

**Report of the
Boulder Faculty Assembly Administrator Appraisal Committee¹
Concerning
Todd Gleeson, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences**

Spring, 2007

SURVEY DESIGN

The Administrator Appraisal Program (AAP) seeks to provide in-depth feedback with a high rate of response to assure 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. Faculty members also are requested to complete and return a “Boulder Faculty Assembly [BFA] Satisfaction Survey” that addresses 20 campus-wide concerns, such as salary and benefit programs. With regard to the appraisal of administrators, the questionnaire contains items addressing the effectiveness of administrators’ performance in key areas. Fifteen items—addressing general administrative style, salary process, and meeting diversity goals—are common for all administrators; any remaining questions are performance based and tailored to the specific circumstances of the administrator being reviewed and his/her school or college. Faculty members respond to the items using a 5-point effectiveness scale (1 = *Very ineffective*, 3 = *Effective*, and 5 = *Very effective*; the committee has interpreted 2 as *Less than effective* and 4 as *More than effective*), plus a “Don’t Know” option, with higher scores indicating more effectiveness. In addition, space is provided for faculty members to write open-ended comments.

The evaluation process for Dean Gleeson was designed to take into account the broad scope of faculty across the school. Although some faculty members and administrators have regular opportunities to interact with the dean, other faculty members do not, and, therefore, may be less well informed or simply uninformed about many aspects of his performance.

To address the problem of different levels of familiarity, the AAP Committee sent the questionnaire to all College of Arts and Sciences faculty designated as eligible by the BFA (the population of interest), and then analyzed the responses from a stratified (proportionate by rank) random sample of that population (hereafter referred to as the “representative sample”), as well as a sample of faculty judged especially likely to be knowledgeable about Gleeson’s role as dean (hereafter referred to as the “knowledgeable sample”).

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE PARTICIPATION

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. Although the return rate for the entire population did not meet this criterion (386 of 888 questionnaires returned; 43% response rate), both the representative sample (100 of 168 questionnaires returned; 60% response rate) and the knowledgeable sample (66 of 89 questionnaires returned; 74% response rate) met this requirement.

AIMS OF THE AAP EVALUATION

The AAP Committee seeks to provide a developmental picture of strengths and areas of improvement for administrators standing for review or reappointment in AY 2006-2007. Broadly viewed, the committee considered four general categories in evaluating responses regarding Dean Gleeson:

Strengths to Build On represent items rated as highly effective by a substantial majority of the faculty (specifically, 60% or higher of respondents gave a rating of 4 or 5 on the scale).

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). Thus, any reallocation of effort to correct weaknesses or changes in priorities should try to protect these strengths.

Issues to be Mindful Of are items judged to be effective or better by the majority of the respondents, but less than effective by a significant minority of respondents (25-39% of respondents gave a rating of 1 or 2 on the scale).

Areas that Need Improvement are items judged by a significant fraction of the faculty as unsatisfactory (40% or more of respondents gave a rating of 1 or 2 on the scale).

OVERVIEW

On all 15 items assessed, more than 60% of the responses by both the representative sample and by the knowledgeable sample consisted of ratings of 3, 4, or 5. For both the representative sample and the knowledgeable sample, 10 items (9 of which were identified by both samples) constituted strengths and 5 items constituted assets. There was one item rated by both samples as an issue to be mindful of, as well as another item that was rated that way by the knowledgeable sample. There were no items that were rated by either sample as areas that need improvement. The open-ended comments also identified some particular strengths and weaknesses characterizing Dean Gleeson's performance.

Strengths to Build On (60% or more ratings of 4 or 5)

Dean Gleeson received ratings in this category on the following 9 items by both the representative sample and the knowledgeable sample:

- *Supporting high-quality research*
- *Creating an atmosphere of trust*
- *Being receptive to concerns of faculty*
- *Being receptive to concerns of staff*
- *Being receptive to concerns of students*
- *Managing conflicts among staff*
- *Treating faculty fairly and inclusively*
- *Appropriately involving faculty in decisions*

- *Acting with integrity*

In addition, the representative sample rated the following item as a strength on which to build:

- *Making decisions in a timely fashion*

The knowledgeable sample also rated the following item as a strength on which to build:

- *Supporting high-quality teaching*

Assets to Protect (50-59% more ratings of 4 or 5)

Dean Gleeson received ratings in this category on the following 4 items by both the representative sample and the knowledgeable sample:

- *Supporting high-quality service*
- *Managing conflicts among faculty*
- *Fostering equitable salary system*
- *Making progress towards diversity goals*

In addition, the representative sample rated the following item as an asset to protect:

- *Supporting high-quality teaching*

The knowledgeable sample also rated the following item as an asset to protect:

- *Making decisions in a timely manner*

Issues to be Mindful of (25-39% of ratings of 1 or 2)

Dean Gleeson received ratings in this category for the following item (which also was rated by both samples as an asset to protect) from both the representative sample and the knowledgeable sample:

- *Managing conflicts among faculty*

In addition, the knowledgeable group rated the following item (which also was rated by this sample as an asset to protect) as an issue of which to be mindful:

- *Fostering equitable salary system*

Open-Ended Comments

In addition to rating the 15 items on the questionnaire, respondents were given the opportunity to provide open-ended comments regarding Dean Gleeson. One hundred seventeen people from the College of Arts and Sciences provided written comments, all of which were submitted verbatim

to the Provost. A content analysis of these comments revealed that 77 (65.8%) constituted positive comments, 48 (41.0%) were negative comments/recommendations/suggestions, and 12 (10.3%) were either neutral comments (indicating they did not know the dean) or focused on the university and not the dean. (Note: The percentages exceed 100% because many people submitted both positive and negative comments). Although it is not possible to generalize from these open-ended comments because they do not come from a representative sample of the population, they do offer potentially valuable information about what these faculty members view as Dean Gleeson's strengths and weaknesses.

With regard to strengths, respondents cited many personal characteristics of Dean Gleeson, including his honesty, integrity, fairness, good intentions, and positive attitude (number of comments [n] = 27). They also indicated that he cared about, was receptive/open to, supportive of, and tried to respond to faculty concerns (n = 23). Other comments included his efforts to improve salary (n = 5), leadership (n = 4), and promotion of high-quality teaching (n = 4) and research (n = 3). Respondents (n = 6) also acknowledged that Dean Gleeson had performed well given limited resources and the difficult times that characterized the university over the past few years.

With regard to weaknesses, respondents cited Dean Gleeson's lack of confronting problems associated with salaries and raises (n = 19); poor appointments of associate deans and Dean Gleeson's reliance on them (n = 9); lack of attention paid to recruiting, supporting, and retaining diverse faculty (n = 8); isolation from and need to communicate/consult more with faculty (n = 8); lack of leadership/vision (n = 7); lack of raising money (n = 6); and the need for him to respect all faculty ranks, especially non-tenure-track faculty and instructors (n = 4).

BFA SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS

The BFA also asked faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences to complete a satisfaction questionnaire that consisted of 20 items rated on a 5-point scale (1 = *Very Dissatisfied*, 2 = *Dissatisfied*, 3 = *Neutral*, 4 = *Satisfied*, 5 = *Very Satisfied*), with higher scores indicating more satisfaction. A "Don't Know or Not Applicable" option was included for each item as well. The return rates were (a) 43% for the population (386 of 888 questionnaires returned), (b) 59% for the representative sample (99 of 168), and (c) 74% for the knowledgeable sample (66 of 89). Results for the Satisfaction Survey were computed for both the representative sample and the knowledgeable sample for Dean Gleeson. The sample means and standard deviations are provided for each item (arranged from highest to lowest for the representative sample): A mean score of 3.51 or greater indicates satisfaction (S), a mean score of 2.50-3.50 indicates neither satisfaction nor dissatisfaction (N), and a mean score of 2.49 or less indicates dissatisfaction (D). In addition, items are identified with respect to the four categories previously identified: (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). As the results show, there was relative agreement between the representative and the knowledgeable samples with respect to the items with which they were satisfied (relationships with colleagues, teaching responsibilities, library access to outside resources, and education and support offered by the library, with the representative sample also identifying departmental support services and technological support in teaching),

neutral, and dissatisfied (university efforts to retain diverse faculty, equitable distribution of salary, and salary compared with peer institutions).

Item	Representative Sample				Knowledgeable Sample			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Sat.	Category	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Sat.	Category
Relationships with colleagues	4.00	1.10	S	Strength	4.20	1.00	S	Strength
Teaching responsibilities	3.90	1.10	S	Strength	3.90	1.00	S	Strength
Library access to outside resources	3.80	.90	S	Strength	3.90	.80	S	Strength
Education and training support offered by library	3.70	.90	S	Strength	3.80	.90	S	Strength
Departmental support services	3.70	1.00	S	Strength	3.40	1.20	N	Asset/Issue
Technological support in teaching	3.70	1.11	S	Strength	3.40	1.10	N	Asset/Issue
Other benefits, including Retirement	3.50	1.00	N	Asset	3.30	1.00	N	Asset
Univ. support for research and creative work	3.50	1.10	N	Asset	3.40	1.00	N	Asset
Classroom facilities	3.40	1.10	N	Asset	3.20	1.10	N	Issue
Faculty governance/progress on shared governance	3.30	.90	N	-----	3.00	1.00	N	Issue
Involvement of faculty in library holding decisions	3.30	1.20	N	Asset	3.50	1.10	N	Asset
Space and facilities	3.30	1.20	N	Issue	2.80	1.30	N	Improve
Support for soliciting outside money	3.20	1.10	N	-----	3.20	1.00	N	-----
Evaluation of teaching	3.00	1.10	N	Issue	3.00	1.00	N	Issue
No. of graduate students assisting in teaching	3.20	1.30	N	Issue	3.00	1.20	N	Improve
Current health plan	3.00	1.10	N	Issue	2.80	1.20	N	Improve
Univ. efforts to recruit/retain diverse faculty	2.80	1.10	N	Improve	3.00	1.10	N	Issue
Univ. efforts to retain diverse undergrads	2.60	1.10	D	Improve	2.90	1.20	N	Issue
Equitable distribution of salary	2.40	1.20	D	Improve	2.50	1.10	D	Improve
Salary compared with peer institution salaries	2.30	1.20	D	Improve	2.30	1.20	D	Improve

CONCLUSION

Dean Gleeson received high ratings from both the representative sample and the knowledgeable sample for all of the items included on the administrator appraisal questionnaire, with all 15 items considered to be either strengths or assets. Only two items on that questionnaire (managing conflicts among faculty and fostering equitable salary system, both of which were rated by the relevant samples as assets) were viewed as issues of which to be mindful. Neither sample rated any items on that questionnaire as areas that need improvement. Faculty members were less positive with respect to their responses to the satisfaction survey, identifying more items that constituted issues to be mindful of or areas that need improvement than items that constituted strengths on which to build or assets to protect. In addition, over 60% of the respondents' open-ended comments identified some particular strengths that characterized Dean Gleeson, whereas about 40% of the respondents identified some weaknesses to address.

Overall, these results indicate that Dean Gleeson is viewed by the faculty as an effective administrator. However, the faculty is not particularly satisfied with a number of campus-wide issues, issues that vary in terms of Dean Gleeson's ability to have an impact.

The Administrator Appraisal Program Committee concludes that Dean Gleeson has achieved a high degree of effectiveness with his leadership of the College of Arts and Sciences. He has an extremely difficult job leading the largest and most complex of the colleges and school on the campus and the high degree of effectiveness as expressed by faculty responses to the administrator appraisal questionnaire speaks to his success.

The Committee congratulates Dean Gleeson for his achievements and it encourages him to maintain his performance strengths and to work on the concerns/needs identified by the faculty.

¹The members of the committee are Arturo Aldama, Sedat Biringen, M. Dean Bowers, Paul Erhard, Lawrence Frey, Anne Heinz, Ken Iwamasa (Vice Chair), Jeff Schiel, Robert Schulzinger (Chair), and Daniel Sher.