In the fall of 2017, Provost Beth Ingram convened a team of four faculty and staff to undertake an administrative review of Dr. Charlene Wolf Hall in her third year as Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (Betsy Birmingham, Rajani Pillai, Florin Salajan, and Jackie Schluchter). This report compiles information and data from four sources: Dr. Wolf Hall’s self-evaluation; her annual reviews; the feedback the administrative review team compiled at the open forum, held on November 2nd, 2017; and a survey sent to faculty, administrators, department chairs and heads, and Dr. Wolf Hall’s direct reports. The Provost’s office sent surveys to 200 randomly generated faculty member e-mail addresses, all department chairs/heads and upper administrators, and all of Dr. Wolf Hall’s current direct reports. Of these, 25 faculty members, 23 chairs/heads, 10 administrators, and 6 direct reports responded.

The committee gathered information that describes patterns of positive interactions and satisfaction among those who work with Dr. Wolf Hall. The report focuses upon in the three important components of Dr. Wolf Hall’s position: leadership, communication, and personal skills, describing the information the team compiled, and commenting on strengths and areas for further growth.

**Leadership**
The survey supports the conclusion that Dr. Wolf Hall’s leadership style is valued widely on our campus. On all leadership questions on the survey, when we filter out those responses who do not have experience working with Dr. Wolf Hall, the responses are between 65-85% agreement or very strong agreement on every item. Faculty call her “approachable, caring, and involved” and chairs and administrators see her as a “solution-oriented” leader. Although they note she “takes a lot of heat for decisions regarding enrollment management funds and summer school revenues, most of these issues are not under her control.” The survey suggests her leadership is nearly universally valued across all constituencies, with her respect, civility and directness standing out as particularly noted and praise-worthy.

The one potential growth area in leadership would be more feedback and guidance to direct reports. That response comes in tandem with a high respect for Dr. Wolf Hall’s leadership style, suggesting those who report to her have a high regard for her insight and direction, and would value more regular opportunities to get that feedback, while acknowledging there are not enough hours in the day for her to do her job.

**Communication**
All groups responding to the survey gave Dr. Wolf Hall high marks for effective communication: openness to feedback, communicating, listening, and sharing even unpopular opinions. For each item most of respondents (66-100%) in every group suggested she “always” or nearly always” demonstrated the characteristic. She was described as “open,” “positive,” “impressive.” Those responding to the survey particularly found her written communication surrounding summer school thorough, effective, and organized. They found her an outstanding listener, and professional in both oral and written communication.

If there is a growth area in communication, it is only because Dr. Wolf Hall’s communication is so valued. One respondent summarized the pattern the review team saw in comments, “My only suggestion is for Charlene to step forward and state her opinion more frequently. She often sits quietly back in a meeting when I know she has great insight to share. I wish she would speak up and offer her thoughts more freely.”

**Personal skills**
Dr. Wolf Hall received consistent high marks for her personal skills, as well. She is seen by all groups as avoiding politicking, treating others with respect and lack of bias, and pursuing new
knowledge and encouraging that in others. She is described as interested in neutral, evidence-based decisions, “thoughtful,” and “open, transparent, and respectful.” If there is an area for growth, it seems to not be about Dr. Wolf Hall’s attitudes and behaviors, but a clearer articulation of her role in the provost’s office and what she does there. This is clearly not a problem for administrators and chairs, who work closely with her, but one faculty member wrote, “I don’t know what she does. She is occasionally seen with the provost taking notes. Some faculty think she is a secretary.” While this comment might underscore that gender-bias is still a challenge on our campus, and that some faculty may not serve on enough university-wide committees to interact with Dr. Wolf Hall, one way to combat this impression is to assure that she is introduced at all meetings, and her position title, and role at the meeting are made explicit (that she is not a note-taker). Those who work with Dr. Wolf Hall find her contributions valuable, and so making those contributions as transparent and openly communicated to the campus as possible is a useful way to ensure that this position, and Dr. Wolf Hall’s role in successfully filling it, are as widely recognized as is possible.

Conclusions
The central concern across the data we collected, surveys, the open forum, and even letters of evaluation suggest that Dr. Wolf Hall’s ideas, collaboration, and opinions are so valued that those who work with her wish that she would speak more, share her own ideas, and demonstrate that she can be a voice for her constituents, and carry their concerns to the provost and the provost’s office. Those who responded to the survey and those attending the open forum expressed concerns that Dr. Wolf Hall has too many responsibilities, despite managing them well, and that this will impact both her success and the success of the units she manages. Respondents want her to “communicate outward,” share “her vision,” and give “honest advice to the provost.” The consistency of these comments suggest that Dr. Wolf Hall’s presence is highly valued in her role, and she is seen as an effective bridge to sharing important information with the provost or the provost’s office. Conversely, she is occasionally seen as not being fully “armed” with information about “unpopular policies” that she is being asked to communicate. Respondents expressed key concerns about the role, not about Dr. Wolf Hall in the role.

For example, at the open forum, the central concern was that Dr. Wolf Hall use her leadership position to advocate for faculty governance around issues of curriculum, working to assert and maintain separation between the UCC and the provost’s office. There was expressed concern that the position—NOT Dr. Wolf Hall herself—should not be as closely involved in managing university curriculum. There is a fine line between curriculum development (governed by the faculty) and strategic enrollment management. Those who work with Dr. Wolf Hall highly value her, and would like her to be able to effectively negotiate that line and articulate it to both the provost’s office and to the members of the UCC, many of whom are not well-versed in general education, and do not hold elected positions representing faculty interests (rather, most are nominated by their deans). This is an issue the review committee does not think is in Dr. Wolf Hall’s ability to correct single-handedly; it was a concern at the open forum, and is related to the survey data asking Dr. Wolf Hall to be proactive in her valued leadership. A comment in the survey reiterated the concern about the role, not about Dr. Wolf Hall, “I feel like some of the issues that have arisen are more a function of what she has been asked to do, rather than her actually doing it . . . .” This was the theme of the open forum, as well.

Dr. Wolf Hall has a job that has expanded significantly beyond her initial job description, likely because she is an able, talented, and an extremely organized leader. In a constantly shifting environment, she has effectively led Summer School, enrollment management funds, and work on too many committees to mention here. The surveys suggest she is calm and collaborative leader, an excellent listener, and highly valued by those who work closely with her. She has managed with exceptional skill a position that has grown to cover too much territory, and is highly valued among administrators on the NDSU campus.