**360-DEGREE EVALUATIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS**

**Summary of Results for Academic Year 2019-2020**

**Background**:

In 2019, the UMES School of Pharmacy implemented a 360-degree evaluation for members of the School’s administrators. The specific goals of this program were to:

1. Seek input on the performance of administrative team members from a variety of stakeholders.

2. Support the continuous quality improvement of the program and the professional development of the administrative team members.

3. Fulfill the requirements of the ACPE Standards 2016 related to Standard 8: Organization and Governance.

As a component of this approved policy, each administrator who has been evaluated is required to prepare an overall summary of the results and a plan to address any identified areas for improvement. Enclosed in this report are an overview of the survey process and a summary of the results of the 360-degree evaluations for the 2019-2020 academic year.

**Survey Process**:

A proposal to implement a comprehensive program for 360-degree evaluation of the school’s administrators was initially discussed at a meeting of the Executive Committee on March 14, 2019. Following a review of similar programs at other universities, a draft policy with a preliminary survey template was developed and approved by the Executive Committee on May 23, 2019. Feedback was solicited from the faculty, and modifications were incorporated prior to final approval by the Faculty Council on September 20, 2019.

Following official ratification of the policy, a pilot of the program was planned for the 360-degree evaluation of the Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (ADAA). Using the approved template, the draft ADAA survey instrument was created with the following components:

* Section I – Respondent demographics
* Section II – Job-specific questions (using a 5-point Likert scale)
* Section III – General evaluation (using a 5-point Likert scale)
* Section IV – Comments

A list of proposed respondents for the ADAA survey was reviewed and approved by the Executive Committee on October 10, 2019. The Director of Assessment constructed an electronic survey instrument in Google Forms from the approved document, and the pilot survey was sent to the approved list of respondents. Following the two-week open window from November-December 2019, the Director of Assessment compiled the survey responses and submitted the aggregate data and de-identified comments in a report to the Dean and ADAA. The report was reviewed at the Executive Committee meeting on December 19, 2019.

Following this pilot, each administrator developed standardized surveys which differed only in the specific job-related questions for Section II. Proposed respondent lists were also created for each position by the administrator being evaluated, and these lists were reviewed by the Executive Committee. Mandatory groups for each respondent list included School of Pharmacy faculty, staff, administrators, and students. Depending on the position, additional respondent groups could include alumni, other university administrators, and external stakeholders. The Director of Assessment provided additional recommendations for respondent groups when appropriate. Each administrator provided the distribution lists of email addresses for the approved respondent groups when necessary.

For the 2019-2020 academic year, surveys were deployed one at a time by the Director of Assessment from November 2019 – May 2020. An accompanying email was sent to explain the purpose for the survey. Respondents were given approximately 2-3 weeks to complete the evaluation. To preserve anonymity and confidentiality, respondent email addresses were not collected. The number of respondents in each administrator’s distribution list ranged from 158-1057, with the largest group including all preceptors who are listed as active in the CoreELMS system.

Following completion of each survey’s open period, the data was downloaded by the Director of Assessment and no additional responses were accepted. The Director of Assessment compiled a summary report of the data which was disseminated only to the administrator being evaluated and his/her immediate supervisor. The report included the following information:

* The evaluation date, the description of the survey’s purpose, and the Likert scale used (5=Strongly Agree, 4=Agree, 3=Neutral, 2=Disagree, 1=Strongly Disagree, Unable to Answer was not factored into the statistical reporting).
* The response rate, the breakdown of the respondents (i.e., faculty, student, etc.), and the aggregate response for the amount of interaction the respondents have with the administrator being evaluated.
* The mean, median, mode, and standard deviation of each job-specific survey question from Section II presented in the form of both a table and a bar graph.
* The mean, median, mode, and standard deviation for the three questions from Section III.
* All of the unedited comments from Section IV

**Summary of Results**:

For the 2019-2020 academic year, the following administrators were evaluated:

* Dr. Rondall Allen (Dean of the School of Pharmacy and Health Professions)
* Dr. James Bresette (Associate Dean for Development and External Relations)
* Dr. Timothy Gladwell (Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Assessment)
* Dr. William Harbester (Assistant Dean for Experiential Education)
* Dr. Victor Hsia (Chair of the Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences)
* Dr. Miriam Purnell (Chair of the Department of Pharmacy Practice and Administration)
* Dr. Lana Sherr (Assistant Dean for Professional Affairs)
* Dr. Sean Vasaitis (Assistant Dean for Student Affairs)

The aggregate survey response rate was 15%.

The results for the responses for Section III across all of the surveys are listed below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** | **Mean** | **Range** |
| I have confidence in this administrator’s ability to perform his/her role. | 4.38 | 3.83 – 4.75 |
| This administrator is aware of my needs. | 4.19 | 3.33 – 4.68 |
| This administrator is responsive to my needs. | 4.27 | 3.43 – 4.72 |

Based on the results of the surveys, each administrator has developed individualized goals as listed below: