

**Report of the
Boulder Faculty Assembly Administrator Appraisal Committee¹
Concerning
Daniel Sher, Dean of the College of Music**

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; no additional items were added by Dean Sher. The complete list of items for Dean Sher 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 College of Music faculty members (68 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 Sher, also asked a separate sample (17 people) judged especially likely to be knowledgeable about Sher'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, 52 of the 68 people surveyed completed the administrator appraisal questionnaire, a response rate of 76%. For the Knowledgeables, all 17 people surveyed completed the questionnaire, a response rate of 100%. Hence, both the Population and the Knowledgeables met and exceeded the desired response rate. Combining these two sets of respondents, 69 of the 85 people surveyed completed the questionnaire, for an overall response rate of 81%.

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire Results

Statistical Results

The statistical results of the administrator appraisal questionnaire for Dean Sher are presented in Table 1. Both the mean score and standard deviation for each of the 27 items assessed on the questionnaire are presented for the Population (with 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 effective or very 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 Sher 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 Sher 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 Sher. 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 Sher. 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 24 items were identified as Strengths by the Population, with 22 of those items also identified as Strengths by the Knowledgeables. Dean Sher received particularly strong ratings (mean scores of 4.0 or better for both sets of respondents) for the following 13 items (in descending order by Population mean score):

- Understanding faculty governance, university policies and budget procedures
- Making decisions in a timely manner
- Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries
- Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems and staff support
- Providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program
- Constructively acting on the concerns of graduate students
- Positioning the College as a leader among AAU peers
- Acting with integrity
- Sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes
- Providing leadership for high-quality undergraduate teaching
- Providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs
- Actively supporting high-quality faculty research
- Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive manner

Three items—(a) acting on the concerns of faculty of color, (b) actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty, and (c) managing conflicts among faculty—were identified as Assets by the Population, with (a) and (b) also rated as Assets by the Knowledgeables. Two items were rated by the Knowledgeables as Bimodal: (a) managing conflicts among staff was an Asset/Issue and (b) managing conflicts among faculty was a Strength/Issue. No other items were rated as an Issue and no items were rated as Improvements Needed by either the Population or the Knowledgeables.

A comparison of these sets of respondents indicated that the Knowledgeables rated Dean Sher higher than the Population on 17 items, lower on 9 items, and the same on 1 item. However, only 1 of those items—managing conflicts among staff—demonstrated a medium-to-large effect size, with the Population rating Dean Sher higher than did the Knowledgeables; the vast majority of these differences demonstrated small effect sizes. Hence, the Population and the Knowledgeables generally agreed on Dean Sher's performance. Moreover, in comparing the ratings for Dean Sher with the other deans assessed this year, Dean Sher was rated more positively on every item, except for 3 by the Population and 4 by the Knowledgeables (with either no difference or a small effect size in each case). Nine items for the Population and 10 items for the Knowledgeables demonstrated medium-to-large effect sizes, and the average effect size for these differences was .34 for the Population and .33 for the Knowledgeables, in the small-to-medium range. These results, thus, suggest that Dean Sher performed significantly better on many items, and overall, compared to the other deans assessed this year.

Open-Ended Comments

Twenty-one respondents (25% of all those surveyed; 30% of those who completed the questionnaire), 16 from the Population (24% of the Population surveyed; 31% of those who

completed the questionnaire) and 5 from the Knowledgeables (29% of those surveyed and who completed the questionnaire) provided comments. A content analysis revealed that 13 respondents (62%) gave comments that could be categorized as entirely positive, 0 gave entirely negative comments, and 8 (38%) gave mixed comments that included both positive and negative points (with 2 of those reflecting primarily negative comments), with a number of those mixed comments first highlighting Dean Sher's strengths as an administrator and then offering negative comments and constructive suggestions. Hence, overall, a majority of the respondents offered positive comments. Although these responses did not come from a representative sample, they offer potentially valuable information about what these respondents viewed as Dean Sher's strengths and weaknesses.

There was a good amount of consistency demonstrated among the positive comments. A number of these comments, as might be expected, were relatively short, simply expressing respondents' satisfaction with or praise for Dean Sher (e.g., "Dean Sher is wonderful to work for" and "Dean Sher has done an outstanding job overall"). With regard to specific strengths identified, comments could be categorized with respect to three themes: (a) personal support or mentoring received from Dean Sher, (b) his leadership of the College of Music (e.g., his vision and innovativeness and the effects they have had on the quality and reputation of the College), and (c) his influence on creating a climate of positive morale within the College of Music. A number of people commented favorably on Dean Sher and the climate at the College of Music relative to prior jobs they had. In addition, at least 5 respondents commented that Dean Sher's performance had shown significant improvement during his tenure as dean.

There was substantial variance among the small number of negative comments offered, making it difficult to identify consistent themes. Two respondents pointed to the problem of retaining high-quality faculty. Two respondents said that Dean Sher needs to better manage conflicts among faculty, most explicitly described in the comment, "Many of us wish he would be more actively involved in resolving potential difficult issues between faculty/factions. Conflict resolution doesn't seem to be of interest to him at times, and it clearly breeds discontent." Idiosyncratic comments included the need to stress academics over popular interests in the curriculum, the need for more transparency in the College budget, and the need to encourage people more to do their best.

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 Sher, 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 Sher. 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 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 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 was satisfied for 14 of the 20 items, dissatisfied for 2 items, and neutral for 4 items; the Knowledgeables were satisfied with 12 items, dissatisfied with 1 item, and neutral on 7 items. Both the Population and the Knowledgeables agreed that 7 items were Strengths; 3 additional items were regarded as Strengths by the Population or the Knowledgeables but failed to quite meet that criterion for the other set of respondents. There was less consensus on areas representing Assets or Issues, and both the Population and the Knowledgeables agreed on three Improvements Needed: classroom facilities, salaries relative to peer institutions, and space and facilities (the last of which received the lowest mean ratings from both sets of respondents).

Although there were some differences in satisfaction between the Population and the Knowledgeables, with the Population more satisfied on 10 items and less satisfied on 7 items (with 3 showing no differences), the majority of these differences demonstrated small effect sizes. Only 1 item—education/training offered by the library—showed a medium-to-large effect size, with the Population more satisfied than the Knowledgeables. The only 2 items that demonstrated small-to-medium effect sizes that are under Dean Sher's control—support for outside money and evaluation of teaching—showed the Population to be more satisfied with regard to evaluation of teaching and less satisfied about support for outside money. When compared to the other deans assessed this year, Dean Sher's respondents reported significantly greater dissatisfaction with classroom facilities (1.4 and .9 effect sizes for the Population and the Knowledgeables, respectively) and with space and facilities (1.2 and 1.0 effect sizes, respectively), both of which were identified as Improvements Needed. The Population also reported moderately (medium-to-strong effect size) greater satisfaction with evaluation of teaching and moderately greater dissatisfaction with technological teaching support compared to

the Populations for the other deans (although the latter item still was rated as a Strength). All other differences demonstrated small or small-to-medium effect sizes.

Sixteen respondents (19% of all those surveyed; 23% of those who completed the questionnaire) provided comments on the satisfaction questionnaire. Many respondents focused on university level concerns. The one issue mentioned at that level that is most germane to Dean Sher was that of taking teaching and its evaluation seriously, which was commented on by eight respondents. In particular, respondents pointed to the privileging of research at the expense of teaching and what they perceived to be the almost sole reliance on a faulty instrument (the FCQs) to evaluate teaching. Three respondents commented directly on the poor facilities in the College of Music, with one noting his/her appreciation for the efforts Dean Sher is making to address this problem.

Conclusion

Dean Sher received high ratings from both the Population and the Knowledgeables on the administrator appraisal questionnaire, with all 27 items receiving high mean scores and categorized as either Strengths or Assets. Two items—constructively managing conflicts among faculty and constructively managing conflicts among staff—were viewed as Issues by a portion of the Knowledgeables, and simultaneously were identified as a Strength or an Asset by the majority of both the Population and the Knowledgeables. Neither the Population nor the Knowledgeables rated any items as Improvements Needed. In addition, nearly two-thirds of respondents provided open-ended comments that were entirely positive about Dean Sher; the remainder offered mixed positive and negative comments; and not a single respondent offered an entirely negative comment. Respondents were also positive with respect to the BFA satisfaction questionnaire, with both the Population and the Knowledgeables satisfied with the majority of the items and dissatisfied about only two items—salaries compared to peer institutions and space and facilities (both of which were Improvements Needed)—but also viewing classroom facilities as an Improvement Needed.

Overall, these results indicate that Dean Sher is viewed by respondents as an effective administrator. However, respondents are concerned about the facilities in the College of Music, and appear to have mixed feelings about Dean Sher's ability to manage conflicts among faculty and among staff. The Administrator Appraisal Program Committee concludes that Dean Sher has achieved a high degree of effectiveness with his leadership of the College of Music. As per the charge given to the 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 Sher *Exceeds Expectations*. The Committee congratulates Dean Sher for his achievements and 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 (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 Sher

Item	Dean Sher				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
23. Understanding faculty governance	4.5 (.6)	Strength	4.6 (.5)	Strength	3.9 (1.3)	3.9 (1.3)	.3	.5	.7
20. Making timely decisions	4.2 (.7)	Strength	4.3 (.8)	Strength	3.3 (1.3)	3.5 (1.3)	.1	.6	.8
18. Responding to faculty	4.2 (.9)	Strength	4.4 (.9)	Strength	3.6 (1.3)	3.5 (1.4)	.2	.5	.7
24. Taking responsibility for office	4.2 (.9)	Strength	4.3 (.6)	Strength	3.7 (1.1)	3.6 (1.3)	.1	.5	.6
2. Professional MA leadership	4.1 (.8)	Strength	4.3 (.8)	Strength	3.5 (1.3)	3.5 (1.4)	.2	.5	.6
11. Act on graduate concerns	4.1 (.8)	Strength	4.1 (.6)	Strength	3.6 (1.2)	3.8 (1.2)	-.1	.4	.3
10. Act on undergraduate concerns	4.1 (.8)	Strength	3.9 (.6)	Strength	3.7 (1.1)	3.8 (1.3)	-.4	.4	.1
7. Positioning College as leader	4.1 (.9)	Strength	4.3 (.8)	Strength	3.6 (1.3)	3.7 (1.3)	.2	.4	.5
26. Acting with integrity	4.1 (1.0)	Strength	4.4 (.6)	Strength	4.0 (1.3)	4.0 (1.3)	.3	.1	.4
21. Sharing bases of major decisions	4.0 (.8)	Strength	4.1 (1.1)	Strength	3.5 (1.4)	3.7 (1.4)	.1	.4	.3
1. Undergraduate leadership	4.0 (.9)	Strength	4.1 (.8)	Strength	3.8 (1.2)	3.7 (1.4)	.1	.3	.4
3. Research MA and PhD leadership	4.0 (.9)	Strength	4.1 (1.0)	Strength	3.4 (1.3)	3.4 (1.4)	.1	.4	.5
4. Supporting high-quality research	4.0 (.9)	Strength	4.1 (1.0)	Strength	3.6 (1.2)	3.8 (1.3)	.1	.3	.3
17. Managing staff conflicts	4.0 (.9)	Strength	3.4 (1.1)	Asset/Issue	3.2 (1.3)	3.0 (1.3)	-.6	.6	.3
9. Act on staff concerns	4.0 (1.1)	Strength	3.9 (.7)	Strength	3.3 (1.3)	3.4 (1.4)	-.1	.5	.4
25. Treating faculty fairly	4.0 (1.2)	Strength	4.2 (1.1)	Strength	3.7 (1.4)	4.0 (1.3)	.2	.2	.2
6. Vision leading industry/profession	3.9 (1.1)	Strength	4.2 (.7)	Strength	3.6 (1.4)	3.7 (1.4)	.3	.2	.5
5. Rewarding high-quality service	3.9 (1.1)	Strength	3.7 (1.0)	Asset	3.4 (1.3)	3.5 (1.3)	-.2	.4	.2
8. Act on faculty concerns	3.9 (1.0)	Strength	4.2 (.8)	Strength	3.3 (1.4)	3.3 (1.4)	.3	.4	.7
19. Involve faculty decision making	3.9 (1.0)	Strength	4.1 (.8)	Strength	3.3 (1.4)	3.6 (1.5)	.1	.5	.4
22. Fostering equitable salary system	3.9 (1.2)	Strength	3.8 (1.1)	Strength	3.3 (1.3)	3.6 (1.4)	-.1	.5	.1
12. Act on women faculty concerns	3.9 (1.2)	Strength	3.6 (.8)	Strength	3.7 (1.3)	3.7 (1.3)	-.2	.2	-.1
13. Act on faculty of color concerns	3.9 (1.1)	Asset	3.7 (.9)	Asset	3.7 (1.3)	3.7 (1.2)	-.2	.2	0

Item	Dean Sher		Knowledgeables (B)		Other Deans		Effects		
	Population (A) M (SD)	Category	M (SD)	Category	Pop. (C) M (SD)	Knowl. (D) M (SD)	B-A	A-C	B-D
27. Earning faculty trust	3.8 (1.1)	Strength	3.9 (1.0)	Strength	3.5 (1.4)	3.4 (1.4)	.2	.2	.4
14. Making progress diversity goals	3.7 (1.0)	Strength	3.7 (.8)	Strength	3.9 (1.0)	3.8 (1.1)	0	-.2	-.1
15. Recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty	3.7 (1.2)	Asset	3.5 (.9)	Asset	3.7 (1.2)	3.7 (1.2)	-.1	-.1	-.1
16. Managing faculty conflicts	3.6 (1.1)	Asset	3.8 (1.2)	Strength/Issue	3.0 (1.3)	3.1 (1.3)	.1	.4	.5

Table 2

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire Results by Category for Dean Sher

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

- Having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures (P & K)
- Making decisions in a timely manner (P & K)
- Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries (P & K)
- Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff (P & K)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program (P & K)
- Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P & K)
- Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P & K)
- Positioning the School/College as a leader among AAU peers, both nationally and internationally (P & K)
- Acting with integrity (P & K)
- Sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes (P & K)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality undergraduate teaching (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)
- Constructively managing conflicts among staff (P)
- Constructively acting on staff concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P & K)
- Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way (P & K)
- Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it or keeping up with it (P & K)
- Rewarding high-quality service (P)
- Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P & K)
- Appropriately involving faculty in decision making (P & K)
- Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system (P & K)
- Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty (P & K)
- Earning the trust of the faculty (P & K)
- Making progress toward diversity goals (P & K)

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

- Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color (P & K)

Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty (P & K)
Constructively managing conflicts among faculty (P)
Rewarding high-quality service (K)

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. Strengths/Issues

Constructively managing conflicts among faculty (K)

B. Assets/Issues

Constructively managing conflicts among staff (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 Sher

Item	Dean Sher				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)					
8. Relationship with colleagues	4.4 (.8)	S	Strength	4.2 (1.1)	S	Strength	4.0 (1.0)	4.0 (.8)	-.2	.3	.2
11. Library access outside resources	4.0 (.8)	S	Strength	3.9 (.8)	S	Strength	4.1 (.8)	4.0 (.8)	-.1	-.2	0
5. Departmental support services	4.0 (.9)	S	Strength	4.2 (1.0)	S	Strength	3.6 (1.1)	3.9 (.7)	.1	.4	.4
1. Teaching responsibilities	4.0 (1.0)	S	Strength	4.2 (.9)	S	Strength	4.1 (.9)	4.3 (.9)	.2	-.1	-.1
12. Education/training by library	3.9 (.7)	S	Strength	3.5 (.9)	S	-	4.0 (.8)	3.8 (.9)	-.5	-.2	-.4
9. University support for research and creative work	3.8 (1.1)	S	Strength	3.7 (1.2)	S	Strength	3.4 (1.1)	3.6 (1.1)	0	.3	.1
3. Technological teaching support	3.7 (.9)	S	Strength	3.8 (.9)	S	Strength	4.2 (1.0)	3.8 (1.1)	.1	-.5	.1
4. No. graduate teaching assistants	3.7 (1.0)	S	Strength	3.9 (1.0)	S	Strength	3.5 (1.2)	3.5 (1.1)	.2	.1	.4
10. Faculty involvement in library	3.6 (.8)	S	Strength	3.4 (.9)	S	-	3.9 (.9)	3.5 (.9)	-.3	-.3	-.2
20. Evaluation of teaching	3.6 (1.0)	S	Asset	3.2 (1.2)	N	Issue	3.1 (1.1)	3.3 (1.0)	-.4	.5	-.1
16. Other benefits, inc. retirement	3.5 (.8)	S	Strength	3.3 (1.1)	S	Asset	3.6 (.9)	3.7 (1.0)	-.3	-.1	-.4
17. Faculty governance	3.5 (.9)	S	Asset	3.5 (.8)	S	-	3.1 (.9)	3.4 (1.0)	0	.4	.1
6. Support for outside money	3.4 (1.0)	S	-	3.8 (1.1)	S	Strength	3.3 (1.1)	3.6 (1.0)	.3	.2	.2
18. University efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty	3.3 (1.0)	S	-	3.2 (1.1)	N	Issue	3.3 (1.0)	3.3 (.9)	-.1	0	-.1
19. University efforts to retain diverse undergraduates	3.2 (1.1)	N	Issue	3.1 (1.1)	N	Issue	3.2 (1.0)	3.0 (.9)	-.1	0	.1
15. Current health plan	3.1 (1.0)	N	Issue	2.8 (1.3)	N	Issue	2.9 (1.3)	2.7 (1.4)	-.3	.2	.1
14. Equitable salary distribution	3.0 (1.1)	N	Issue	3.1 (1.2)	N	Improve	2.7 (1.2)	2.8 (1.3)	0	.3	.2
2. Classroom facilities	2.8 (1.0)	N	Improve	3.0 (1.2)	N	Improve	4.2 (1.0)	4.0 (1.1)	.2	-1.4	-.9
13. Salary with peer institutions	2.7 (1.0)	D	Improve	3.0 (1.4)	N	Improve	2.7 (1.2)	2.8 (1.2)	.3	0	.1
7. Space and facilities	2.5 (1.1)	D	Improve	2.4 (1.2)	D	Improve	3.9 (1.2)	3.6 (1.3)	-.1	-1.2	-1.0

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

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

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