

**Report of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Administrator Appraisal Committeeⁱ
Concerning
Anne Heinz, Dean, Continuing Education**

Spring, 2011

Administrator Appraisal Program

The Administrator Appraisal Program (AAP) of the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) seeks to provide substantive feedback about administrators. Such feedback is based on a high rate of response reflecting a representative survey of faculty members associated with a particular administrator and familiar with his or her performance and professional accomplishments. For example, if the dean of the Leeds School of Business is being evaluated, then faculty in that school would be asked to provide feedback because they are likely to be familiar with their dean's performance. Faculty members have the opportunity to provide AAP feedback to the review/reappointment process when the president, chancellor, provost, or the dean of their school or college is undergoing a third- or fifth-year review. In this particular case, the last Appraisal for Dean Heinz was conducted in 2005.

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire

The administrator appraisal questionnaire (posted at http://www.colorado.edu/pba/aap/11/AAP_quest_Heinz_20101014r.pdf) regarding Dean Heinz contained 25 items addressing the administrator's performance in key areas, such as administrative/leadership style; support for teaching, research, and service; meeting faculty, staff, and student concerns; and making progress toward diversity goals. For Dean Heinz's questionnaire, members of the AAP Committee approved a revised list of questions reflecting relevance to Continuing Education and Professional Studies.

The complete list of items for Dean Heinz is presented in Appendix A. Faculty members responded to these items using a 5-point Likert-type effectiveness scale (5 = *Very Effective*, 4 = *Effective*, 3 = *Neither Effective nor Ineffective*, 2 = *Ineffective*, 1 = *Very Ineffective*), plus a "Don't Know/Not Applicable" option, with higher scores indicating more effectiveness. In addition, space was provided for respondents to write open-ended comments about the dean. The questionnaire was completed online.ⁱⁱ

Respondents and Response Rates

Dean Heinz's Population is unusual, relative to those of other UCB deans, because she does not have a clearly defined faculty constituency. Dean Heinz's Population consisted of AAP-eligible evaluators in Continuing Education and Professional Studies and faculty on lists provided to the appraisal committee by Dean Heinz (e.g., faculty providing distance education via the Center for Advanced Engineering and Technology Education). A total of 244 people were invited to evaluate Dean Heinz. Of these, 80 indicated that they were not familiar enough with her performance to provide an evaluation. Of the remaining 164 potential evaluators, 61 were considered "Knowledgeables" (i.e., they are judged to be especially familiar with the dean's performance). The Knowledgeables were either 1) AAP-eligible evaluators and assistant/associate deans or faculty chairs or 2) on the list of Knowledgeables provided to the appraisal committee by Dean Heinz.

One-hundred and seventeen potential evaluators were considered to be in Dean Heinz's general Population. Fourteen of the 61 Knowledgeables were also in the general Population. Thus, the number in the "Population, excluding Knowledgeables" is 103 (117-14).

The AAP Committee and the BFA have agreed, on the advice of faculty who specialize in survey methods, that a 60% return rate is needed for a representative statistical study. This requirement was met among all three Populations. In the "Population, including Knowledgeables," 84 responses were received out of a possible 117 (72%). In the "Population, excluding Knowledgeables," 70 responses were received out of a possible 103 (68%). Finally, 53 of the 61 Knowledgeables responded (87%).

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire Results

Statistical Results

The statistical results of the administrator appraisal questionnaire for Dean Heinz are presented in Table 1. Both the mean score and standard deviation for each of the 25 items assessed on the questionnaire are presented for the Knowledgeables and for the Population excluding the Knowledgeables. The means are listed in descending order according to the Population responses. Table 1 also provides a categorization for each item based on the percentage of the respondents who used the scale points of (a) 1 or 2, (b) 3, and (c) 4 or 5.

In keeping with past practices, these categories are labeled as:

- (a) ***Strengths to build on***, which represent items rated as effective or very effective by a substantial majority of the faculty (specifically, 60% or higher of respondents must give a rating of 4 or 5 on the scale);
- (b) ***Assets to protect***, which are items where at least half of the respondents found the dean's performance to be better than effective (50-59% of respondents must give a rating of 4 or 5 on the scale);
- (c) ***Issues to be mindful of***, which are items judged to be ineffective or very ineffective by a significant minority of respondents (25-39% of respondents must give a rating of 1 or 2 on the scale); and/or
- (d) ***Areas that need improvement (Improvements Needed)***, which are items judged by a significant portion of respondents to be ineffective or very ineffective (40% or more of respondents must give a rating of 1 or 2 on the scale).

To assess differences between the Population and the Knowledgeables for Dean Heinz, Table 1 also indicates effects sizes and their direction (positive or negative) for each item (expressing differences in standard deviation units). In interpreting effect sizes, a value of (a) .20 or less represents a small, unnoticeable effect; (b) .21- .49 represents a small-to-medium effect; (c) .50-.79 represents a medium-to-large effect; and (d) .80 or greater represents a large effect.

There were only two large effect sizes (on constructively managing conflicts among faculty and constructively managing conflicts among staff). This finding indicates that, in general, the mean ratings of the Knowledgeables did not differ in a practical sense from the mean ratings of the Population.

The results showed that 24 of the 25 items on the questionnaire were categorized as Strengths by

both the Population and the Knowledgeables. Dean Heinz received particularly strong ratings (mean scores of 3.9 or better from both sets of respondents) for the following 24 items (in descending order by Population mean score):

- Acting with integrity
- Earning the trust of the faculty
- Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries
- Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way
- Having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes
- Providing leadership for Summer Session
- Providing leadership for Continuing Ed. And Professional Studies
- Making decisions in a timely manner
- Appropriately involving faculty in decision making
- Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color
- Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty
- Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns
- Providing leadership for Outreach and Engagement
- Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it
- Constructively acting on faculty concerns
- Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff
- Sharing the bases of the major decisions she makes
- Positioning the CEPS/Summer Session/Outreach & Engagement as leader among AAU peers
- Actively supporting high-quality teaching, research, creative work, and service
- Constructively acting on staff concerns
- Constructively acting on graduate student concerns
- Making progress towards diversity goals
- Constructively managing conflicts among faculty
- Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system

The last item on the questionnaire— constructively managing conflicts among staff —was rated as her strongest Strength (4.9) by the Knowledgeables. The Population, in contrast, rated it as an Asset (3.8). It should be noted, however, that only 9 members of the “Population, excluding Knowledgeables” responded to this question, representing 13% of the 70 respondents from this group. The response rate on this item may have been so low because a) few people may have been aware of such conflicts and her handling of them or b) few conflicts occurred.

With the exception of one item rated by one group as an Asset, all dimensions of Dean Heinz’s performance were categorized as Strengths, a clear and impressive improvement for that item over the 2005 AAP report.

Open-Ended Comments

The open-ended comments about Dean Heinz corroborated the statistical results presented above and in Table 1. The comments that related to Dean Heinz and her performance were uniformly positive. Both her leadership and her administrative abilities were highlighted. As one respondent noted, “Dean Heinz is one of the reasons that I am proud to be a faculty member at CU. She exemplifies what is best about CU, including the commitment to impeccable standards for academic and creative work and the value of extending such work into the wider community.” Other

respondents spoke highly of her abilities as an administrator: “Dean Heinz is an engaged leader who is, perhaps, the most encouraging administrator on campus. She is upbeat and positive, always supportive, while also a shrewd judge of events.” Other ways in which respondents described Dean Heinz include: effective, visionary, talented, generous, thoughtful, distinguished, respectful, attentive, exceptional, supportive, and inspiring. Overall, the open-ended comments directly relating to Dean Heinz can be summarized by one respondent’s statement: “CU is extremely privileged to have her as a Dean.”

Some open-ended comments by Knowledgeables that dealt with issues other than Dean Heinz’s performance registered concerns about the computer system used for student enrollment, the need for better technical support, and alcohol policy. One respondent voiced concerns about summer school sessions, suggesting revision and decentralization of classes. The same respondent questioned Continuing Education’s valuing the generation of revenue over quality.

Campus-Wide Satisfaction Questionnaire Results

Statistical Results

The campus-wide satisfaction portion of Dean Heinz’s survey included 20 items. The same scoring system was used for this section as is described in Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire Results. Ratings were given on a five-point scale where a 1 is “very dissatisfied” and a 5 is “very satisfied.” Each item was categorized based on the responses. The categories are (a) Strengths to build on (60% or more ratings of 4 and 5), (b) Assets to protect (50-59% of ratings of 4 and 5), (c) Issues to be mindful of (25-39% of ratings of 1 and 2), and (d) Areas that need improvement (40% or more ratings of 1 and 2). Effect sizes have been calculated; however all of the effect sizes had a “small” designation, except for one that had a “small to medium” designation, and they are not discussed further here.

Overall, the Population indicated that 7 of the 20 items were Strengths. These include: teaching responsibilities, technological support in teaching, departmental support services, relationships with colleagues, University support for research and creative work, Library access to outside resources, and other benefits including retirement. Considering these seven items, only three of them were not considered Strengths by the Knowledgeables. These were teaching responsibilities, University support for research and creative work, and other benefits including retirement.

Overall, the Population indicated that seven items were Assets. They are: classroom facilities, number of graduate students assisting in teaching, support for soliciting outside money, involving faculty in Library holdings decisions, education and training support offered by the Library, University efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty, and evaluation of teaching. Of these items, three were viewed as Issues by the Knowledgeables (classroom facilities, number of graduate students assisting in teaching, and support for soliciting outside money), two were viewed as strengths (involving faculty in Library holdings decisions and education and training support offered by the Library), and the remaining two had a pattern of proportions of ratings over the scale points that did not place them in any of the categories (i.e., both items were below the Issues threshold of 25% of ratings of 1 or 2, and were below the Asset threshold of 50% of ratings of 4 or 5).

The Population further indicated that four items were Issues. They are: number of graduate students assisting in teaching, space and facilities (which the Knowledgeables rated as Needs Improvement),

equitable distribution of salary (which the Knowledgeables also rated as Needs Improvement), and current health plan. One of these (number of graduate students assisting in teaching) was bimodal, in that it was also rated by the Population as an Asset. The Knowledgeables indicated that six items were Issues (classroom facilities, number of graduate students assisting in teaching, support for soliciting outside money, University support for research and creative work, current health plan, and faculty governance and progress toward shared governance).

The only item that was ranked Needs Improvement by both the Population and the Knowledgeables was salary compared with peer institution salaries. It is worth considering, however, that this item likely is not fully under Dean Heinz's control.

Open-Ended Comments

As with Knowledgeables' open-ended comments directly related to Dean Heinz, the Population's open-ended comments about issues exclusively under the dean's control were uniformly positive. One Population comment reads: "Dean Heinz has transformed Continuing Education and Summer School. She has developed and implements exciting new programs (FIRST, Maymester, outreach), engaged faculty and students and worked closely with faculty. She is an outstanding leader and administrator."

Some Population open-ended comments revealed concerns over macro issues, such as lack of adjunct faculty recognition, low TA salaries, methods of salary distribution, salaries of administrators compared to faculty salaries, lack of student diversity, discontinuance of A&S faculty College Accounts, increased class size, and lack of raises.

Conclusions

Dean Heinz received very high ratings from both the Population and the Knowledgeables on the administrator appraisal questionnaire, with all items receiving high mean scores. Overall, the survey results revealed respondents' high regard for Dean Heinz and her leadership of Continuing Education. As per the charge given to the Administrator Appraisal Program Committee to provide an overall rating of "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," or "Needs Improvement," the Committee concludes, on the basis of the data acquired, that Dean Heinz *Exceeds Expectations*. The Committee congratulates Dean Heinz for her achievements and encourages her to maintain her performance strengths.

ⁱ The members of the committee are Arturo Aldama (A&S Representative, Ethnic Studies), Andrew Cooperstock (Other Units Representative, Music), Lori Hunter (BFA Representative at-large), Roger King (Other Units Representative, Computer Science), Catherine Kuncze, (BFA Representative, Program in Writing and Rhetoric, Committee Chair), Claudia Mills (A&S Representative, Philosophy), Page Moreau (BFA Representative, Business), Daniel Sher (Administration Representative, Music), Elizabeth Skewes (BFA Representative, Journalism), and James Williams (Administration Representative, Library). Jeff Schiel (Office of Planning and Budget, and Analysis, ex-officio member) served as a resource to the committee.

ⁱⁱ Questionnaire responses were submitted online directly to the Office of Planning, Budget, and Analysis, where the data were analyzed. A summary of the statistical data, along with the open-ended

comments with respondents' names removed, was provided to the AAP Committee Chair, who distributed the information to the appropriate committee members. If applicable, committee members from the school/college of the dean under review do not see that dean's appraisal data, do not participate in any stage of data analysis, are not involved in the preparation of the written report, and will not see the written report about that dean until it is released to all faculty.

Table 1

**Administrator Appraisal Program, 2010-11
Results for Dean Heinz**

Item	Population* (A)			Knowledgeables (B)			Effect size, B vs. A
	Mean	(SD)	Category	Mean	(SD)	Category	
24. Acting with integrity	4.7	(0.7)	Strength	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	0.2
25. Earning the trust of the faculty	4.7	(0.8)	Strength	4.6	(0.7)	Strength	-0.1
16. Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries	4.7	(0.5)	Strength	4.7	(0.5)	Strength	0.1
23. Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way	4.6	(0.7)	Strength	4.7	(0.5)	Strength	0.2
21. Having solid understanding of faculty governance processes, univ. policies, & budget procedures	4.6	(0.6)	Strength	4.8	(0.5)	Strength	0.4
2. Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for Summer Session	4.6	(0.8)	Strength	4.6	(0.8)	Strength	0.0
1. Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for Continuing Ed. and Professional Studies	4.5	(0.8)	Strength	4.6	(0.8)	Strength	0.1
18. Making decisions in a timely manner	4.5	(0.5)	Strength	4.7	(0.5)	Strength	0.3
17. Appropriately involving faculty in decision making	4.4	(0.8)	Strength	4.6	(0.8)	Strength	0.2
12. Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color	4.4	(0.8)	Strength	4.6	(0.7)	Strength	0.2
11. Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty	4.4	(0.8)	Strength	4.7	(0.7)	Strength	0.4
9. Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)	4.4	(0.5)	Strength	4.3	(1.1)	Strength	-0.1
3. Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for Outreach and Engagement	4.4	(1.0)	Strength	4.5	(0.9)	Strength	0.2
5. Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it or keeping up with it	4.4	(0.8)	Strength	4.5	(0.8)	Strength	0.2
7. Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)	4.4	(0.8)	Strength	4.3	(0.9)	Strength	-0.0
22. Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff	4.3	(0.9)	Strength	4.7	(0.6)	Strength	0.5
19. Sharing the bases of the major decisions she makes	4.3	(1.0)	Strength	4.6	(0.8)	Strength	0.3
6. Positioning the CEPS/Summer Session/Outreach & Engagement as leader among AAU peers	4.3	(0.8)	Strength	4.4	(0.9)	Strength	0.2
4. Actively supporting high-quality teaching, research, creative work, and service	4.2	(1.0)	Strength	4.3	(1.1)	Strength	0.1
8. Constructively acting on staff concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)	4.2	(0.8)	Strength	4.6	(0.6)	Strength	0.6
10. Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)	4.2	(0.7)	Strength	4.3	(1.1)	Strength	0.2
13. Making progress toward diversity goals	4.1	(1.0)	Strength	4.7	(0.6)	Strength	0.7
14. Constructively managing conflicts among faculty	4.1	(1.0)	Strength	4.7	(0.6)	Strength	0.8
20. Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system	3.9	(1.1)	Strength	4.4	(1.2)	Strength	0.4
15. Constructively managing conflicts among staff	3.8	(1.1)	Asset	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	1.7

Scale: 1=Very ineffective, 2=Ineffective, 3=Neither effective nor ineffective, 4=Effective, 5=Very effective

Categories: Strength (60% or more ratings of 4 or 5); Asset (50%-59% ratings of 4 or 5); Issue (25%-39% ratings of 1 or 2); Improvement (more than 40% ratings of 1 or 2)

Effect sizes: These express the difference between means in terms of standard deviation units. Example: An effect size of -0.5 indicates that the mean for the knowledgeables is 1/2 standard deviation unit smaller than the mean for the population. Interpretive rules of thumb: Absolute value of 0.20 or less -- small; 0.21-0.49 -- small to medium; 0.50-0.79 -- medium to large; 0.80 or greater -- large.

*Knowledgeables have been excluded from the population for this analysis.

CU-Boulder Office of Planning, Budget, and Analysis; Code ref: L:\mgt\AAP\2010-11\AAP2010_results.sas; Created 01/13/2011

Appendix A
Complete List of Items for Dean Heinz's Appraisal

1. Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for Continuing Education and Professional Studies
2. Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for Summer Session
3. Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for Outreach and Engagement
4. Actively supporting high-quality teaching, research, creative work, and service
5. Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it or keeping up with it
6. Positioning the CEPS/Summer Session/Outreach and Engagement as a leader among AAU peers, both nationally and internationally
7. Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)
8. Constructively acting on staff concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)
9. Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)
10. Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)
11. Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty
12. Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color
13. Making progress toward diversity goals
14. Constructively managing conflicts among faculty
15. Constructively managing conflicts among staff
16. Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries
17. Appropriately involving faculty in decision making
18. Making decisions in a timely manner
19. Sharing the bases of the major decisions she makes
20. Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system
21. Having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures
22. Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff
23. Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way
24. Acting with integrity
25. Earning the trust of the faculty