

**Report of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Administrator Appraisal Committeeⁱ
Concerning
Lori Shepard, Dean of the School of 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 Shepard was conducted in 2005.

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire

The administrator appraisal questionnaire for Dean Shepard (posted at http://www.colorado.edu/pba/aap/11/AAP_quest_Shepard_20101014r.pdf) contained 38 items addressing the effectiveness of 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. Of these, 27 were "standard" items (i.e., they had been extensively reviewed by the Appraisal Committee and had been used in a prior year's AAP), and 11 were submitted by Dean Shepard to the Appraisal Committee and approved for inclusion in her questionnaire. These items are specific to the mission of the School of Education and cover positioning the School as a leader in the State for teacher training, outreach to K-12 and community, and budget and space management. Also, these items extend the recruitment goals for underrepresented members beyond faculty to graduate students, undergraduate students, and staff.

The complete list of items for Dean Shepard 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 ratings indicating more effectiveness. In addition, space was provided for respondents to write open-ended comments about the dean. Respondents were given a choice as to whether or not they wanted their verbatim comments forwarded to the dean. The questionnaire was completed onlineⁱⁱ.

Respondents and Response Rates

All School of Education faculty members (52 people), the population of interest (hereafter referred to as the "Population"), designated as eligible by the BFA were sent an e-mail requesting that they complete the online administrator appraisal questionnaire. In keeping with past practices, the AAP Committee, in collaboration with Dean Shepard, also asked a separate sample (11 people) judged

especially likely to be knowledgeable about Shepard's role as Dean (hereafter referred to as the "Knowledgeables") to complete the questionnaire.

The AAP Committee and 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. Of the 52 faculty members surveyed for Dean Shepard's appraisal, 42 (81%) responded. Thirty-two of the responses were from the Population, excluding Knowledgeables (78% response rate) and 10 were from the Knowledgeables (91% response rate). The response rates exceed the 60% criterion that the BFA considers necessary for a representative statistical study.

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire Results

Statistical Results

The statistical results of the administrator appraisal questionnaire for Dean Shepard are presented in Table 1. Both the mean rating and standard deviation for each of the 38 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 Shepard, 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 no large effect sizes. This finding indicates that the mean rating of the Knowledgeables did not differ in a practical sense from the mean rating of the Population for any of the items.

The results showed that 37 of the 38 items on the questionnaire were categorized as Strengths by both the Population and the Knowledgeables. Dean Shepard was rated "Very effective" (that is, a Population rating of 4.5 or higher) on 23 items, listed below (in descending order by Population mean rating):

Having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures
 Providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented masters & doctoral programs
 Positioning the School as a leader in the state and country with regard to the preparation of graduate students
 Sharing the bases of major decisions she makes
 Acting with integrity
 Constructively acting on graduate student concerns
 Having the vision to lead the industry/profession
 Positioning the School/College as a leader among AAU peers, both nationally and internationally
 Providing leadership for making budget decisions (both new requests and cuts) that are strategic
 Actively supporting high-quality faculty research (e.g., mentoring and funding opportunities)
 Providing leadership for making budget decisions (both new requests and cuts) that are fair
 Providing leadership (infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program
 Earning the trust of the faculty
 Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system
 Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty
 Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)
 Providing leadership (infrastructure and resources) for high-quality undergraduate teaching
 Appropriately involving faculty in decision making
 Providing active support for faculty and student initiatives intended to build community in the School
 Positioning the School as a leader among state institutions with regard to teacher education
 Making decisions regarding the use of space resources that are strategic, efficient, and effective
 Making decisions about space resources that are fair
 Supporting high-quality K-12 and community outreach
 Making decisions in a timely manner

Dean Shepard achieved the rating of "Effective" (Population mean rating of 3.8 to 4.4) on the following 13 items:

Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries
 Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented students in graduate programs
 Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)
 Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way
 Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color
 Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty
 Rewarding high quality service
 Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff
 Constructively managing conflicts among faculty
 Making progress toward diversity goals
 Constructively acting on staff concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)
 Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented students in the undergraduate program

Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented staff

The last item on the questionnaire— Constructively managing conflicts among staff —is the only one that, according to the mean score of 3.1 among the Population, is defined as “Neither effective nor ineffective.” The mean score for this item among the knowledgeable was 3.7, which would otherwise define this as “Effective.” Thus, Dean Shepard was rated very positively in virtually all aspects of the multiple-choice items on the appraisal form.

Open-Ended Comments

The open-ended comments about Dean Shepard largely corroborated the statistical results presented above. While relatively few respondents (a total of nine) chose to offer comments, six were strongly positive, one was mixed, and two were on balance negative. The positive comments were extremely positive, indeed, glowing: “I am very grateful to have Lorrie Shepard as my Dean . . . She is truly an exceptional leader and scholar”; “I believe the School of Education would be much less than it is today without the leadership and guidance of Dean Shepard. She is an incredible and talented individual that cares deeply about institutional excellence, equity and social justice”; “Dean Shepard is an outstanding leader. . . She not only handles all responsibilities in an exemplary way, but also she is deeply committed to the School and its mission and employees.” Other positive comments cited her communication and leadership skills, as well as her dedication and work ethic. The one mixed comment praised Dean Shepard as “a very effective Dean in most areas that she is responsible for,” but called for more attention to diversity goals and faculty of color concerns, as well as a more just and fair allocation of budget and space resources. Of the two negative comments, one criticized Dean Shepard for focusing on managing crises to the neglect of devising methods for proactively preventing their occurrence and criticized her for failing to deal with a problematic staff member. The other negative comment echoed the mixed comment above in charging unfairness in the distribution of various resources and rewards (while also noting that there are simply too few resources and rewards available). The negative comments about fairness in resource allocation are not corroborated by the general rating of Dean Shepard’s fairness in decision-making about resources, for the general rating categorizes this quality as a Strength. The negative comment about the handling of problems with a particular staff member may reinforce the rating of Dean Shepard’s management of conflicts among staff as an area in need of improvement. Overall, however, a largely positive picture of Dean Shepard’s leadership emerges from the open-ended comments submitted by survey respondents.

Campus-Wide Satisfaction Questionnaire Results

Statistical Results

The campus-wide satisfaction portion of Dean Shepard’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 none of the effect sizes exceeded a “medium” designation, and they are not discussed further here.

Overall, the Population indicated that 11 of the 20 items were Strengths for Dean Shepard. They are: teaching responsibilities, technological support in teaching, number of graduate students assisting in teaching, departmental support services, support of soliciting outside money, relationships with colleagues, University support for research and creative work, involving faculty in Library holdings decisions, Library access to outside resources, education and training support offered by the Library, and other benefits including retirement. Considering these 11 items, only three of them were not considered Strengths by the Knowledgeables. These were support for soliciting outside money (3 of the 9 respondents gave a rating of 1 or 2), education and training support offered by the Library (3 of the 7 respondents gave a rating of 3, and none gave a rating of 1 or 2), and other benefits including retirement (5 of the 10 respondents gave a rating of 3 and 1 gave a rating of 1 or 2). The Population with Knowledgeables excluded still ranked these items as Strengths.

Overall, the Population indicated that six items were Assets. They are: classroom facilities, salary compared with peer institution salaries, equitable distribution of salary, current health plan, faculty governance/progress made in shared governance, and evaluation of teaching. Of these items, classroom facilities were viewed as a Strength by the Knowledgeables, as were Faculty governance/progress made in shared governance and evaluation of teaching. Again, these Knowledgeable results did not significantly impact the Population with Knowledgeables excluded rankings.

The Population further indicated that five items were Issues. They are: classroom facilities, number of graduate students assisting in teaching, space and facilities, salary compared with peer institution salaries, and University efforts to recruit/retain diverse faculty. Three of these (classroom facilities, number of graduate students assisting in teaching, and salary compared with peer institution salaries) were bimodal, in that they were also rated by the Population as either a Strength or an Asset. Similarly, space and facilities and University efforts to recruit/retain diverse faculty were rated *both* Needs Improvement and an Asset by the Knowledgeables. (In the case of space and facilities, for example, this happened because 4 of 10 people rated the item 1 or 2, and 5 people rated it 4 or 5). Salary compared with peer institutions also got a Needs Improvement by the Knowledgeables, as did University efforts to recruit/retain diverse undergraduate students.

The only item that was ranked Needs Improvement by both the Population and the Knowledgeables was University efforts to retain diverse undergraduate students.

Open-Ended Comments

The majority of the campus-wide satisfaction comments provided by Dean Shepard's raters came from the Population (without Knowledgeables), and one comment came from a Knowledgeable. A large portion of the campus-wide comments from the Population addressed macro-issues about lack of State support impacting faculty merit raises, about salary inequities, about lack of classroom media support and outdated and dirty classroom spaces, and about lack of a sustained diversity hiring plan to recruit and retain faculty of color. The comments that addressed Dean Shepard directly and issues of administration and leadership mirror the positive spectrum of the statistical findings and state that the Dean is a "brilliant scholar" and a "caring and effective leader." Another commentator states that he/she feels "honored to be a part of the School of Education under her leadership." One comment that could be either anchored in macro-issues or in Dean Shepard's leadership discusses the teacher education program and the ways that the "practicum" sites are

managed. A campus-wide comment provided by one of the Knowledgeables discusses issues of shared governance and states that faculty use shared governance to focus on “gripes” rather than “productive cooperation.” Overall the campus-wide comments address macro issues affecting the School of Education. Specifically, comments register concerns about making the classrooms on par with the rest of the campus in terms of its technology, concerns about bringing raises and salaries in line with those at peer institutions, and concerns about having a sustained recruitment plan for faculty of color.

Conclusions

The overview of Dean Shepard’s 2005 reporting part states: “On every question except one, at least 75% of all respondents (“knowledgeables”, the full faculty, and the combined groups) rated Dean Shepard 3, 4, or 5 (that is, effective or very effective); on one question, this percentage was 64, *Managing conflicts among staff*. In the total group, the median percentage of respondents giving a rating of effective or better across all questions was 89%. In none of the groups did the dean receive a rating that falls in the [category of] Needs Improvement.”

The 2011 AAP Committee had a much more comprehensive set of items than did the 2005 AAP Committee to assist in appraising Dean Shepard.ⁱⁱⁱ With this list of expanded items, she continues to receive high ratings. Dean Shepard received very high ratings from both the Population and the Knowledgeables on the administrator appraisal questionnaire, with all but one item, *Managing conflicts among staff*, receiving high mean ratings. Overall, the survey results reveal respondents’ high regard for Dean Shepard and her leadership of the School of 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 Shepard *Exceeds Expectations*. The Committee congratulates Dean Shepard for her achievements and leadership and looks forward to the continued success of the School of Education.

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 Kunce, (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 did not see that dean’s appraisal data, did 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.

ⁱⁱⁱDean Shepard's 2005 report is published at
(<http://www.colorado.edu/FacultyGovernance//committees/REPORTS/shepard06.html>)

Table 1

Administrator Appraisal Program, 2010-11
Results for Dean Shepard

Item	Population* (A)			Knowledgeables (B)			Effect size, B vs. A
	Mean	(SD)	Category	Mean	(SD)	Category	
23. Having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.0
3. Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's & doctoral programs	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.0
33. Positioning the School as a leader in the state and country with regard to the preparation of graduate students	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.2
21. Sharing the bases of the major decisions she makes	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	-0.0
26. Acting with integrity	4.8	(0.5)	Strength	5.0	(0.0)	Strength	0.5
11. Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)	4.8	(0.5)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.2
6. Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it or keeping up with it	4.8	(0.6)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.3
7. Positioning the School/College as a leader among AAU peers, both nationally and internationally	4.7	(0.5)	Strength	5.0	(0.0)	Strength	0.6
35. Providing leadership for making budget decisions (both new requests and cuts) that are strategic	4.7	(0.7)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.3
4. Actively supporting high-quality faculty research (e.g., mentoring and funding opportunities)	4.7	(0.7)	Strength	5.0	(0.0)	Strength	0.6
36. Providing leadership for making budget decisions (both new requests and cuts) that are fair	4.7	(0.7)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.4
2. Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program	4.6	(0.8)	Strength	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	0.2
27. Earning the trust of the faculty	4.6	(0.8)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.4
22. Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system	4.6	(0.6)	Strength	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	0.3
12. Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty	4.6	(0.8)	Strength	4.9	(0.4)	Strength	0.4
10. Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)	4.6	(0.7)	Strength	4.6	(0.8)	Strength	0.0
1. Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality undergraduate teaching	4.5	(0.7)	Strength	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	0.4
19. Appropriately involving faculty in decision making	4.5	(0.7)	Strength	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	0.4
31. Providing active support for faculty and student initiatives intended to build community in the School	4.5	(0.7)	Strength	4.6	(0.5)	Strength	0.1
32. Positioning the School as a leader among state institutions with regard to teacher education	4.5	(0.9)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.5
37. Making decisions regarding the use of space resources that are strategic, efficient, and effective	4.5	(0.8)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.5
38. Making decisions regarding the use of space resources that are fair	4.5	(0.8)	Strength	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	0.4
34. Supporting high-quality K-12 and community outreach	4.5	(0.7)	Strength	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	0.5
20. Making decisions in a timely manner	4.5	(0.9)	Strength	4.7	(0.5)	Strength	0.2

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

Continued on following page

Table 1 (continued)

Administrator Appraisal Program, 2010-11
Results for Dean Shepard

Item	Population* (A)			Knowledgeables (B)			Effect size, B vs. A
	Mean	(SD)	Category	Mean	(SD)	Category	
18. Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries	4.4	(0.9)	Strength	4.6	(0.5)	Strength	0.2
29. Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented students in graduate programs	4.4	(0.8)	Strength	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	0.6
8. Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)	4.3	(1.0)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.6
25. Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way	4.3	(1.1)	Strength	4.9	(0.3)	Strength	0.6
13. Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color	4.3	(1.0)	Strength	4.8	(0.4)	Strength	0.6
15. Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty	4.3	(1.1)	Strength	4.7	(0.5)	Strength	0.4
5. Rewarding high-quality service	4.3	(0.9)	Strength	4.4	(0.5)	Strength	0.2
24. Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff	4.2	(1.0)	Strength	4.6	(0.5)	Strength	0.4
16. Constructively managing conflicts among faculty	4.2	(0.8)	Strength	4.3	(0.5)	Strength	0.2
14. Making progress toward diversity goals	4.1	(1.0)	Strength	4.7	(0.5)	Strength	0.6
9. Constructively acting on staff concerns (whether or not you agreed with her decisions)	4.0	(1.2)	Strength	4.4	(0.8)	Strength	0.4
28. Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented students in the undergraduate program	3.9	(1.1)	Strength	4.2	(0.7)	Strength	0.3
30. Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented staff	3.8	(1.2)	Strength	4.4	(0.5)	Strength	0.5
17. Constructively managing conflicts among staff	3.1	(1.4)	Improvement	3.7	(0.8)	Strength	0.5

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 Shepard's Appraisal

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

Appendix A (continued)

31. Providing active support for faculty and student initiatives intended to build community in the School
32. Positioning the School as a leader among state institutions with regard to teacher education
33. Positioning the School as a leader in the state and country with regard to the preparation of graduate students
34. Supporting high-quality K-12 and community outreach
35. Providing leadership for making budget decisions (both new requests and cuts) that are strategic
36. Providing leadership for making budget decisions (both new requests and cuts) that are fair
37. Making decisions regarding the use of space resources that are strategic, efficient, and effective
38. Making decisions regarding the use of space resources that are fair