

**Report of the
Boulder Faculty Assembly Administrator Appraisal Committee¹
Concerning
David Getches, Dean of the School of Law**

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 Getches included three additional items (raising funds, external relations, and pursuing financial self-sufficiency). The complete list of items for Dean Getches 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 School of Law faculty members (50 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 Getches, also asked a separate sample (10 people) judged especially likely to be knowledgeable about Getches'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, 41 of the 50 people surveyed completed the administrator appraisal questionnaire, a response rate of 82%. For the Knowledgeables, 9 of the 10 people surveyed completed the questionnaire, a response rate of 90%. Hence, both the Population and the Knowledgeables met and exceeded the desired response rate. Combining these two sets of respondents, 50 of the 60 people surveyed completed the questionnaire, for an overall response rate of 83%.

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire Results

Statistical Results

The statistical results of the administrator appraisal questionnaire for Dean Getches are presented in Table 1. Statistics were not available for Item 10 (constructively acting on the concerns of undergraduate students) because of the small number of respondents; therefore, the total number of items rated was 29. 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/or (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 Getches 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 Getches 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 Getches. 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 Getches. 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 27 of the 29 items on the questionnaire were categorized as Strengths by both the Population and the Knowledgeables. Dean Getches received particularly strong ratings (mean scores of 4.0 or better for both sets of respondents) for the following 21 items (in descending order by Population mean score):

- Providing leadership for high-quality undergraduate teaching
- Raising funds
- External relations
- Pursuing financial self-sufficiency
- Providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program
- Acting with integrity
- Making decisions in a timely manner
- Understanding faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures
- Providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs
- Actively supporting high-quality faculty research
- Positioning the School/College as a leader among AAU peers
- Having the vision to lead the industry/profession
- Making progress toward diversity goals
- Earning the trust of the faculty
- Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff
- Sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes
- Constructively acting on graduate student concerns
- Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries
- Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color
- Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty
- Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive manner

The response to the item about providing leadership for high-quality undergraduate teaching is considered an anomaly, since the Law School only provides graduate instruction. It is speculated that perhaps respondents were considering support of teaching, in general.

The 2 other items on the questionnaire—(a) constructively managing conflicts among faculty and (b) fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system—were rated as Strengths by the Knowledgeables. The Knowledgeables, thus, rated every single item on the questionnaire as a Strength. The Population rated (a) as an Asset and (b) as Bimodal (both an Asset and an Issue). Hence, only 1 item was identified (by a portion of the Population) as an Issue. There were no items rated by the Population or by the Knowledgeables as Improvements Needed.

Although the Knowledgeables generally agreed in their ratings of the items, as indicated by the relatively small standard deviations, the Population demonstrated a wider range of opinions on several items. Specifically, responses by the Population to the following 4 items resulted in the highest standard deviations that appeared in Dean Getches's appraisal: (a) constructively acting

on staff concerns; (b) constructively managing conflicts among staff; (c) appropriately involving faculty in decision making; and (d) fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system.

A comparison of these sets of respondents indicated that the Knowledgeables rated him significantly higher (.8 or higher effect size) than did the Population on 7 items; effects sizes on the remaining 22 items were medium to large (13 items), small to medium (5 items) or unnoticeable (4 items). The 7 items that demonstrated the largest difference (in order of magnitude of the difference) were: (a) fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system; (b) appropriately involving faculty in decision making; (c) actively supporting high-quality faculty research; (d) providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs; (e) constructively managing conflicts among faculty; (f) responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries; and (g) sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes. The first two items should be focused on by Dean Getches, as they demonstrated some of the lowest mean scores for the items on the questionnaire, and there was a full-point difference between the Population and the Knowledgeables. In addition, constructively managing conflicts among faculty deserves attention, as the mean score for the Population was one of the lowest of the items on the questionnaire.

These findings, however, also need to be interpreted in light of the comparisons of Dean Getches with the other deans assessed this year, which indicated higher ratings by both the Population and the Knowledgeables on every single item, including those mentioned in the last paragraph (except for fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system, which demonstrated a zero effect size for the Population). On 2 items rated by the Population—leadership of high-quality undergraduate teaching (an anomaly, as explained previously) and leadership of high-quality teaching in the professional MA program—the effect size was large (.8 or higher); 11 other items demonstrated medium-to-large effect sizes. Moreover, the results demonstrated a significantly higher effect size (.8 or higher) on 24 items for Dean Getches's Knowledgeables compared to those of the other deans. These results, thus, suggest that Dean Getches performed significantly better on a great many items compared to the other deans assessed this year.

Open-Ended Comments

The open-ended comments about Dean Getches largely corroborated the statistical results presented above. Nineteen respondents (32% of all those surveyed; 38% of those who completed the questionnaire), 15 from the Population (30% of the Population surveyed; 37% of those who completed the questionnaire) and 4 from the Knowledgeables (40% of the Knowledgeables surveyed; 44% of those who completed the questionnaire), provided comments. A content analysis revealed that 11 respondents (58%) gave comments that could be categorized as entirely positive, 3 (16%) gave entirely negative comments, and 5 (26%) gave mixed comments that included both positive and negative points, with a number of those mixed comments first highlighting Dean Getches's strengths as an administrator and then offering negative comments and constructive suggestions. Overall, the positive comments far outnumbered the negative comments and were greater in number than the negative and the mixed comments combined. Although these responses did not come from a representative sample of the faculty, they offer potentially valuable information about what these respondents view as Dean Getches's strengths and weaknesses.

A number of the positive comments, as might be expected, were relatively short but expressed in strong terms respondents' support of the dean (e.g., "The best dean I could imagine working under," "I continually feel fortunate that Dean Getches is willing to lead this fine law school" and "The dean of deans"). With regard to specific strengths identified, respondents pointed to Dean Getches's leadership, vision, and commitment to revitalizing the Law School; support of the faculty; personal characteristics (e.g., "fair, trustworthy, and honest"); attempts to increase salary; the increased number of legal writing professors hired; "unassailable" commitment to diversity; effectiveness in external relations (including alumni); and fund-raising skills.

In terms of concerns, respondents noted a lack of market equity in faculty salaries, as well as perceived inequities between Law School faculty; the need for more transparency in the merit review process for faculty, as well as merit being based more on research productivity and relying less on FCQ scores to evaluate teaching; a lack of responsiveness to staff concerns and resource allocation (mentioned twice). In terms of making progress toward diversity goals, Dean Getches fared better compared to the other deans assessed this year, as seen in the results in Table 1 for Item 14 (making progress toward diversity goals; 4.3 and 4.9 for the Population and Knowledgeables, respectively, compared to 3.7 and 3.6 for the other deans). However, two comments demonstrated a notable amount of ideological resentment towards Dean Getches's efforts to promote faculty diversity, suggesting that he needs to expand his commitment to diversity by including the "intellectual diversity" of faculty who espouse conservative and right-wing viewpoints, and move away from recruiting faculty of color. The most negative comment was from a respondent who claimed that Dean Getches engages in "favoritism" and that "The Law School is very unfriendly to women at all levels [and that] most women were unhappy," which may be reflective of the somewhat elevated standard deviation in the Population's response to Item 12 on the questionnaire (constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty), although that item also was categorized as a strength for Dean Getches by both the Population and the Knowledgeables. Moreover, the AAP Committee does not know the respondents' gender and, therefore, whether this comment was written by a woman and whether other women in the Law School feel that way.

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 Getches, as previously indicated, far exceeded the minimum rate needed.

Table 3 presents the results for the satisfaction questionnaire for the Population and for the Knowledgeable for Dean Getches. The mean and standard deviation are provided for each item,

in descending order according to the Population responses. As a general way to interpret the 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 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 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.

As the results showed, the Population demonstrated satisfaction on the BFA satisfaction questionnaire on 17 of the 20 items assessed, with 9 of those items showing mean scores over 4.0 (and no items on the questionnaire with a mean rating below 3.0). The Knowledgeables indicated satisfaction in nearly all of the same areas, except for 3 items that did not have a sufficient number of responses (library access, library training, and number of graduate assistants) and 2 items that were rated as neutral (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied) (university efforts to retain diverse students and university efforts to recruit/retain a diverse faculty). The Population expressed neutral reactions for 2 items (equitable salary distribution and the current health plan), whereas the Knowledgeables demonstrated satisfaction for those items. Both sets of respondents were neutral with regard to salary relative to peer institutions.

Of the 20 items assessed, the Population rated 10 items as Strengths: classroom facilities, space and facilities, technological support in teaching, teaching responsibilities, libraries' access to outside resources, education/training by library, departmental support services, number of graduate teaching assistants, collaboration with colleagues, and faculty involvement with library holdings. The opinions about these 10 areas were confirmed by the Knowledgeables, except in cases where there were not sufficient responses. In addition, 4 items—other benefits including retirement, support for research, university efforts to retain diverse undergraduates, and university efforts to recruit/retain diverse faculty—were considered Assets by the Population, whereas responses from the Knowledgeables on these 4 items varied slightly: other benefits including retirement—Strength; support for research—Strength; university efforts to retain diverse undergraduates—Issue; and university efforts to recruit/retain diverse faculty—Issue. Although the Population's response for the item of shared faculty governance did not fall into a particular category, it was rated as an Issue by the Knowledgeables. Evaluation of teaching was assessed as an Issue by the Population, but was considered a Strength by the Knowledgeables. The Population also rated support for soliciting outside money as an Issue to be mindful of (the Knowledgeables did not provide a sufficient number of responses). The current health plan was

considered an Issue to be mindful of by the Population and both a Strength and an Issue by the Knowledgeables. Both sets of respondents agreed that salary relative to peer institutions represented an Issue.

These results, thus, demonstrate that both the Population and the Knowledgeables are relatively satisfied with the items assessed on the satisfaction questionnaire. A comparison of the effect sizes demonstrated that Dean Getches's Knowledgeables rated 8 of 15 items higher than did his Population (5 of the 20 items did not have a sufficient response rate); of those 8 items, 3 showed a relatively large effect: teaching responsibilities, other benefits including retirement, and equitable distribution of salary. On 6 items, the Population showed a higher level of satisfaction than did the Knowledgeables; however, none of the effect sizes were large. Given the relatively high mean scores and the number of items characterized as strengths or assets, these differences between the Population and the Knowledgeables are not particularly important. This interpretation is supported by a comparison of the effect sizes of Dean Getches's constituency on the BFA satisfaction questionnaire to those of the other deans assessed this year. That comparison reveals that the Population for Dean Getches rated 15 of 20 items higher (more satisfied) and 5 items as zero or slightly lower (less satisfied) than did the Populations for the other deans. Of the 15 higher (more satisfied) effect sizes for the Population ratings, 3 were significantly larger (.8 or more): classroom facilities, space and facilities, and technological support in teaching; 5 were medium to large; and 7 were medium or small. In comparing the Knowledgeables for Dean Getches to those of the other deans assessed this year, 8 of 15 items with sufficient responses showed a large effect size (.8 or higher) and, hence, a significantly higher level of satisfaction: classroom facilities, space and facilities, technological teaching support, teaching responsibilities, departmental support services, other benefits including retirement, evaluation of teaching, and equitable distribution of salary; 2 items showed a medium to large effect; 3 items demonstrated a small or no effect; and 2 items showed a small negative effect (university efforts to recruit/retain a diverse faculty and faculty governance/ progress in shared governance), demonstrating a slightly lower level of approval as compared to the Knowledgeables for the other deans.

Only four respondents provided comments on the satisfaction questionnaire. Three respondents commented on diversity issues, with one saying that although Dean Getches has committed significantly increased funding to attract diverse students, much more needs to be done to attracting diverse, especially African-American and Native-American, faculty and students; another saying that searches for high-ranking administrators need to be more sensitive to this issue; and the third arguing that intellectual, not ethnic, diversity was needed. The fourth respondent pointed out that given the resources, the university is doing as well as it can.

Conclusion

Dean Getches received very high ratings from both the Population and the Knowledgeables on the administrator appraisal questionnaire, with all items receiving high mean scores and nearly all of the items categorized as Strengths. The exceptions were 2 items rated by the Population as an Asset (constructively managing faculty conflicts) and as an Asset/Issue (fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system). Neither the Population nor the Knowledgeables rated any other item as an Issue or as an Improvement Needed. There were some items that showed an

elevated standard deviation, suggesting a concerned minority of respondents, and there were some items that the Knowledgeables rated significantly higher than did the Population, and these items certainly deserve attention by Dean Getches. However, comparisons with the other deans assessed this year revealed that Dean Getches was rated higher by both the Population and the Knowledgeables on every item (except the Asset/Issue identified for the Population, which demonstrated no difference), and for many items, significantly higher. The open-ended comments generally followed the pattern of the numerical data, with the great majority expressing very positive comments about Dean Getches, a moderately sized minority providing both positive and negative comments/suggestions, and a small minority expressing some important concerns about a few issues.

Both sets of respondents for Dean Getches were generally satisfied, as demonstrated by their ratings on the BFA satisfaction questionnaire, with mean scores of 4.00 or higher on 9 of the 20 items for the Population and on 10 of the 15 items for which data were available for the Knowledgeables. Both the Population and Knowledgeables indicated satisfaction on all but 3 items (1 of which was common), for which neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction was expressed. The majority of the items were categorized as Strengths and Assets. Five Issues were identified by both the Population and the Knowledgeables (2 of which were common), and no items were indentified as Improvements Needed. The Issues identified that are under Dean Getches's control (e.g., the common concern with the evaluation of teaching) certainly deserve his attention; others (e.g., salary compared with peer institutions and current health plan) are university related issues. Finally, comparisons with the other deans assessed this year showed that Dean Getches's respondents consistently were more satisfied.

Overall, the survey results revealed respondents' high regard for Dean Getches and his leadership and management of the Law School. The survey also identified some issues for him to work on to be an even better dean. 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 Getches *Exceeds Expectations*. The Committee congratulates Dean Getches for his achievements and encourages him to maintain his performance strengths and to work on the concerns/needs identified by the Law School faculty.

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 Getches

Item	Dean Getches				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
1. Undergraduate leadership	4.9 (.3)	Strength	5.0 (0)	Strength	3.8 (1.1)	3.7 (1.3)	.4	1.0	1.0
28. Raising funds	4.8 (.4)	Strength	5.0 (0)	Strength			.6		
29. External relations	4.8 (.4)	Strength	4.9 (.4)	Strength			.1		
30. Pursuing financial self-sufficiency	4.8 (.4)	Strength	4.7 (.7)	Strength			-.2		
2. Professional MA leadership	4.7 (.7)	Strength	4.8 (.4)	Strength	3.6 (1.2)	3.6 (1.3)	.2	1.0	1.0
26. Acting with integrity	4.5 (.9)	Strength	4.9 (.3)	Strength	3.9 (1.3)	3.9 (1.2)	.5	.4	.8
20. Making timely decisions	4.4 (.9)	Strength	4.8 (.4)	Strength	3.6 (1.3)	3.4 (1.3)	.5	.7	1.1
23. Understanding faculty governance	4.4 (1.0)	Strength	4.9 (.3)	Strength	4.0 (1.3)	4.0 (1.2)	.5	.4	.8
3. Research MA and PhD leadership	4.3 (.8)	Strength	5.0 (0)	Strength	3.5 (1.2)	3.4 (1.3)	1.0	.7	1.3
4. Supporting high-quality research	4.2 (.9)	Strength	5.0 (0)	Strength	3.6 (1.2)	3.7 (1.2)	1.0	.5	1.1
7. Positioning College as leader	4.4 (.9)	Strength	4.9 (.3)	Strength	3.6 (1.3)	3.7 (1.2)	.7	.6	1.0
6. Vision leading industry/profession	4.3 (.8)	Strength	4.8 (.4)	Strength	3.6 (1.3)	3.7 (1.3)	.6	.6	.9
14. Making progress diversity goals	4.3 (.8)	Strength	4.6 (.5)	Strength	3.7 (1.1)	3.6 (1.1)	.3	.6	.9
27. Earning faculty trust	4.3 (1.0)	Strength	4.9 (.4)	Strength	3.4 (1.3)	3.3 (1.3)	.7	.7	1.2
24. Taking responsibility for office	4.2 (1.0)	Strength	4.6 (.7)	Strength	3.8 (1.1)	3.7 (1.2)	.4	.4	.8
21. Sharing bases of major decisions	4.1 (1.0)	Strength	4.9 (.3)	Strength	3.5 (1.3)	3.6 (1.3)	.8	.4	1.0
11. Act on graduate concerns	4.1 (1.0)	Strength	4.6 (.5)	Strength	3.7 (1.1)	3.7 (1.1)	.6	.4	.9
18. Responding to faculty	4.1 (1.1)	Strength	4.9 (.4)	Strength	3.7 (1.3)	3.6 (1.3)	.8	.3	1.0
13. Act on faculty of color concerns	4.1 (1.1)	Strength	4.5 (.8)	Strength	3.6 (1.2)	3.5 (1.1)	.4	.4	1.0
15. Recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty	4.1 (1.1)	Strength	4.1 (.9)	Strength	3.7 (1.2)	3.8 (1.0)	0	.4	.5
25. Treating faculty fairly	4.1 (1.2)	Strength	4.8 (.4)	Strength	3.7 (1.4)	4.0 (1.3)	.6	.3	.7
12. Act on women faculty concerns	3.9 (1.2)	Strength	4.6 (.7)	Strength	3.6 (1.2)	3.5 (1.2)	.6	.2	1.0

Table 2

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire Results by Category for Dean Getches

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

- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality undergraduate teaching (Population without knowledgeables [P] and Knowledgeables [K])
- Raising funds (P & K)
- External relations (P & K)
- Pursuing financial self-sufficiency (P & K)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program (P & K)
- Acting with integrity (P & K)
- Making decisions in a timely manner (P & K)
- Having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures (P & K)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs (P & K)
- Actively supporting high-quality faculty research (e.g., mentoring and funding opportunities) (P & K)
- Positioning the School/College as a leader among AAU peers, both nationally and internationally (P & K)
- Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it or keeping up with it (P & K)
- Making progress toward diversity goals (P & K)
- Earning the trust of the faculty (P & K)
- Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff (P & K)
- Sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes (P & K)
- Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P & K)
- Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries (P & K)
- Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color (P & K)
- Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty (P & K)
- Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way (P & K)
- Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty (P & K)
- Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P & K)
- Rewarding high-quality service (P & K)
- Appropriately involving faculty in decision making (P & K)
- Constructively managing conflicts among faculty (P & K)
- Constructively acting on staff concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P & K)
- Constructively managing conflicts among staff (P & K)
- Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system (K)

Assets (Items rated Effective or Very Effective by 50-59% of respondents): None

Issues (Items rated Ineffective or Very Ineffective by 25-39% of respondents): None

Improvements Needed (Items rated Ineffective or Very Ineffective by 40% or more of respondents): None

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

A. Assets/Issues

Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system (P)

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 Getches

Item	Dean Getches				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)					
2. Classroom facilities	4.8 (.4)	S	Strength	4.7 (.8)	S	Strength	3.5 (1.2)	3.5 (1.2)	-.3	1.2	1.0
7. Space and facilities	4.8 (.4)	S	Strength	4.4 (1.3)	S	Strength	3.2 (1.3)	3.1 (1.4)	-.7	1.3	.9
3. Technological teaching support	4.7 (.5)	S	Strength	4.6 (.5)	S	Strength	3.9 (1.0)	3.7 (1.0)	-.2	.9	.9
1. Teaching responsibilities	4.4 (.6)	S	Strength	5.0 (0)	S	Strength	3.9 (1.0)	4.2 (.9)	1.0	.5	1.0
11. Library access outside resources	4.4 (.6)	S	Strength	No answers			4.0 (.8)	4.0 (.7)		.5	
12. Education/training by library	4.4 (.7)	S	Strength	No answers			3.9 (.8)	3.7 (.9)		.7	
5. Departmental support services	4.2 (.7)	S	Strength	4.7 (.5)	S	Strength	3.6 (1.1)	3.9 (.8)	.6	.5	1.0
4. No. graduate teaching assistants	4.2 (1.0)	S	Strength	No answers			3.5 (1.1)	3.6 (1.0)		.6	
8. Relationship with colleagues	4.1 (1.1)	S	Strength	4.2 (.8)	S	Strength	4.1 (.9)	4.0 (.9)	.1	0	.1
10. Faculty involvement in library	3.8 (1.1)	S	Strength	No answers			3.8 (.8)	3.5 (.9)		-.1	
16. Other benefits, inc. retirement	3.6 (.9)	S	Asset	4.3 (.8)	S	Strength	3.5 (.9)	3.5 (1.0)	.8	0	.9
9. University support for research and creative work	3.6 (1.1)	S	Asset	4.2 (.8)	S	Strength	3.5 (1.1)	3.6 (1.2)	.5	.1	.5
19. University efforts to retain diverse undergraduates	3.5 (.9)	S	Asset	3.0 (1.3)	N	Issue	3.1 (1.0)	3.0 (.9)	-.6	.4	0
18. University efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty	3.5 (1.0)	S	Asset	3.0 (1.1)	N	Issue	3.2 (1.0)	3.3 (1.0)	-.5	.3	-.3
17. Faculty governance	3.3 (.9)	S	-	3.3 (1.3)	S	Issue	3.2 (1.0)	3.4 (.9)	-.1	.2	-.2
20. Evaluation of teaching	3.3 (1.1)	S	Issue	4.0 (.8)	S	Strength	3.2 (1.1)	3.2 (1.1)	.7	0	.8
6. Support for outside money	3.3 (1.2)	S	Issue	No answers			3.3 (1.1)	3.6 (1.0)		0	
14. Equitable salary distribution	3.2 (1.2)	N	Issue	4.2 (1.0)	S	Strength	2.7 (1.2)	2.8 (1.2)	.8	.4	1.2
15. Current health plan	3.0 (1.1)	N	Issue	3.5 (1.2)	S	Stren/Issue	2.9 (1.3)	2.6 (1.3)	.4	.1	.7
13. Salary with peer institutions	3.0 (1.1)	N	Issue	3.0 (.9)	N	Issue	2.6 (1.1)	2.9 (1.3)	0	.4	.1

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

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. External relations
30. Pursuing financial self-sufficiency

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