

Periodic Review: Vice President of Academic Affairs Andrew Bodman, Ph.D.

Campus Survey Results

Survey. The survey consisted of questions probing four primary areas of evaluation: leadership, professional relationships, supervisory skills, and managerial and fiscal skills. A question assessing overall effectiveness was also included. Respondents were also asked three open ended questions that queried Provost Bodman's special strengths, areas for improvement, and other general comments.

Leadership

Ten questions asked about different general areas of leadership. Most respondents, regardless of role in the University or frequency of contact with Provost Bodman, agreed that he was "definitely effective" or "usually effective" in his leadership. Most highly rated was his leadership in student retention with 87% of all respondents agreeing that Provost Bodman was "definitely effective" or "usually effective," lowest rated in the area was his leadership in promoting quality of faculty and staff through personnel decisions with 73% of all respondents agreed that Provost Bodman was "definitely effective" or "usually effective."

When Provost Bodman's leadership evaluations are examined by either frequency of contact with him or by the respondent's role in the University (faculty, staff, or administrator) all subgroups are highly supportive of Dr. Bodman's leadership ability. Overall regardless of frequency of contact respondents are very positive about Provost Bodman's leadership. For respondents who report infrequent contact with Provost Bodman their median response was 1.3 ("definitely effective"), and for people in frequent contact with Dr. Bodman the median = 1.54 ("definitely effective"). Similarly, when the data are examined by role in the University we find similar medians; faculty = 1.2, staff = 1.7, administrators = 1.4 all in the range of "definitely effective."

The comments support these numerical ratings. Respondent were asked to provide written comments on Dr. Bodman's areas of special strength, areas of potential improvement, and other general comments in the areas under evaluation. Following are just a few illustrative comments. From faculty, *"He has a vision for CSUSB based on his academic leadership experience, articulates and role models his vision for the entire campus..."* *"He has vision yet can get down to details,"* *"Dr. Bodman is interested in dealing with the large and global issues surrounding the CSU system and has written a thoughtful and insight essay, voicing his concerns for the system."* And from administrators, *"He has a clear vision for the university, and he understands the challenges and opportunities that CSUSB has, as opposed to other CSU campuses. He is truly a brilliant man who treats all with respect. He is honest and opinionated -- with the good of the university in mind. He seems to tackle every challenge with grace and success"* and *"Provost Bodman should be commended for his leadership. He is straight forward, effective, helpful,*

caring, and overall a strong leader. He is articulate and motivates through his words and actions.” Staff say that Dr. Bodman, *“Exhibits strong leadership skills and listens to people and what they have to say.”*

The quantitative data combined with the comments provide strong evidence of strong leadership skills as perceived by faculty, staff and administrators of the University.

Professional relationships

Eleven questions asked about different general areas of professional relationships. Most respondents, regardless of role in the University or frequency of contact with Provost Bodman, agreed that he was “definitely effective” or “usually effective” in his professional relationships. Most highly rated was his ability to treat people with respect with 89% of all respondents agreeing that Provost Bodman was “definitely effective” or “usually effective.” Provost Bodman’s lowest rated in the areas were in “accessibility to students” and “consulting appropriately before making decisions” with 73% of all respondents agreeing that Provost Bodman was “definitely effective” or “usually effective” in these two sub-areas.

When Provost Bodman’s professional relationship evaluations are examined by either frequency of contact with him or by the respondent’s role in the University (faculty, staff, or administrator) all subgroups are highly complementary of Dr. Bodman’s professional relationships. Overall regardless of frequency of contact respondents are very positive about Provost Bodman’s professional relationships. For respondents who report infrequent contact with Provost Bodman their median response = 1.3 (“definitely effective,”) and for people who are in frequent contact with Provost Bodman their median = 1.1 (“definitely effective”.) Similarly, when the data are examined by role in the University we find similar medians; faculty = 1.1, staff = 1.4, administrators = 1.3 all in the range of “definitely effective.”

The comments support these numerical ratings. Just few illustrative comments are included in the body of this report. From faculty, *“He is always “present” when he talks to you. It is a gift he has. Whomever he is speaking to gets his full attention,” “has a natural ability to be fair, honest and welcoming to new faculty” “is an honest, straightforward person” “his special strength is his interpersonal skill as an effective communicator....” “One truly gets the sense that he respects people and listens carefully to their views before making decisions,” “Professor Bodman handles challenging personnel issues with the highest level of integrity.”* And from administrators, *“He is very respectful and pleasant to all,” “especially for his level of a senior leader, he was kind and patient”* and from staff, *“he is a fair and objective individual, personable, amicable, and has tremendous energy,” “Dr. Bodman demonstrates respect for, and supports staff members who work in offices or departments that provide academic and advising services for students. He makes us feel that we are an integral part of Academic Affairs and that our services are valuable”* and *“Students come back from seeing him and feel that even if his*

answer was "no" They were heard. This is very important in building confidence and effective communication skills in students. Thank you."

The quantitative data combined with the comments provide strong evidence of strong ability to maintain quality professional relationships as perceived by faculty, staff and administrators of the University.

Supervision

Four questions asked about different general areas of supervision. Most respondents, regardless of role in the University or frequency of contact with Provost Bodman, agreed that he was "definitely effective" or "usually effective" in his supervision. Most highly rated was his ability to provide opportunities for feedback, with 77% of all respondents agreeing that Provost Bodman was "definitely effective" or "usually effective." Provost Bodman's lowest rating in this category was "resolved conflicts/complaints constructively" with 67% of all respondents agreed that Provost Bodman was "definitely effective" or "usually effective" in this sub-area.

When Provost Bodman's supervisory evaluations are examined by either frequency of contact with him or by the respondent's role in the University (faculty, staff, or administrator) all subgroups are positive. Regardless of frequency of contact respondents are positive about Provost Bodman's supervision skills. For respondents who report infrequent contact with Provost Bodman their median response = 1.5 ("definitely effective"), and people who are in frequent contact with Dr. Bodman rated supervision = 1.5 ("definitely effective"). When the data are examined by role in the University we find similar medians; faculty = 1.3 ("definitely effective"), staff = 2, administrators = 2 all in the range of "usually effective."

The comments support these numerical ratings. There are many more comments about Provost Bodman's special strengths than his areas for improvement, and many more positive comments than negative. However, the area of supervision was the area that drew the most comments for areas for potential improvement. Only just few illustrative comments are included in the body of this report. The comments from faculty, "*Professor Bodman handles challenging personnel issues with the highest level of integrity,*" and "*He listens, analyzes, and makes decisions with explanations so it is clear what the reasoning was. He is supportive of people in the "chain of command" and takes into account the input he asked for.*" From administrators, "*He never seeks to dominate the initial discussion and he makes all points of view feel welcome,*" "*Dr. Bodman could delegate some tasks and communications to others in order to improve the efficiency of his office,*" "*he seems to be stretched too thin, so he is not always accessible,*" "*Some slowness in response to concerns, possibly through overload,*" "*More feedback both positive and suggestions for growth - especially if there are no concerns - the person still wants feedback and to know how they can continue to improve or stretch.*" From staff, "*He listens effectively and*

offers constructive suggestions. He is willing and able to make decisions both independently as well as work as part of a team.”

The quantitative data combined with the comments provide evidence of Provost Bodman’s ability to supervise effectively as perceived by faculty, staff and administrators of the University. Clearly the data support solid supervision skills. However, given some of these responses Provost Bodman may want to reflect on some aspects of his supervision. It may be that Provost Bodman is indeed “*stretched too thin*” and his ability to respond quickly to email and various paperwork requests is hampered by his extraordinary workload.

Managerial and Fiscal Skills

Four questions probed different general areas of managerial and fiscal ability. Most respondents, regardless of role in the University or frequency of contact with Provost Bodman, agreed that his managerial and fiscal skills were “definitely effective” or “usually effective.” Most highly rated was Dr. Bodman’s ability to consider the broad needs of the university in making decisions; 84% of all respondents agree that Provost Bodman was “definitely effective” or “usually effective.” Provost Bodman’s lowest rated in the area in this category was “allocates resources fairly”; 75% of all respondents agreed that Provost Bodman was “definitely effective” or “usually effective” in this sub-area.

When Provost Bodman’s managerial and fiscal skill evaluations are examined by either frequency of contact with him or by the respondent’s role in the University (faculty, staff, or administrator) all subgroups are also quite positive. Overall regardless of frequency of contact respondents are positive about Provost Bodman’s managerial and fiscal skills. For respondents who report infrequent contact with Provost Bodman median = 1.7 “usually effective,” and frequent contact with Dr. Bodman median = 1 (“definitely effective”). Similarly, when the data are examined by role in the University we find similar medians; faculty = 1 (“definitely effective,”) staff = 1.3, administrators = 1 all in the range of “definitely effective.”

The comments support these numerical ratings. Some illustrative comments follow. From faculty, in referring to Provost Bodman’s white paper, “...*Andy analyzes the problems of the California higher education with the kind of insight that bespeaks a thinker of broad vision, philosophical depth, and profound understanding,*” and “*Dr. Bodman appears to always have the interests of CSUSB at the forefront of his actions,*” “*Bodman gives every indication of being equitable in making decisions and willing to support growth areas with resources. I have appreciated his willingness to offer tangible financial support for new or growing projects, programs, etc.*” Staff comments are equally positive; “*Exhibits strong leadership skills and listens to people and what they have to say. Has made critical decisions in the recent budget crisis to effectively manage funding levels for colleges.*” From administrators, “*Another area of strength is his management style. In a word, he is collaborative. He never seeks to dominate the*

initial discussion and he makes all points of view feel welcome. At the same time, he is not reluctant to share his perspective on issues, and I think we benefit from his experience at several other institutions before he came here,” and “clarity of thinking. Ability to cut through verbiage to the central issues. Analytical sharpness,” “highly intelligent with exceptional analytical skills. Very personable. I really like him as a fellow human being.” The quantitative data combined with the comments provide solid evidence of strong Provost Bodman’s skills in his managerial and fiscal roles as perceived by faculty, staff and administrators of the University.

Overall evaluation of Provost Bodman’s effectiveness as an administrator

One final question queried Dr. Bodman’s overall effectiveness. Responses to this question were quite positive as expected from the sub-areas above, 83% of faculty, staff, and administrators responded that Provost Bodman was “definitely” or “usually” effective; people with infrequent contact provided median = 1, frequent contact median = 1, faculty median = 1, staff median = 2, administrators = 1.

The comments support these numerical ratings. Many of the supportive comments are already included in the text of this section. Some comments speak to Provost Bodman’s overall ability. From staff, *“Dr. Bodman is an excellent Vice President of Academic Affairs; the campus is fortunate to have him,” “Overall, I appreciate and respect Provost Bodman and believe he's doing a GREAT job as an Administrator for our university!”* From Administrators, *“Dr. Bodman has been an excellent Provost. We hope that he stays with us for many years to come” “Dr. Bodman is an outstanding administrator!”* And finally, from the Faculty, *“Dr. Bodman is an outstanding leader and has an amazing ability to bring out the best in people,” “Andy Bodman is the best provost with whom I have ever worked,” “Dr. Andy Bodman is about the best provost a faculty member like me can hope for” He was a good choice for Provost. He has done an excellent Job, “Very pleased with his performance. We're so lucky to have him among us!” “I hope that Dr. Bodman stays at the university for many, many years to come. I am proud to be in a university where Dr. Bodman is provost.”*

Consider together the results of this anonymous survey provide strong evidence that Dr. Andrew Bodman is highly respected and is an outstanding Vice President of Academic Affairs.