

**Report of the
Boulder Faculty Assembly Administrator Appraisal Committee¹
Concerning
Dennis Ahlburg, Dean of the Leeds School of Business**

Spring, 2008

Administrator Appraisal Program

The Administrator Appraisal Program (AAP) of the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) seeks to provide substantive feedback about administrators based on a high rate of response reflecting a representative survey of the faculty. 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 the third- or fifth-year review.

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire

The administrator appraisal questionnaire (posted at <http://www.colorado.edu/pba/aap/index.htm>) contained 27 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. Additional items were included at a particular dean's request; Dean Ahlburg included two additional items (raising funds and working with corporate partners). The complete list of items for Dean Ahlburg 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.²

Respondents and Response Rates

All Leeds School of Business faculty members (63 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 Ahlburg, also asked a separate sample (16 people) judged especially likely to be knowledgeable about Ahlburg'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. For the Population, 53 of the 63 people surveyed completed the administrator appraisal questionnaire, a response rate of 84%. For the Knowledgeables, 15 of the 16 people surveyed completed the questionnaire, a response rate of 94%. Hence, both the Population and the Knowledgeables met and exceeded the desired response rate. Combining these two sets of respondents, 68 of the 79 people surveyed completed the questionnaire, for an overall response rate of 86%.

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire Results

Statistical Results

The statistical results of the administrator appraisal questionnaire for Dean Ahlburg are presented in Table 1. Both the mean score and standard deviation for each of the 29 items assessed on the questionnaire are presented for the Population (with the Knowledgeables excluded for this and all other Population analyses) and for the Knowledgeables. The means and standard deviations 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 Population and the percentage of the Knowledgeables 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* represent items rated as effective or very effective by a substantial majority of the faculty (specifically, 60% or higher of respondents gave a rating of 4 or 5 on the scale); (b) *Assets to protect* are items where at least half of the respondents found the dean's performance to be better than effective (50-59% of respondents gave a rating of 4 or 5 on the scale); (c) *Issues to be mindful of* are items judged to be ineffective or very ineffective by a significant minority of respondents (25-39% of respondents gave a rating of 1 or 2 on the scale); and (d) *Areas that need improvement (Improvements Needed)* are items judged by a significant portion of respondents to be ineffective or very ineffective (40% or more of respondents gave a rating of 1 or 2 on the scale). Items also are categorized as Bimodal when they are rated such that they meet the criteria for two categories. A Bimodal categorization means that the members of the Population or the members of the Knowledgeables are divided and view an item in potentially very different ways (e.g., a significant portion seeing the item as a strength and a significant portion seeing it as an issue). A complete list of items categorized in these ways for the Population and for the Knowledgeables for Dean Ahlburg is presented in Table 2.

Table 1 also indicates effects sizes and their direction (positive or negative) for each item (expressing differences in standard deviation units). First, the Population and the Knowledgeables for Dean Ahlburg were compared. Second, the responses from the Populations for the other four deans assessed this year were combined, the overall mean and standard deviation were computed for each item, and those overall scores were compared with the Population responses for Dean Ahlburg. Third, the responses of the Knowledgeables for the other four deans were combined, the overall mean and standard deviation were computed for each item, and those overall scores were compared with the Knowledgeables for Dean Ahlburg. 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. Although the AAP Committee recognizes that each dean faces unique circumstances and challenges, comparing the deans assessed this year (a new analysis for these reports), combined with the ratings and categories, is potentially useful for appraising a dean, especially for general items (e.g., acting with integrity). Moreover, the AAP Committee hopes that over time, a large database of administrator appraisals will make these comparisons an even more valuable assessment procedure.

The results showed that the Population and the Knowledgeables only rated two items in common as Strengths: raising funds and working with corporate partners (both of which were items added by Dean Ahlburg). These items were also the only two that achieved a mean score of 4.0 or greater. The Population identified 3 additional items as Strengths: (a) making progress toward diversity goals, (b) providing leadership for high-quality undergraduate teaching, and (c) recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty. There were also a number of Bimodal items that represented Strengths/Issues; acting with integrity was identified as such by both the Population and the Knowledgeables. The Population also identified constructively managing conflicts among staff as a Strength/Issue. The Knowledgeables identified 6 other items: (a) acting on undergraduate student concerns; (b) acting on staff concerns; (c) treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive manner; (d) understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures; (e) actively supporting high-quality faculty research, and (f) sharing the basis of major decisions he makes.

There were 4 Assets identified by the Population—(a) constructively acting on undergraduate concerns, (b) acting on the concerns of faculty of color, (c) acting on the concerns of women faculty, and (d) taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff—and 1 Asset identified by the Population—providing leadership for high-quality undergraduate teaching. The Population also rated 8 items in a Bimodal manner that represented Assets/Issues; the Knowledgeables rated 5 different items in that manner.

The Population and the Knowledgeables both rated 5 items as Issues: (a) positioning the School as a leader among AAU peers, (b) constructively acting on faculty concerns, (c) appropriately involving faculty in decision making, (d) earning faculty trust, and (e) providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs. The Population also rated 3 other items as Issues: constructively acting on graduate student concerns, making decisions in a timely manner, and rewarding high-quality service. The Knowledgeables rated 2 other items as Issues: providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program and responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries.

The Population and the Knowledgeables rated 1 item in common as Needing Improvement: managing conflicts among faculty. The Population also rated fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system as Needing Improvement; the Knowledgeables rated rewarding high-quality service, making decisions in a timely manner, and constructively managing conflicts among staff as Needing Improvement.

In comparing these two sets of respondents, the Population rated Dean Ahlburg higher on 24 of the 29 items, lower on 1 item, and the same on 4 items than did the Knowledgeables. This means, counterintuitive to what might be expected, that those who work most closely with Dean Ahlburg rated him lower than did the other respondents. Only 2 of those items, however, demonstrated a medium-to-large effect size, with the Population rating Dean Ahlburg higher than did the Knowledgeables for managing conflicts among staff and making progress toward diversity goals. Most of the other differences showed small effect sizes.

The more important comparisons concerned the ratings of Dean Ahlburg with the other deans assessed this year for the 27 common items on the questionnaire. Those comparisons showed

that for the Population, Dean Ahlberg was rated lower than the other deans for 26 of the 27 items, with effect sizes large for 1 item (understanding faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures), medium to large for 15 items (e.g., providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs, and acting on graduate student concerns), small-to-medium for 5 items, and small for 5 items. For the Knowledgeables, comparisons showed that Dean Ahlberg was rated lower than the other deans for all 27 items, with effect sizes large for 15 items and medium to large for 12 items. These results, thus, suggest that Dean Ahlberg performed lower on virtually every item compared to the other deans assessed this year, and significantly lower on a large number of those items.

Open-Ended Comments

Thirty-four persons (43% of all those surveyed; 50% of those who completed the questionnaire), 25 from the Population (40% of the Population surveyed; 47% of those who completed the questionnaire) and 9 from the Knowledgeables (56% of the Knowledgeables surveyed; 60% of those who completed the questionnaire) from the Leeds School of Business provided comments. A content analysis revealed that 8 respondents (24%) gave comments that could be categorized as entirely positive, 14 (41%) gave entirely negative comments, and 12 (35%) gave mixed (or neutral) comments that included both positive and negative points, with 4 of those comments being overwhelmingly negative. Although these responses did not come from a representative sample, they offer potentially valuable information about what these respondents viewed as Dean Ahlberg's strengths and weaknesses, especially since the responses, in general, addressed closely related issues.

A number of the positive comments, as might be expected, were relatively short, simply expressing respondents' support of the dean (e.g., "I support him and consider us fortunate to have him" and "I don't think that the survey captures my extreme satisfaction with Dean Ahlberg"). With regard to specific strengths identified, respondents pointed to Dean Ahlberg's focus on completing the new building and related fund-raising efforts, working with corporate partners, and engaging the external business community and broader constituencies. Some respondents acknowledged that he has performed well in view of the limited resources available in the School.

The negative comments are more difficult to summarize because of their extensive nature (with many taking up multiple pages of text) and the intensity with which they generally are written. Many respondents cited Dean Ahlberg's poor administrative and interpersonal skills, authoritarian style of leadership, ineffective communication with faculty, inability to position the Leeds School of Business as a leader among peer institutions, general lack of leadership and vision, lack of integrity and fairness, and inadequate understanding of the profession and its needs. Several respondents cited low morale in the School, and that Dean Ahlberg had not been effective in addressing or resolving this important issue, or in managing conflicts and treating faculty of all ranks openly, constructively, and fairly. Moreover, he was perceived as not having a good understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures. Important decisions affecting the faculty and the School were said to be made in a vacuum rather than through the inclusion of faculty leadership. Several respondents cited lack of efforts to retain top faculty and are considering leaving the School this spring. Even respondents

who acknowledged Dean Ahlburg's work in raising funds for the new building commented that doing so may have affected his performance in other areas.

BFA Satisfaction Questionnaire Results

In addition to the administrator appraisal questionnaire, all eligible faculty members in the university (1650 people) were asked to complete a "Boulder Faculty Assembly Satisfaction Questionnaire" (posted at <http://www.colorado.edu/pba/aap/index.htm>) that consisted of 20 items (see Appendix B) rated on a 5-point scale (1 = *Very Dissatisfied*, 2 = *Dissatisfied*, 3 = *Neutral*, 4 = *Satisfied*, 5 = *Very Satisfied*), plus a "Don't Know or Not Applicable" option, with higher scores indicating more satisfaction. Space for open-ended comments also was provided. Of the 1650 questionnaires sent, 758 were returned, for a response rate of 46%; a separate report is being submitted about those responses to the satisfaction questionnaire. The response rates for both the Population and the Knowledgeables for Dean Ahlburg, as previously indicated, far exceeded the minimum rate needed.

Table 3 presents the results for the satisfaction questionnaire for the Population and for the Knowledgeables for Dean Ahlburg. The mean and standard deviation are provided for each item, in descending order according to the Population responses. As a general way to interpret these mean scores, a mean score of 3.26 or greater indicates satisfaction (S), a mean score of 2.75-3.25 indicates neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction (N), and a mean score of 2.74 or less indicates dissatisfaction (D). In addition, items are categorized in the four ways previously identified for the administrator appraisal questionnaire: (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), (d) Areas that need improvement (Improvements Needed; 40% or more ratings of 1 and 2), or (e) Bimodal (with the specific categories identified) when appropriate. Effect sizes for the items also are provided, using the same procedures of combining the data for the other four deans that were assessed this year and using those combined data for comparison purposes, as described previously for the administrator appraisal questionnaire. The comparison group of the other deans was used instead of the entire university population that completed the satisfaction questionnaire because these raters all have in common the fact that they are evaluating their respective dean, and it is possible that those who evaluated a dean might have a somewhat different perspective on campus-wide issues (as measured by the satisfaction questionnaire) than those who did not evaluate a dean. It also should be pointed out that some items on this questionnaire are directly under the control of the dean, whereas other items are university issues that are not controlled by the dean.

The results showed that both the Population and the Knowledgeables were satisfied with 13 of the 20 items, with particularly strong ratings (mean scores of 4.0 or better for both sets of respondents) on 3 items: technological teaching support, classroom facilities, and space and facilities. Each of these items were considered a Strength by both sets of respondents, as were (a) relationships with colleagues, (b) library access to outside resources, (c) education/training by the library, and (d) teaching responsibilities. Both sets of respondents were neutral regarding support for outside money, faculty governance, and evaluation of teaching, although all 3 items and the latter 2 items were considered Issues by the Population and by the Knowledgeables, respectively. The Population also was neutral, whereas the Knowledgeables were satisfied, about

the number of graduate teaching assistants; however, this was considered an Issue for both groups. Both sets of respondents were dissatisfied with the current health plan, salary compared with peer institutions, and equitable salary distributions, and considered these to be Improvements Needed.

A comparison of the effect sizes showed that the Population rated 11 of the 20 items higher, 5 items lower, and 4 items the same as did the Knowledgeables; however, the majority of these differences demonstrated a small effect size. Only the item of faculty involvement in the library, with the Population being higher, demonstrated a medium-to-large effect size. Hence, the Population and the Knowledgeables generally were equally satisfied with regard to the majority of these items. Comparisons between the deans assessed this year demonstrated that Dean Ahlburg's Population was less satisfied than the Populations of the other deans on 12 items; however, effect sizes generally were small, with only 1 item (number of graduate teaching assistants) demonstrating a medium-to-large effect size. Dean Ahlburg's Population was more satisfied on 7 items, with classroom facilities and space and facilities showing medium-to-large effect sizes. Dean Ahlburg's Knowledgeables were less satisfied than the Knowledgeables for the other deans on 13 items and more satisfied on 7 items; effect sizes varied, with large positive effect sizes for classroom facilities and for space and facilities, but large negative effect sizes for support for outside money and faculty governance.

Eleven respondents (14% of those surveyed; 16% of those who completed the questionnaire) provided comments on the satisfaction questionnaire. Two respondents expressed their general satisfaction, including one who mentioned the first-rate facilities at the Leeds School of Business. All respondents identified things about which they were dissatisfied, with many respondents focusing on university concerns. Of those who commented on issues germane to the School, three respondents focused on the lack of effectively evaluating teaching, with two of them questioning the overreliance on FCQs. Another respondent objected to soliciting letters from students for tenure and promotion. Another respondent was dissatisfied with the teaching load across faculty. Another respondent believed that faculty governance in the Leeds School and in the university had been undermined. One respondent said that the Leeds School does not encourage seeking research grants and does not reward those who obtain research grants. Another respondent took exception to the revenue sharing between the School and the campus.

Conclusion

Dean Ahlburg received high ratings from both the Population and the Knowledgeables for raising funds and working with corporate partners, items that he added to the administrator appraisal questionnaire and the only items that received mean scores of 4.0 or greater. The Population identified 3 other Strengths and 4 Assets; the Knowledgeables identified 1 of those items as an Asset. Hence, there were only a few items that were categorized in these ways. The largest number of items (10 for the Population and 14 for the Knowledgeables) were categorized in a Bimodal manner (as Strengths/Issues or as Assets/Issues), suggesting that there are divisions within these sets of respondents regarding how they view Dean Ahlburg's performance. There also were a significant number of Issues (8 for the Population and 5 for the Knowledgeables) and a smaller number (2 for the Population and 3 for the Knowledgeables) of Improvements Needed. The comparisons of Dean Ahlburg with the other deans assessed this year revealed that he was

rated lower on 26 of the 27 items by the Population and on all 27 items by the Knowledgeables, with many of these items rated significantly lower. The largest number of comments submitted by participants were entirely negative (41%) and explicated many of the reasons why items were rated as Issues or Improvements Needed. A significant minority (24%), however, provided entirely positive comments, and a sizable group (35%) provided both positive and negative comments (although the negative comments were featured more heavily in that group).

Overall, the survey results demonstrate (a) that Dean Ahlburg is viewed by a minority of the respondents as an effective administrator, (b) that there are some members of the Population and some members of the Knowledgeables who are divided with regard to their perceptions of Dean Ahlburg's effectiveness, but (c) that a majority of the items were rated by both sets of respondents, and identified in the largest number of comments, as Issues or as Improvements Needed. These results, thus, suggest that Dean Ahlburg generally is not perceived by respondents to be an effective leader of the Leeds School of Business. He is viewed as devoting the majority of his efforts to raising funds to complete the new building, an important goal, but these efforts have created a vast array of faculty, staff, and student issues and concerns that need attention. 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 Ahlburg *Needs Improvement*.

¹The members of the committee are Arturo Aldama (A&S Representative, Ethnic Studies), Sedat Biringen (BFA Representative, Aerospace Engineering Sciences; Committee Vice-Chair), Deane Bowers (BFA Representative, Museum and Field Studies), Lawrence Frey (A&S Representative, Communication, Committee Chair), Anne Heinz (Administration Representative, Continuing Education), Bella Mody (Other Units Representative, School of Journalism and Mass Communication), David Pinkow (Other Units Representative, Music), Joseph Rosse (Other Units Representative, Leeds School of Business), and Stein Sture (Administration Representative, Graduate School). Jeff Schiel (Office of Planning, Budget, and Analysis, *ex-officio* member) served as a resource to the committee. The committee thanks Frances Costa of Planning, Budget, and Analysis, for her assistance.

²Questionnaire 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 people's name removed, was provided to the AAC Committee Chair, who distributed the information to appropriate committee members. 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, were 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

Administrative Appraisal Questionnaire Results for Dean Ahlburg

Item	Dean Ahlburg				Other Deans		Effects		
	Population (A) M (SD)	Category	Knowledgeables (B) M (SD)	Category	Pop. (C) M (SD)	Knowl. (D) M (SD)	B-A	A-C	B-D
28. Raising funds	4.7 (.6)	Strength	4.4 (1.2)	Strength					
29. Working with corporate partners	4.2 (.9)	Strength	4.2 (1.1)	Strength					
14. Making progress diversity goals	3.8 (1.1)	Strength	3.1 (1.2)	Asset/Issue	3.9 (1.0)	4.0 (.9)	-.6	-.1	-.8
1. Undergraduate leadership	3.7 (1.1)	Strength	3.2 (1.5)	Asset	3.9 (1.1)	4.1 (1.1)	-.4	-.2	-.7
15. Recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty	3.6 (1.2)	Strength	3.2 (1.2)	Asset/Issue	3.7 (1.2)	3.8 (1.0)	-.3	-.1	-.5
26. Act with integrity	3.6 (1.5)	Strength/Issue	3.3 (1.5)	Strength/Issue	4.2 (1.1)	4.3 (.9)	-.2	-.5	-1.0
10. Act on undergraduate concerns	3.5 (1.3)	Asset	3.3 (1.7)	Strength/Issue	4.0 (.9)	4.0 (.7)	-.1	-.5	-.6
17. Managing staff conflicts	3.5 (1.6)	Strength/Issue	2.5 (1.2)	Improve	3.3 (1.2)	3.3 (1.2)	-.7	.2	-.6
13. Act on faculty of color concerns	3.5 (1.4)	Asset	3.0 (1.3)	Asset/Issue	3.8 (1.2)	3.8 (1.0)	-.4	-.2	-.8
12. Act on women faculty concerns	3.4 (1.4)	Asset	3.2 (1.5)	Asset/Issue	3.8 (1.2)	3.8 (1.1)	-.1	-.3	-.5
24. Taking responsibility for office	3.4 (1.1)	Asset	3.1 (1.3)	Asset/Issue	4.0 (1.0)	4.1 (1.0)	-.3	-.5	-.9
9. Act on staff concerns	3.4 (1.4)	Asset/Issue	3.0 (1.4)	Strength/Issue	3.5 (1.3)	3.7 (1.2)	-.2	-.1	-.5
25. Treating all faculty fairly	3.3 (1.5)	Asset/Issue	3.4 (1.6)	Strength/Issue	4.0 (1.2)	4.3 (1.0)	.1	-.6	-.8
6. Vision leading industry/profession	3.3 (1.4)	Asset/Issue	3.3 (1.7)	Issue	3.8 (1.2)	4.0 (1.1)	-.1	-.4	-.6
23. Understanding faculty governance	3.3 (1.5)	Asset/Issue	3.1 (1.5)	Strength/Issue	4.3 (1.0)	4.4 (.9)	-.1	-.8	-1.2
4. Supporting high-quality research	3.2 (1.3)	Asset/Issue	3.4 (1.5)	Strength/Issue	3.9 (1.1)	4.0 (1.1)	.1	-.6	-.5
21. Sharing bases of major decisions	3.2 (1.5)	Asset Issue	3.1 (1.6)	Strength/Issue	3.8 (1.2)	4.0 (1.1)	-.1	-.5	-.8
2. Professional MA leadership	3.2 (1.3)	Asset/Issue	2.8 (1.4)	Issue	3.9 (1.1)	4.1 (1.1)	-.3	-.6	-1.1
18. Responding to faculty	3.2 (1.4)	Asset/Issue	2.9 (1.5)	Issue	4.0 (1.2)	4.0 (1.1)	-.3	-.6	-.9
11. Act on graduate student concerns	3.2 (1.3)	Issue	3.2 (1.6)	Asset/Issue	3.9 (1.0)	4.1 (.7)	0	-.7	-.9
7. Positioning College as leader	3.2 (1.3)	Issue	2.3 (1.4)	Issue	3.9 (1.2)	4.1 (1.1)	0	-.6	-.7
20. Making timely decisions	3.2 (1.4)	Issue	2.8 (1.5)	Improve	3.9 (1.1)	3.9 (1.1)	-.3	-.6	-.9

Item	Dean Ahlburg				Other Deans		Effects		
	Population (A)		Knowledgeables (B)		Pop. (C)	Knowl. (D)	B-A	A-C	B-D
	M (SD)	Category	M (SD)	Category	M (SD)	M (SD)			
8. Act on faculty concerns	3.1 (1.5)	Issue	2.9 (1.3)	Issue	3.6 (1.3)	3.7 (1.3)	-.1	-.4	-.7
19. Involve faculty decision making	3.1 (1.5)	Issue	2.9 (1.6)	Issue	3.6 (1.3)	4.0 (1.1)	-.1	-.4	-.9
27. Earning faculty trust	3.1 (1.5)	Issue	2.7 (1.4)	Issue	3.8 (1.2)	3.8 (1.2)	-.2	-.5	-.9
5. Rewarding high-quality service	3.1 (1.3)	Issue	2.9 (1.4)	Improve	3.7 (1.2)	3.7 (1.1)	-.1	-.5	-.7
3. Research MA & PhD leadership	3.0 (1.3)	Issue	2.7 (1.3)	Issue	3.8 (1.1)	3.9 (1.1)	-.2	-.7	-1.0
22. Fostering equitable salary system	2.9 (1.4)	Improve	2.9 (1.4)	Asset/Issue	3.6 (1.2)	3.9 (1.2)	0	-.5	-.8
16. Managing faculty conflicts	2.9 (1.5)	Improve	2.7 (1.2)	Improve	3.3 (1.3)	3.5 (1.3)	-.1	-.3	-.6

Table 2

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire Results by Categories for Dean Ahlburg

Strengths (Items rated Effective or Very Effective by 60% or more of respondents)

- Raising funds (Population without Knowledgeables [P] and Knowledgeables [K])
- Working with corporate partners (P & K)
- Making progress toward diversity goals (P)
- Providing leadership for high-quality undergraduate teaching (P)
- Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty (P)

Assets (Items rated Effective or Very Effective by 50-59% of respondents)

- Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P)
- Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color (P)
- Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty (P)
- Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff (P)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality undergraduate teaching (K)

Issues (Items rated Ineffective or Very Ineffective by 25-39% of respondents)

- Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P)
- Positioning the School/College as a leader among AAU peers, both nationally and internationally (P & K)
- Making decisions in a timely manner (P)
- Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decision) (P & K)
- Appropriately involving faculty in decisions making (P & K)
- Earning the trust of the faculty (P & K)
- Rewarding high-quality service (P)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs (P & K)
- Constructively managing conflicts among staff (K)
- Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it or keeping up with it (K)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program (K)
- Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries (K)

Improvements Needed (Items rated Ineffective or Very Ineffective by 40% or more of respondents)

Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system (P)
 Constructively managing conflicts among faculty (P & K)
 Making decisions in a timely manner (K)
 Rewarding high-quality service (K)

Bimodal Categories (Items rated in two of the categories above)

A. Strengths/Issues

Acting with integrity (P & K)
 Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P)
 Constructively managing conflicts among staff (P)
 Constructively acting on the concerns of staff (K)
 Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way (K)
 Having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures (K)
 Actively supporting high-quality faculty research (e.g., mentoring and funding opportunities) (K)
 Sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes (K)

B. Assets/Issues

Constructively acting on the concerns of staff (P)
 Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way (P)
 Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it or keeping up with it (P)
 Having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures (P)
 Actively supporting high-quality faculty research (e.g., mentoring and funding opportunities) (P)
 Sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes (P)
 Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program (P)
 Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries (P)
 Making progress toward diversity goals (K)
 Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty (K)
 Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color (K)
 Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty (K)
 Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff (K)
 Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (K)
 Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system (K)

Note: Items are arranged in descending order by mean score for the population followed by descending order in mean score for the knowledgeable (see Table 1).

Table 3

Satisfaction Questionnaire Results for Dean Ahlburg

Item	Dean Ahlburg				Other Deans		Effects				
	Population (A)		Knowledgeables (B)		Pop. (C)	Knowl. (D)	B-A	A-C	B-D		
	M (SD)	Sat. Category	M (SD)	Sat. Category	M (SD)	M (SD)					
3. Technological teaching support	4.4 (.7)	S	Strength	4.1 (.9)	S	Strength	3.9 (1.0)	3.6 (1.0)	-.3	.4	.5
2. Classroom facilities	4.3 (.8)	S	Strength	4.4 (1.0)	S	Strength	3.6 (1.2)	3.4 (1.2)	0	.7	.8
7. Space and facilities	4.2 (.9)	S	Strength	4.4 (.5)	S	Strength	3.3 (1.4)	2.9 (1.4)	.3	.7	1.3
8. Relationship with colleagues	4.0 (1.1)	S	Strength	3.9 (.6)	S	Strength	4.2 (.9)	4.1 (1.0)	-.1	-.2	-.2
11. Library access outside resources	4.0 (.9)	S	Strength	3.9 (.8)	S	Strength	4.2 (.8)	4.0 (.8)	-.2	-.2	-.2
10. Faculty involvement in library	4.0 (.8)	S	Strength	3.5 (.7)	S	-	3.9 (.9)	3.5 (1.0)	-.6	.2	.1
12. Education/training by library	3.9 (.8)	S	Strength	3.8 (.7)	S	Strength	4.0 (.8)	3.7 (1.0)	-.1	-.2	.1
1. Teaching responsibilities	3.8 (1.1)	S	Strength	3.9 (1.0)	S	Strength	4.2 (.9)	4.4 (.8)	0	-.4	-.6
16. Other benefits, inc. retirement	3.7 (.9)	S	Strength	3.5 (1.1)	S	Asset	3.5 (.9)	3.6 (1.1)	-.2	.2	-.1
5. Departmental support services	3.4 (1.3)	S	Asset/Issue	3.6 (.9)	S	Asset	3.9 (.9)	4.1 (.8)	.2	-.5	-.6
9. University support for research and creative work	3.4 (1.2)	S	Asset	3.6 (.9)	S	Asset	3.6 (1.1)	3.7 (1.2)	.2	-.1	-.1
18. University efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty	3.4 (.9)	S	-	3.4 (.9)	S	-	3.3 (1.0)	3.2 (1.0)	0	.1	.2
19. University efforts to retain diverse undergraduates	3.3 (1.1)	S	-	3.1 (.9)	S	Issue	3.1 (1.0)	3.0 (1.0)	-.2	.2	.2
4. No. graduate teaching assistants	3.2 (1.2)	N	Issue	3.3 (1.1)	S	Issue	3.8 (1.0)	3.8 (1.0)	.1	-.6	-.6
6. Support for outside money	3.0 (1.2)	N	Issue	3.0 (.9)	N	-	3.4 (1.0)	3.9 (.9)	0	-.4	-1.0
17. Faculty governance	3.0 (1.1)	N	Issue	2.8 (1.1)	N	Issue	3.3 (.9)	3.6 (.8)	-.1	-.3	-.8
20. Evaluation of teaching	2.9 (1.2)	N	Issue	3.0 (1.0)	N	Issue	3.4 (1.0)	3.4 (1.1)	.1	-.4	-.3
15. Current health plan	2.7 (1.4)	D	Improve	2.3 (1.3)	D	Improve	3.1 (1.1)	2.9 (1.3)	-.3	-.3	-.4
13. Salary with peer institutions	2.6 (1.3)	D	Improve	2.5 (1.4)	D	Improve	2.7 (1.1)	3.0 (1.2)	-.1	0	-.4
14. Equitable salary distribution	2.6 (1.2)	D	Improve	2.3 (1.1)	D	Improve	2.9 (1.2)	3.1 (1.2)	-.2	-.3	-.7

Appendix A:
Items on the Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire for Dean Ahlburg

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 his decisions)
9. Constructively acting on staff concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions)
10. Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions)
11. Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his 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 he 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. Raising funds
29. Working with corporate partners

**Appendix B:
Items on Boulder Faculty Assembly Satisfaction Questionnaire**

1. Teaching responsibilities and opportunities (this could include teaching load, number, kinds, and size of classes, as well as issues such as scheduling)
2. Classroom facilities
3. Technological support in teaching
4. Number of graduate students assisting in teaching
5. Departmental support services
6. The support that you receive for soliciting outside money, such as extramural contracts and grants
7. Space and facilities (e.g., office, lab, departmental needs)
8. Collaborative relationships with colleagues with whom you work on a routine basis
9. Support and encouragement you receive from the University for your research and creative work
10. Faculty involvement in the decision-making process about CU Libraries' holdings (excludes Law Library)
11. CU Libraries' access to materials from outside resources, such as databases, data repositories, and archives
12. Education and training support offered by CU Libraries' staff in new information technology
13. Salary relative to those of your peers at comparable research institutions
14. Equitable distribution of salary, given the current salary structure and resources at CU-Boulder
15. The current health plan
16. Other benefits, including retirement
17. Faculty governance in recent years and the progress made in shared governance
18. University efforts to recruit/retain a diverse faculty
19. University efforts to retain a diverse undergraduate student body
20. Evaluation of teaching