

**Report of the
Boulder Faculty Assembly Administrator Appraisal Committee¹
Concerning
Paul Voakes, Dean of the School of Journalism and Mass Communication**

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 Voakes included five additional items (recruiting new faculty; representing the School to external audiences; making sound budget decisions; communicating effectively with the unit; and providing vision, strategic leadership). The complete list of items for Dean Voakes 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 Journalism and Mass Communication faculty members (27 people), the population of interest (hereafter referred to as the "Population"), designated as eligible by the BFA were sent an e-mail requesting them to complete the online administrator appraisal questionnaire. In keeping with past practices, the AAP Committee, in collaboration with Dean Voakes, also asked a separate sample (8 people) judged especially likely to be knowledgeable about Voakes'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, 26 of the 27 people surveyed completed the administrator appraisal questionnaire, a response rate of 96%. For the Knowledgeables, all 8 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, 34 of the 35 people surveyed completed the questionnaire, for an overall response rate of 97%.

Results of the Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire

The statistical results of the administrator appraisal questionnaire for Dean Voakes are presented in Table 1. Both the mean score and standard deviation for each of the 32 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 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 Voakes is presented in Table 2.

Table 1 also indicates effect sizes and their direction (positive or negative) for each item (expressing differences in standard deviation units). First, the Population and the Knowledgeables for Dean Voakes 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 Voakes. 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 Voakes. 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 of the 32 items assessed, the Population rated 4 items as Strengths and the Knowledgeables rated 16 items as Strengths. None of the mean scores given for the

Population for any item was over 4.0, whereas 10 of the 32 items were rated as 4.0 or higher by the Knowledgeables. The 3 common items rated as Strengths by the Population and the Knowledgeables were: (a) constructively acting on undergraduate concerns; (b) representing the School to external audiences; and (c) taking responsibility for office logistics, system, and support staff. The Population identified 1 additional item—recruiting new faculty—as a Strength; the Knowledgeables identified 13 additional items as Strengths (with 10 items having mean scores of 4.0 or higher): (a) making sound budget decisions; (b) constructively acting on graduate student concerns; (c) acting with integrity; (d) making progress toward diversity goals; (e) providing leadership for high-quality undergraduate teaching; (f) fostering an equitable, merit-based, salary system; (g) treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way; (h) constructively acting on staff concerns; (i) actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty; (j) providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the professional master’s program; (k) actively supporting high-quality research; (l) providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master’s and doctoral programs; and (m) constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color. These results show that the Population and the Knowledgeables agreed on a relatively small number of items categorized as Strengths of Dean Voakes.

Dean Voakes received Bimodal responses from both the Population and the Knowledgeables on a relatively large number of items (14 and 13 items, respectively) that were categorized as both a Strength and an Issue, demonstrating that there are divisions within each of these sets of respondents regarding their evaluation of Dean Voakes. However, no common Strengths/Issues were identified by these two sets of respondents. For the Population, 6 items were categorized as Strengths/Issues: (a) making sound budget decisions; (b) constructively acting on graduate student concerns; (c) acting with integrity; (d) making progress toward diversity goals; (e) fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system; and (f) treating faculty of all ranks in a fair, inclusive way. For the Knowledgeables, 11 items were categorized as Strengths/Issues: (a) recruiting new faculty; (b) making decisions in a timely manner; (c) sharing the bases of major decisions he makes; (d) having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures; (e) communicating effectively with the unit; (f) constructively acting on faculty concerns; (g) responding respectfully and in a timely manner to faculty inquiries; (h) positioning the School as a leader among AAU peers; (i) acting on the concerns of women faculty; (j) rewarding high-quality service; and (k) appropriately involving faculty in decision making.

There was 1 item that was categorized as an Asset by the Population—providing leadership in high-quality undergraduate teaching—and 0 items in this category for the Knowledgeables. There were, however, a large number of items categorized in a Bimodal manner as both an Asset and as an Issue, demonstrating, again, internal divisions within these sets of respondents regarding their views of Dean Voakes’s effectiveness. Specifically, the Population identified 5 Assets/Issues—(a) making decisions in a timely manner; (b) sharing the bases of major decisions he makes; (c) having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures; (d) communicating effectively with the unit; and (e) constructively acting on faculty concerns—and the Knowledgeables identified 2 Assets/Issues—(a) having the vision to lead the industry/profession and (b) providing vision, strategic leadership. There also was 1 item identified by the Population that was categorized as an Asset/Improvement Needed: constructively acting on staff concerns.

With respect to Issues, the Population identified 4 items: (a) constructively managing conflicts among staff, (b) actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty, (c) acting on the concerns of women faculty, and (d) acting on concerns of faculty of color. The Knowledgeables identified 2 items as Issues: earning faculty trust and constructively managing conflicts among faculty.

The Population identified 9 items that were categorized as Improvements Needed:

- Providing leadership for high-quality teaching of the professional master's program
- Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries
- Positioning the School as a leader among AAU peers
- Actively supporting high-quality research
- Rewarding high-quality service
- Involving faculty in decision making
- Providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs
- Earning the trust of the faculty
- Constructively managing conflicts among faculty

There were no Improvements Needed identified by the Knowledgeables.

The data, thus, demonstrated that Dean Voakes was rated very differently by the Population and by the Knowledgeables, which was confirmed in the comparisons made between these two sets of respondents, as they differed on 31 of the 32 items on the questionnaire, with, in all cases, the Population rating Dean Voakes lower than did the Knowledgeables. Moreover, the differences were often quite significant, with 1 item (providing leadership for high-quality teaching of the professional master's program) showing a large effect size, and 12 other items showing medium-to-large effect sizes. Hence, those who work closest to Dean Voakes rated him more favorably, and significantly so in many cases, than did the Population.

Comparisons of Dean Voakes with the other deans assessed this year on the 27 common items of the administrator appraisal questionnaire showed that Dean Voakes's Population rated him lower on 26 items than did the Populations for the other deans, with effect sizes large for 3 items (understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures; acting on the concerns of faculty of color; and earning faculty trust), medium to large for 15 items (providing leadership of the research-oriented master's and doctoral program, constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty, supporting high-quality research, responding respectfully and in a timely manner to faculty, and recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty), small to medium for 5 items, and small for 3 items. In contrast, Dean Voakes's Knowledgeables rated him higher than the Knowledgeables for the other deans on 13 items (with effect sizes large for 1 item—acting on undergraduate student concerns—small to medium for 7 items, and small for 5 items), lower on 13 items (with effect sizes medium to large for 2 items, small to medium for 1 item, and small for 8 items), and the same on 1 item. These data, thus, show, again, that there was a significant difference between the Population and the Knowledgeables for Dean Voakes when compared to those respondents for the other deans

assessed this year, with Dean Voakes's Population rating him lower across the items, and significantly lower on many items, and the Knowledgeables rating him higher on half the items and lower on half, but not significantly higher or lower.

Open-ended Comments

Thirty persons (86% of all people surveyed; 88% of those who completed the questionnaire), 8 from the Population, 6 from the Knowledgeables, and 16 unknown (as their comments were received via an attachment to a single e-mail that contained all of them, sent by an AAP committee member who received them from faculty concerned about submitting responses to the online questionnaire), provided comments. A content analysis revealed that 7 (23%) gave comments that could be categorized as entirely positive, 19 (63%) gave entirely negative comments, and 4 (13%) gave mixed comments that included both positive and negative points. Overall, the negative comments outnumbered the positive comments (and the positive and mixed comments combined). Given the response rate, which well exceeds the 60% return rate needed for a representative survey, these comments document the sentiments of Dean Voakes's constituency and provide valuable information about what this constituency views as the dean's strengths and weaknesses.

With respect to strengths, two main themes emerged. First, five respondents cited significant improvements over the past 5 years of Dean Voakes's tenure. Some of these respondents focused on the creation of a new strategic plan, bylaws, policies and procedures, annual faculty evaluation criteria and procedures, and undergraduate and graduate curricula; management of the accreditation process; more administrative transparency; balancing of professional and scholarly missions of the School; more community outreach; new funds available; and excellent new hires. The other respondents focused on improvements in Dean Voakes's communication with faculty members (including a weekly e-mail summary) and faculty's inclusion in decision making. Second, three respondents focused on Dean Voakes's personal characteristics, including his intelligence, approachability/accessibility, reasonableness/fairness, quickness of response to inquiries, supportive nature, and decisiveness.

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. A number of important themes, however, did emerge, many of which were in line with items on the administrator appraisal questionnaire categorized as Issues and Improvements Needed based on their numerical ratings. First, many respondents said that Dean Voakes privileges a professional focus over a research focus, a vision that is not commensurate with the status and standing of the University of Colorado of Boulder as a top research university. Respondents pointed to the lack of support for faculty research, from funding to promoting achievements, and to the extremely poor rating the School received in a recent survey conducted by a national scholarly association. Respondents also noted that this focus translated into Dean Voakes emphasizing undergraduate education (primarily traditional print journalism skills in an era of technological innovation, as well as an emphasis on advertising) at the expense of graduate education. Second, many respondents pointed to a general lack of effective communication with faculty, claiming that Dean Voakes isolates himself in his office and uses e-mail too much to communicate with faculty, as well as the lack of including faculty in decision-making processes (which was also

mentioned by a respondent who supported him), noting that he was too quick to take advantage of opportunities presented without securing faculty buy-in. Third, problems with personnel matters, such as reappointment cases and unsuccessful hiring opportunities, were identified. Fourth, the dean was viewed as spending too much time raising funds or communicating with alumni, activities that had taken him away from meeting the day-to-day needs of the School and its faculty. Fifth, some respondents raised the issue of Dean Voakes's active support of diversity and his treatment of women and faculty of color, with, according to one respondent half of the women faculty having discussed their concerns with university grievance officers. The majority of respondents, thus, raised serious, significant issues about Dean Voakes's leadership.

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 Voakes, 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 Voakes. 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.

The results of the satisfaction questionnaire indicated that, in contrast to the sharp differences between the Population and the Knowledgeables on the administrator appraisal questionnaire,

both sets of respondents were mostly in agreement. Both the Population and the Knowledgeables rated the following 9 items (of the 20 items assessed) as satisfactory (with the first 7 items rated as either a Strength or an Asset): (a) faculty involvement in the library, (b) teaching responsibilities, (b) number of graduate teaching assistants, (d) library access to outside resources, (e) relationship with colleagues, (f) education/training offered by the library, (g) departmental support services, (h) university support for research and creative work, and (i) support for outside money. In addition, classroom facilities were rated as satisfactory by the Population (although a significant portion viewed those facilities as an Issue), and 3 other items were rated as satisfactory by the Knowledgeables: technological teaching support (although a significant portion viewed it as an Issue), faculty governance, and evaluation of teaching.

Three items were rated by both the Population and the Knowledgeables as neutral (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied): (a) other benefits including retirement (an Issue for the Population), (b) university efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty, and (c) space and facilities (with both the Knowledgeables and a significant portion of the Population seeing these as an Issue). The Population rated 4 additional items as neutral—technological teaching support (with a significant portion seeing it as an Issue), faculty governance, evaluation of teaching (also an Issue), and the current health plan (an Improvement Needed)—and the Knowledgeables rated 4 additional items as neutral—classroom facilities (also an Issue), university efforts to retain diverse undergraduates, equitable salary distribution (with a significant portion seeing it as an Improvement Needed), and salary with peer institutions (with a significant portion seeing it as an Issue).

Only 3 items were rated unsatisfactory (dissatisfaction) by the Population (all of which were Improvements Needed): (a) university efforts to retain diverse undergraduates, (b) equitable salary distribution, and (c) salary with peer institutions. No items were rated as unsatisfactory by the Knowledgeables.

A comparison of Dean Voakes's Population and Knowledgeables showed that the Population rated 6 items lower (with only 1 item—faculty involvement in the library—showing a large effect size, and most of the others demonstrating small or small-to-medium effect sizes) and 14 items higher than did the Knowledgeables (with effects sizes small for 4 items, small to medium for 4 items, medium to large for 3 items, and large for 3 items). Mirroring the results for the administrator appraisal questionnaire, Dean Voakes's Population was less satisfied than the Populations for the other deans assessed this year for 17 of the 20 items assessed (with most of the effect sizes in the small-to-medium range) and more satisfied for 3 items. Dean Voakes's Knowledgeables, compared to the Knowledgeables for the other deans, were less satisfied on 12 items (most in the medium-to-small effect size), more satisfied on 6 items, and demonstrated no difference on 2 items. Hence, overall, both the Population and the Knowledgeables for Dean Voakes were less satisfied than these sets of respondents for the other deans assessed this year.

Only three respondents provided comments on the satisfaction questionnaire. All three respondents focused on university concerns and did not mention any specific item related to the School of Journalism and Mass Communication.

Conclusion

Dean Voakes received very different ratings by the Population and the Knowledgeables on the items of the administrator appraisal questionnaire. Whereas the Population identified 4 Strengths, 1 Asset, 4 Issues, and 9 Improvements Needed, the Knowledgeables identified 15 Strengths, 0 Assets, 2 Issues, and 0 Improvements Needed. In addition, whereas the Population identified 6 items as Strengths/Issues, 6 items as Assets/Issues, and 1 item as an Asset/Improvement Needed, the Knowledgeables identified 12 items as Assets/Issues, 1 item as an Asset/Issue, and 0 items as Assets/Improvement Needed. Moreover, the mean scores for the 32 items assessed never exceeded 3.9 for the Population (with 7 items rated below 3.0), whereas the mean scores for the Knowledgeables never were below 3.0 (with 10 items rated 4.0 or better). The significance of these differences is further supported by the fact that for all items, the Population rated Dean Voakes lower than did the Knowledgeables.

There, thus, are clear and substantial differences in the ratings of Dean Voakes, with the Population significantly less favorable toward the dean than are the Knowledgeables (those who work most closely with him). It should be acknowledged that the members of the Population and the members of Knowledgeables often were divided themselves, as demonstrated by both the large standard deviations and through the Bimodal responses on some items. Hence, there are Strengths and Assets on which Dean Voakes certainly can build on, both with regard to the internal management of the School (e.g., office logistics and budget decisions) and with respect to its representation to external audiences, as respondents' comments verified. Of particular significance, however, as identified by the Population, are the Improvements Needed, which include almost one-third of the items on the administrator appraisal questionnaire, and the Issues, which, when added, constitute almost half of the items (with a substantial portion of the Knowledgeables also identifying many Issues). In addition, the majority of respondents expressed negative comments about the dean's leadership. Moreover, Dean Voakes's Population rated him lower, and significant lower in many cases, than did the Populations for the other deans assessed this year on 26 of the 27 items on the administrator appraisal questionnaire. In addition, both sets of respondents were less satisfied than their counterparts in the other schools and colleges surveyed this year. The relationship between respondents' ratings of Dean Voakes's effectiveness and their general lack of satisfaction (including many issues that are not under the dean's control) is unclear: It could be that these respondents are a relatively unsatisfied group compared to their counterparts assessed this year whose unfavorable view of the working environment may have influenced their assessment of the Dean Voakes's performance, but it could also be that Dean Voakes's performance has created or exacerbated an unsatisfied group of respondents.

Overall, the survey results indicate that little has changed since the third-year review of Dean Voakes. Dean Voakes is rated relatively well by those identified as Knowledgeable but relatively low on the majority of the items of the administrator appraisal questionnaire by the Population. The faculty of the School of Journalism and Mass Communication, may, in the words of many respondents who provided comments, be a difficult group to lead, but the data suggest that Dean Voakes is not perceived as effectively leading that group by the Population and by a portion of the Knowledgeables. 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 Voakes *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 the Office 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 Voakes

Item	Dean Voakes				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
10. Act on undergraduate concerns	3.9 (1.3)	Strength	4.7 (.5)	Strength	3.8 (1.0)	3.7 (1.1)	.7	.1	.9
29. Representing School to audiences	3.8 (1.3)	Strength	4.6 (1.1)	Strength			.6		
24. Taking responsibility for office	3.6 (1.3)	Strength	4.0 (1.4)	Strength	3.9 (1.0)	3.8 (1.2)	.3	-.3	.2
28. Recruiting new faculty	3.6 (1.4)	Strength	3.8 (1.5)	Strength/Issue			.1		
30. Making sound budget decisions	3.5 (1.5)	Strength/Issue	4.2 (1.6)	Strength			.4		
11. Act on graduate concerns	3.5 (1.6)	Strength/Issue	4.0 (1.3)	Strength	3.8 (1.1)	3.8 (1.0)	.3	-.3	.2
26. Acting with integrity	3.4 (1.8)	Strength/Issue	3.9 (1.5)	Strength	4.1 (1.2)	4.1 (1.1)	.3	-.5	-.2
14. Making progress diversity goals	3.3 (1.3)	Strength/Issue	4.0 (1.3)	Strength	3.9 (1.0)	3.7 (1.0)	.6	-.7	.3
1. Undergraduate leadership	3.3 (1.3)	Asset	4.1 (1.4)	Strength	3.9 (1.0)	3.8 (1.3)	.6	-.6	.3
22. Fostering equitable salary system	3.3 (1.3)	Strength/Issue	4.0 (1.2)	Strength	3.4 (1.3)	3.6 (1.3)	.5	-.1	.3
25. Treating faculty fairly	3.3 (1.6)	Strength/Issue	4.1 (1.5)	Strength	3.9 (1.3)	4.1 (1.2)	.5	-.4	0
9. Act on staff concerns	3.3 (1.5)	Asset/Improve	3.8 (1.6)	Strength	3.5 (1.3)	3.5 (1.2)	.3	-.2	.3
6. Vision leading industry/profession	3.2 (1.6)	Asset/Issue	3.6 (1.6)	Asset/Issue	3.8 (1.2)	3.9 (1.2)	.3	-.5	-.2
20. Making timely decisions	3.2 (1.5)	Asset/Issue	3.5 (1.1)	Strength/Issue	3.8 (1.2)	3.6 (1.3)	.2	-.5	-.1
21. Sharing bases of major decisions	3.2 (1.6)	Asset/Issue	3.9 (1.6)	Strength/Issue	3.7 (1.2)	3.8 (1.3)	.4	-.4	.1
17. Managing staff conflicts	3.2 (1.3)	Issue	3.2 (.8)	-	3.4 (1.3)	3.1 (1.3)	0	-.2	.1
23. Understanding faculty governance	3.1 (1.5)	Asset/Issue	3.6 (1.5)	Strength/Issue	4.2 (1.1)	4.2 (1.1)	.4	-1.0	-.5
31. Communicating within unit	3.1 (1.5)	Asset/Issue	3.5 (1.7)	Strength/Issue			.3		
8. Act on faculty concerns	3.1 (1.5)	Asset/Issue	3.6 (1.5)	Strength/Issue	3.5 (1.3)	3.5 (1.3)	.3	-.3	.1
32. Vision, strategic planning	3.1 (1.6)	Asset/Issue	3.6 (1.6)	Asset/Issue			.4		
15. Recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty	3.1 (1.3)	Issue	3.9 (1.4)	Strength	3.8 (1.1)	3.6 (1.1)	.6	-.7	.3
2. Professional MA leadership	3.1 (1.4)	Improve	4.1 (1.5)	Strength	3.8 (1.1)	3.6 (1.2)	.8	-.6	.4

18. Responding to faculty	3.1 (1.6)	Improve	3.6 (1.4)	Strength/Issue	3.9 (1.2)	3.7 (1.3)	.4	-.7	-.1
7. Positioning College as leader	3.1 (1.6)	Improve	3.6 (1.5)	Strength/Issue	3.8 (1.2)	3.9 (1.2)	.4	-.6	-.2
4. Supporting high-quality research	3.0 (1.5)	Improve	3.7 (1.4)	Strength	3.8 (1.1)	3.9 (1.2)	.5	-.7	-.1
12. Act on women faculty concerns	2.9 (1.4)	Issue	3.5 (1.6)	Strength/Issue	3.8 (1.2)	3.7 (1.1)	.4	-.7	-.2
5. Rewarding high-quality service	2.9 (1.5)	Improve	3.9 (1.4)	Strength/Issue	3.6 (1.2)	3.5 (1.2)	.6	-.5	.3
19. Involve faculty decision making	2.8 (1.5)	Improve	3.5 (1.7)	Strength/Issue	3.6 (1.3)	3.7 (1.3)	.4	-.6	-.2
3. Research MA and PhD leadership	2.8 (1.6)	Improve	3.7 (1.5)	Strength	3.7 (1.1)	3.6 (1.3)	.5	-.7	0
13. Act on faculty of color concerns	2.7 (1.3)	Issue	3.4 (1.5)	Strength	3.9 (1.1)	3.7 (1.0)	.5	-1.0	-.3
27. Earning faculty trust	2.7 (1.4)	Improve	3.0 (1.6)	Issue	3.7 (1.3)	3.6 (1.3)	.2	-.8	-.5
16. Managing faculty conflicts	2.4 (1.5)	Improve	3.3 (1.0)	Issue	3.3 (1.3)	3.3 (1.4)	.6	-.6	0

Table 2

Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire Results by Category for Dean Voakes

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

- Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (Population without knowledgeable [P] and Knowledgeables [K])
- Representing the School to external audiences (P & K)
- Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff (P & K)
- Recruiting new faculty (P)
- Making sound budget decisions (K)
- Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (K)
- Acting with integrity (K)
- Making progress toward diversity goals (K)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality undergraduate teaching (K)
- Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system (K)
- Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way (K)
- Constructively acting on staff concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (K)
- Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty (K)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program (K)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs (K)
- Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color (K)

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

- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality undergraduate teaching (P)

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

- Constructively managing conflicts among staff (P)
- Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty (P)
- Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty (P)
- Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color (P)
- Earning the trust of the faculty (K)
- Constructively managing conflicts among faculty (K)

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

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)
 Positioning the School/College as a leader among AAU peers, both nationally and internationally (P)
 Actively supporting high-quality faculty research (e.g., mentoring and funding opportunities) (P)
 Rewarding high-quality service (P)
 Appropriately involving faculty in decision making (P)
 Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs (P)
 Earning the trust of the faculty (P)
 Constructively managing conflicts among faculty (P)

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

A. Strengths/Issues

Making sound budget decisions (P)
 Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P)
 Acting with integrity (P)
 Making progress toward diversity goals (P)
 Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system (P)
 Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive way (P)
 Recruiting new faculty (K)
 Making decisions in a timely manner (K)
 Sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes (K)
 Having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures (K)
 Communicating effectively with the unit (K)
 Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (K)
 Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries (K)
 Positioning the School/College as a leader among AAU peers, both nationally and internationally (K)
 Actively supporting high-quality faculty research (e.g., mentoring and funding opportunities) (K)
 Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty (K)
 Rewarding high-quality service (K)
 Appropriately involving faculty in decision making (K)

B. Assets/Issues

Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it or keeping up with it (P & K)

Making decisions in a timely manner (P)
Sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes (P)
Having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures (P)
Communicating effectively with the unit (P)
Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P)
Providing vision, strategic leadership (P & K)

C. Assets/Improvements Needed

Constructively acting on staff concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P)

No Category (Items that did reflect any category)

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 Voakes

Item	Dean Voakes					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)					
10. Faculty involvement in library	4.1 (.6)	S	Strength	3.3 (.8)	S	Asset	3.8 (.9)	3.5 (.9)	-1.1	.3	-.2
1. Teaching responsibilities	4.1 (.8)	S	Strength	4.6 (.5)	S	Strength	4.0 (1.0)	4.2 (.9)	.7	.1	.5
4. No. graduate teaching assistants	3.9 (1.1)	S	Strength	3.6 (1.0)	S	Asset	3.6 (1.1)	3.7 (1.1)	-.3	.3	-.1
11. Library access outside resources	3.8 (.8)	S	Strength	3.7 (.8)	S	Asset	4.1 (.8)	4.0 (.8)	-.2	-.4	-.4
8. Relationship with colleagues	3.8 (.9)	S	Strength	3.9 (.8)	S	Strength	4.1 (1.0)	4.1 (.9)	.2	-.5	-.1
12. Education/training by library	3.7 (.7)	S	Asset	4.2 (.4)	S	Strength	4.0 (.8)	3.7 (.9)	.9	-.4	.6
5. Departmental support services	3.6 (1.0)	S	Asset	4.0 (.5)	S	Strength	3.8 (1.1)	4.0 (.9)	.4	-.1	0
9. University support for research and creative work	3.3 (.8)	S	-	3.4 (1.5)	S	Improve	3.5 (1.1)	3.7 (1.1)	.2	-.3	-.2
6. Support for outside money	3.3 (1.0)	S	-	4.2 (1.3)	S	Strength	3.3 (1.1)	3.6 (1.0)	.8	-.1	.6
2. Classroom facilities	3.3 (1.1)	S	Asset/Issue	3.1 (1.3)	N	Issue	3.8 (1.2)	3.8 (1.2)	-.1	-.5	-.5
3. Technological teaching support	3.2 (1.1)	N	Asset/Issue	3.5 (1.1)	S	Stren/Issue	4.2 (.9)	3.8 (1.0)	.3	-1.0	-.3
17. Faculty governance	3.1 (.6)	N	-	3.8 (.9)	S	Strength	3.2 (1.0)	3.3 (1.0)	.9	-.2	.4
16. Other benefits, inc. retirement	3.1 (1.1)	N	Issue	3.0 (1.2)	N	Asset/Issue	3.6 (.9)	3.6 (1.0)	-.1	-.6	-.6
20. Evaluation of teaching	3.0 (1.0)	N	Issue	3.4 (1.0)	S	-	3.2 (1.1)	3.2 (1.1)	.4	-.2	.2
18. University efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty	2.9 (.7)	N	-	3.0 (.9)	N	-	3.3 (1.0)	3.3 (1.0)	.2	-.5	-.3
7. Space and facilities	2.9 (1.0)	N	Issue	3.1 (1.4)	N	Asset/Issue	3.6 (1.3)	3.3 (1.4)	.1	-.4	-.2
15. Current health plan	2.8 (1.5)	N	Improve	2.3 (1.4)	D	Improve	3.0 (1.2)	2.8 (1.3)	-.4	-.1	-.4
19. University efforts to retain diverse undergraduates	2.5 (.8)	D	Improve	3.0 (.9)	N	-	3.2 (1.0)	3.0 (1.0)	.5	-.7	0
14. Equitable salary distribution	2.4 (1.2)	D	Improve	2.8 (1.4)	N	Asset/Impr	2.8 (1.2)	2.9 (1.2)	.3	-.4	-.1
13. Salary with peer institutions	2.3 (1.2)	D	Improve	3.0 (1.2)	N	Asset/Issue	2.7 (1.1)	2.9 (1.2)	.6	-.3	.1

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

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. Recruiting new faculty
29. Representing the School to external audiences
30. Making sound budget decisions
31. Communicating effectively with the unit
32. Providing vision, strategic leadership

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