitations were distributed. | | | | |

The survey requested the respondent to enter the name of the person being evaluated. This data was used to confirm that the data reported was for the correct administrator. Survey questions were the same as those used in 2017-2018. The choices were changed to be definitely yes, probably yes, probably not, and definitely not.

Questions in the survey for Deans and Department Chairs or Faculty Directors

1. Do you have confidence in your (department chair or faculty director, dean)’s ability to perform his/her current role?
2. Does your (department chair or faculty director, dean) involve faculty in the decision-making process?
3. Has your (department chair or faculty director, dean) communicated the goals and action plans for your department this year?
4. If you have received this year’s goals and action plans, has your (department chair or faculty director, dean) made progress on these? (A choice was included – I have not received this year’s goals.)
5. Does your (department chair or faculty director, dean) promote a positive work environment?
6. Any additional comments about your (department chair or faculty director, dean).

Each of the questions numbered 1 to 5 in this list included an open ended opportunity to explain or enter comments.

Questions for Associate Deans

1. Do you have confidence in your associate dean’s ability to perform his/her current role?
2. Does your associate dean’s involve faculty in the decision-making process?
3. Does your associate dean’s promote a positive work environment?
4. Any additional comments about your associate dean.

The goal questions are not asked about associate deans.

Combined results for all department chairs, deans, and associate deans are presented in the following tables. Note that blank entries in the column at the left are missing responses. Individual data for deans, associate deans, and department chairs are not included in this report. Also note that the output is in alphabetic order rather than order presented as choices within the survey.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ChairQ2aDoyouhaveconfidenceinyourdepartmentchairorfacultydirecto Chair Q2a: Do you have confidence in your department chair or faculty director's ability to perform his/her current role?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 80 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 17.0 |
| Definitely not | 49 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 27.4 |
| Definitely yes | 210 | 44.7 | 44.7 | 72.1 |
| Probably not | 43 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 81.3 |
| Probably yes | 88 | 18.7 | 18.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ChairQ3aDoesyourdepartmentchairorfacultydirectorinvolvefacultyin Chair Q3a: Does your department chair or faculty director involve faculty in the decision-making process?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 81 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 17.2 |
| Definitely not | 49 | 10.4 | 10.4 | 27.7 |
| Definitely yes | 185 | 39.4 | 39.4 | 67.0 |
| Probably not | 55 | 11.7 | 11.7 | 78.7 |
| Probably yes | 100 | 21.3 | 21.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ChairQ4aHasyourdepartmentchairorfacultydirectorcommunicatedthego Chair Q4a: Has your department chair or faculty director communicated the goals and action plans for your department this year?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 85 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 18.1 |
| Definitely not | 46 | 9.8 | 9.8 | 27.9 |
| Definitely yes | 192 | 40.9 | 40.9 | 68.7 |
| Probably not | 54 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 80.2 |
| Probably yes | 93 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ChairQ4bIfyouhavereceivedthisyearsgoalsandactionplanshasyourdepa Chair Q4b: If you have received this year's goals and action plans, has your department chair or faculty director made progress on these?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 86 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 18.3 |
| Definitely not | 19 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 22.3 |
| Definitely yes | 142 | 30.2 | 30.2 | 52.6 |
| I have not received this year's goals. | 77 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 68.9 |
| Probably not | 32 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 75.7 |
| Probably yes | 114 | 24.3 | 24.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ChairQ5aDoesyourdepartmentchairorfacultydirectorpromoteapositive Chair Q5a: Does your department chair or faculty director promote a positive work environment?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 81 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 17.2 |
| Definitely not | 48 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 27.4 |
| Definitely yes | 195 | 41.5 | 41.5 | 68.9 |
| Probably not | 61 | 13.0 | 13.0 | 81.9 |
| Probably yes | 85 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DeanQ2aDoyouhaveconfidenceinyourdeansabilitytoperformhishercurre Dean Q2a: Do you have confidence in your dean's ability to perform his/her current role?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 72 | 15.3 | 15.3 | 15.3 |
| Definitely not | 65 | 13.8 | 13.8 | 29.1 |
| Definitely yes | 156 | 33.2 | 33.2 | 62.3 |
| Probably not | 47 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 72.3 |
| Probably yes | 130 | 27.7 | 27.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DeanQ3aDoesyourdeaninvolvefacultyinthedecisionmakingprocess Dean Q3a: Does your dean involve faculty in the decision-making process?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 78 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 16.6 |
| Definitely not | 85 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 34.7 |
| Definitely yes | 97 | 20.6 | 20.6 | 55.3 |
| Probably not | 83 | 17.7 | 17.7 | 73.0 |
| Probably yes | 127 | 27.0 | 27.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DeanQ4aHasyourdeancommunicatedthegoalsandactionplansforyourdepar Dean Q4a: Has your dean communicated the goals and action plans for your department this year?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 77 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 16.4 |
| Definitely not | 68 | 14.5 | 14.5 | 30.9 |
| Definitely yes | 153 | 32.6 | 32.6 | 63.4 |
| Probably not | 57 | 12.1 | 12.1 | 75.5 |
| Probably yes | 115 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DeanQ4bIfyouhavereceivedthisyearsgoalsandactionplanshasyourdeanm Dean Q4b: If you have received this year's goals and action plans, has your dean made progress on these?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 86 | 18.3 | 18.3 | 18.3 |
| Definitely not | 20 | 4.3 | 4.3 | 22.6 |
| Definitely yes | 93 | 19.8 | 19.8 | 42.3 |
| I have not received this year's goals. | 98 | 20.9 | 20.9 | 63.2 |
| Probably not | 39 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 71.5 |
| Probably yes | 134 | 28.5 | 28.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DeanQ5aDoesyourdeanpromoteapositiveworkenvironment Dean Q5a: Does your dean promote a positive work environment?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 78 | 16.6 | 16.6 | 16.6 |
| Definitely not | 81 | 17.2 | 17.2 | 33.8 |
| Definitely yes | 142 | 30.2 | 30.2 | 64.0 |
| Probably not | 52 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 75.1 |
| Probably yes | 117 | 24.9 | 24.9 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AD1Q2aDoyouhaveconfidenceinyourfirstAssociateDeansabilitytoperfo AD1 Q2a: Do you have confidence in your first Associate Dean's ability to perform his/her current role?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 105 | 22.3 | 22.3 | 22.3 |
| Definitely not | 28 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 28.3 |
| Definitely yes | 197 | 41.9 | 41.9 | 70.2 |
| Probably not | 34 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 77.4 |
| Probably yes | 106 | 22.6 | 22.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AD1Q3aDoesyourfirstAssociateDeaninvolvefacultyinthedecisionmakin AD1 Q3a: Does your first Associate Dean involve faculty in the decision-making process?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 113 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 24.0 |
| Definitely not | 47 | 10.0 | 10.0 | 34.0 |
| Definitely yes | 113 | 24.0 | 24.0 | 58.1 |
| Probably not | 63 | 13.4 | 13.4 | 71.5 |
| Probably yes | 134 | 28.5 | 28.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AD1Q4aDoesyourfirstAssociateDeanpromoteapositiveworkenvironment AD1 Q4a: Does your first Associate Dean promote a positive work environment?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 112 | 23.8 | 23.8 | 23.8 |
| Definitely not | 29 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 30.0 |
| Definitely yes | 171 | 36.4 | 36.4 | 66.4 |
| Probably not | 43 | 9.1 | 9.1 | 75.5 |
| Probably yes | 115 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AD2Q2aDoyouhaveconfidenceinyoursecondAssociateDeansabilitytoperf AD2 Q2a: Do you have confidence in your second Associate Dean's ability to perform his/her current role?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 178 | 37.9 | 37.9 | 37.9 |
| Definitely not | 29 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 44.0 |
| Definitely yes | 133 | 28.3 | 28.3 | 72.3 |
| Probably not | 31 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 78.9 |
| Probably yes | 99 | 21.1 | 21.1 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AD2Q3aDoesyoursecondAssociateDeaninvolvefacultyinthedecisionmaki AD2 Q3a: Does your second Associate Dean involve faculty in the decision-making process?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 178 | 37.9 | 37.9 | 37.9 |
| Definitely not | 37 | 7.9 | 7.9 | 45.7 |
| Definitely yes | 89 | 18.9 | 18.9 | 64.7 |
| Probably not | 60 | 12.8 | 12.8 | 77.4 |
| Probably yes | 106 | 22.6 | 22.6 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AD2Q4aDoesyoursecondAssociateDeanpromoteapositiveworkenvironment AD2 Q4a: Does your second Associate Dean promote a positive work environment?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 183 | 38.9 | 38.9 | 38.9 |
| Definitely not | 31 | 6.6 | 6.6 | 45.5 |
| Definitely yes | 115 | 24.5 | 24.5 | 70.0 |
| Probably not | 39 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 78.3 |
| Probably yes | 102 | 21.7 | 21.7 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AD3Q2aDoyouhaveconfidenceinyourthirdAssociateDeansabilitytoperfo AD3 Q2a: Do you have confidence in your third Associate Dean's ability to perform his/her current role?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 390 | 83.0 | 83.0 | 83.0 |
| Definitely not | 5 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 84.0 |
| Definitely yes | 39 | 8.3 | 8.3 | 92.3 |
| Probably not | 8 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 94.0 |
| Probably yes | 28 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AD3Q3aDoesyourthirdAssociateDeaninvolvefacultyinthedecisionmakin AD3 Q3a: Does your third Associate Dean involve faculty in the decision-making process?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 390 | 83.0 | 83.0 | 83.0 |
| Definitely not | 5 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 84.0 |
| Definitely yes | 29 | 6.2 | 6.2 | 90.2 |
| Probably not | 14 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 93.2 |
| Probably yes | 32 | 6.8 | 6.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AD3Q4aDoesyourthirdAssociateDeanpromoteapositiveworkenvironment AD3 Q4a: Does your third Associate Dean promote a positive work environment?** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid |  | 392 | 83.4 | 83.4 | 83.4 |
| Definitely not | 4 | .9 | .9 | 84.3 |
| Definitely yes | 42 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 93.2 |
| Probably not | 7 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 94.7 |
| Probably yes | 25 | 5.3 | 5.3 | 100.0 |
| Total | 470 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |