

Performance Review of  
**DR. M. CHRISTOPHER BROWN II**  
PRESIDENT  
KENTUCKY STATE UNIVERSITY

**DR. JAMES A. ANDERSON**

EVALUATION FACILITATOR

**December, 2019**



## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the annual presidential review of Dr. M. Christopher Brown II is 1) to provide the Board of Regents with the information that they can use to evaluate the President's productivity and success, 2) to serve as a source of performance feedback for the President himself, 3) to elicit comments from other sources concerning the President's performance as determined by the Regents, and 4) to enhance the confidence of the Kentucky State University family and the public that the mission and vision of KSU are being fulfilled, thus solidifying their trust in his leadership. President Brown understood the purpose of the evaluation and cooperated willingly in its execution.

A significant aspect of the 2019 annual evaluation of the President of Kentucky State University involves the survey responses of members of the Board of Regents. The Board has the responsibility of evaluating the performance of the President and the Board utilizes a set of performance metrics that are linked to the strategic institutional priorities. A survey instrument was developed in-house that represented a qualitative assessment of the perceptions of the Board members. Also, the instrument afforded the Regents the opportunity to make individual comments. A qualitative assessment is bound by certain limitations that may not yield the concrete factual information that some expect. Its value is that it allows the "perceptions" of respondents to be compared to a range of other data that together will provide a more robust evaluation.

The expectation is that the overall evaluation will be both fair and authentic so that the Board can make an informed decision. The Board responses will be compared to the self-assessment performed by President Brown which documented his performance and institutional priorities and goals. This decision is in line with what occurs at many other institutions who conduct a full 360 degree evaluation of the president every 3-4 years.

The consultant is Dr. James A. Anderson who served as the Chancellor of Fayetteville State University from April, 2008 until June of 2019. He also worked at a second HBCU, Xavier University of New Orleans, where he chaired the Psychology department. He is well published in the topical areas of assessment and evaluation, and he served as a senior administrator responsible for assessment and academic program review at three large research universities (Texas A&M, North Carolina State University, and the State University of New York at Albany). He is also a consultant for the accrediting body, SACSCOC and in that capacity he chairs site visits to HBCU's and minority serving institutions.

## **THE PROCEDURES FOR THE EVALUATION**

### **PURPOSE**

The Kentucky State University Board of Regents shall review the performance of the President on an annual basis. The purpose of such a performance review is to evaluate the progress of the President; to provide the President with an opportunity for constructive input from student, faculty, staff, and other constituencies; to review the President's professional contributions and performance as a "leader" and as an "administrator;" and to provide the President with feedback to improve his or her performance.

### **PROCEDURE**

The Kentucky State Board of Regents shall engage the services of a consultant to coordinate the evaluation process. As part of that process, the consultant shall poll and interview students, faculty, staff, and other constituencies; the consultant shall review and analyze the poll results and the interview results; the consultant shall summarize the consultant's findings; and the consultant shall prepare a final report for the Board of Regents.

### **WRITTEN QUESTIONNAIRES – Students, Faculty, and Staff**

The Office of Institutional Research shall select student, faculty, and staff at random to serve as evaluators. OIR shall ensure that the evaluators reflect the demographic representation make-up of campus. Once identified, OIR shall notify the evaluators by email of their selection and provide them with the written evaluation instrument. OIR shall inform evaluators that their evaluations shall be anonymous. OIR shall give evaluators two weeks at a minimum to complete and to return written questionnaires to OIR.

OIR shall make an effort to achieve the highest response level possible. OIR shall send up to two rounds of emails to evaluators within this two-week period requesting the return of the written questionnaires. OIR shall forward the written questionnaires directly to the consultant to assemble, process, and analyze.

### **WRITTEN EVALUATIONS – Board of Regents**

The Board of Regents shall complete the Board of Regent evaluation form. Upon completion of the evaluation form, individual board members shall return the form directly to the consultant who shall assemble, process, and analyze.

### **WRITTEN EVALUATION – Presidential Self-Evaluation**

The President shall complete a self-assessment in narrative form. In that narrative, President's narrative shall include data that indicates progress toward the performance metrics as stated in the President's Employment Agreement and shall include written evidence pertaining to the performance factors included in the Board of Regent's Written Evaluation Form (Strategies and Priorities; Leadership; Relationships with Constituencies; Financial Management; Fund-Raising; and Future Positioning).

### **INTERVIEWS – Students, Faculty, Staff, and Constituencies**

The consultant shall conduct on-campus interviews with students, faculty, staff, and constituencies. These interviews shall occur in groups or in small groups at the discretion of the consultant.

## **FINAL REPORT**

The consultant shall review and analyze the information gathered from the written evaluation forms, the Presidential Self-Evaluation, and the in-person interviews. The final report shall include the same headings that were included on the Board of Regent's evaluation form as well as written evidence pertaining to each of those performance factors (Strategies and Priorities; Leadership; Relationships with Constituencies; Financial Management; Fund-Raising; and Future Positioning).

## **MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF PRESIDENT BROWN**

- Led the campus community through a successful SACSCOC 10-year accreditation review
- Launched a campus-wide comprehensive strategic planning process
- Reinvigorated the brand and identity of KSU
- The University obtained full-match land-grant appropriation from the legislature in a non-budget year
- Senior staff received expert professional development training to improve their managerial performance
- Worked with the Division of Finance and Administration to execute campus facilities improvements and enhancements
- The University was able to sustain enrollment and retention numbers
- Gross tuition and fee revenue increases
- The entire campus was introduced to a formal budget development process
- Successfully reopened The Halls dormitory
- The number of unrestricted gifts to KSU increased
- The campus launched a capital and facilities master planning process
- Initiated the KSU-Frankfort Town and Gown council

## **BOARD OF REGENTS SURVEY RESULTS**

A Likert-Scale survey instrument was utilized to elicit Board feedback. The survey was developed in-house by reviewing instruments from other similar institutions. Caution should be taken in the interpretation of the results for two reasons: 1) the small number of respondents, and 2) the limitations of a 5 point Likert Scale. Moreover, three Board members were new. Nonetheless, areas of general agreement among Board members were identified and from their personal written comments the evaluator was able to identify their perceptions of the President's positive characteristics.

In the survey virtually all Board members either "strongly agreed" or "agreed" with all statements that represented priority areas. Two areas of concern that 6-7 Regents identified were associated with "risk management" and the amount of time and energy that the President gave to fundraising. In my personal meeting with the Board of Regents they also desired more data and information from the President that would help them make more informed decisions.

## **BOARD PERCEPTIONS OF POSITIVE CHARACTERISTICS FROM SURVEY**

- I know he has the best interests of the university in mind daily.
- He is great and I am honored he is my president.
- Great job
- He needs support from everyone.
- President Brown has made significant strides for KSU.
- President Brown is great, knowledgeable, and respected by many.
- President Brown has done a good job of hiring VP's and establishing collegiality among them.

## **BOARD APPROVED 2019-2020 PERFORMANCE METRICS**

President M. Christopher Brown II has committed to an agenda of transparency and excellence based upon his comments from his self-assessment. He is committed to utilizing measurable outcomes and quantifiable metrics as his yardstick of accomplishment thus providing the Board of Regents and the public with an effective way of evaluating his success and productivity. He identifies five categories of outcomes that can be evidence-based and that overlap with the institutional priorities and outcomes, and he equally weights each of them. They are:

ACADEMIC OUTCOMES (20%)

FISCAL OUTCOMES (20%)

GRADUATION OUTCOMES (20%)

STRATEGIC OUTCOMES (20%)

STUDENT OUTCOMES (20%)

President Brown and the KSU Board of Regents are aware of those Outcome areas that can fluctuate because the university has varied influence over what occurs in that area, for example, campus-based state appropriations.

## CONCLUDING COMMENTS

The ultimate value of the 2019 evaluation of the President of KSU resides in the totality of responses from the Board, and the Presidential self-assessment. Although other constituent groups were not included in this evaluation, their comments and concerns are welcomed once the final evaluation report is ready for public dissemination.

Future Presidential evaluations should utilize more rigor, especially in the development of the evaluation tools. As was stated earlier, it is important for this effort to be a fair and authentic summation of the President's leadership efforts. The Board of Regents deserve a wealth of data and information to facilitate their review and their decision-making.

The survey responses and comments of the Board of Regents combined with their perusal of his self-assessment feedback suggest that high value is placed upon the leadership style and accomplishments of President M. Christopher Brown II.

