

**Report of the  
Boulder Faculty Assembly Administrator Appraisal Committee<sup>1</sup>  
Concerning  
James Williams, Dean of the University Libraries**

**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 items were added for Dean Williams. The complete list of items for Dean Williams 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.<sup>2</sup>

**Respondents and Response Rates**

All University Libraries faculty members (35 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 Williams, asked a separate sample (13 people) judged especially likely to be knowledgeable about Williams'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, 31 of the 35 people surveyed completed the administrator appraisal questionnaire, a response rate of 89%. For the Knowledgeables, all 13 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, 44 of the 48 people surveyed completed the questionnaire, for an overall response rate of 92%.

## Results of the Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire

### Preface

It is important to point out that the administrator appraisal questionnaire was designed for performance appraisal of degree-granting colleges/schools at the University of Colorado at Boulder, and not units such as University Libraries, which encompass Norlin, Business, Earth Sciences, Engineering, Math, and Music libraries. This unit does not have its own students or degree-granting programs, which accounts for the 20-25% missing/not applicable responses on 5 items related to providing leadership for high-quality teaching (regarding undergraduate, professional master's, and research-oriented master's and doctoral programs) and constructively acting on students' concerns (undergraduate and graduate). Instruction in the libraries generally takes place in response to requests from academic units for 1-2 orientation sessions, although a few library faculty sometimes teach research methods courses for credit. Moreover, organizing and managing a unit such as Universities Libraries arguably, is a more complex challenge than managing some of the academic units being appraised this year. For instance, the dean of libraries manages a large physical plant spread over six locations that is in transition to a digital mode.

Hence, although Dean Williams was assessed using the same questionnaire employed for the other (academic) deans assessed this year, and he is compared to those deans in the results presented, these comparisons are perhaps less important for this dean than for the other deans. It probably is more appropriate to compare Dean Williams's performance this year with his 2002 performance review, although that comparison also needs to be interpreted with the understanding that the administrator appraisal questionnaire had 27 items this year but only 20 items (with most of them assessing different things) in 2002.

### Statistical Results

The statistical results of the administrator appraisal questionnaire for Dean Williams 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 members of 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 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 (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 Williams 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 Williams 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 Williams. 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 Williams. In interpreting effect sizes, a value of (a) .20 or less represents a small, unnoticeable effect; (b) .21-.49 represents a small-to-medium effect; (c) .50-.79 represents a medium-to-large effect; and (d) .80 or greater represents a large effect. Although the AAP Committee recognizes that each dean faces unique circumstances and challenges, comparing the deans assessed this year (a new analysis for these reports), combined with the ratings and categories, is potentially useful for appraising a dean, especially for general items (e.g., acting with integrity). Moreover, the AAP Committee hopes that over time, a large database of administrator appraisals will make these comparisons an even more valuable assessment procedure.

The results showed that the Population and the Knowledgeables both rated Dean Williams as demonstrating Strengths on 9 of the 27 items. The mean scores were 4.0 or higher on the first 3 items for both sets of respondents and on the fourth item for the Population. The 9 Strengths were:

- Understanding faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures
- Acting with integrity
- Treating faculty of all ranks in a fair and inclusive manner
- Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty
- Making progress toward diversity goals
- Actively supporting high-quality faculty research,
- Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns
- Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color
- Providing leadership for high-quality undergraduate teaching

The Population identified 5 additional Strengths: (a) constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty; (b) responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries; (c) earning the trust of the faculty; (d) taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff; and (e) positioning the School/College as a leader among AAU peers. The Knowledgeables identified 3 other Strengths: (a) constructively acting on graduate student concerns; (b) providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program; and (c) fostering an

equitable, merit-based salary system. In all, the Population identified 14 Strengths (52% of the 27 items) and the Knowledgeables identified 12 Strengths (44%). In 2002, the Population identified 19 Strengths (95% of the 20 items) and the Knowledgeables identified 14 Strengths (70%). Hence, Dean Williams's ratings demonstrated many Strengths, although fewer Strengths this year than in 2002.

The ratings by the Population and the Knowledgeables identified 2 common items that were categorized as Assets: (a) providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs, and (b) sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes. The Population identified 3 additional Assets: (a) constructively acting on graduate student concerns, (b) rewarding high-quality service, and (c) providing leadership for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program. The Knowledgeables identified 1 additional Asset: positioning the school/college as a leader among AAU peer. Because of the high number of Strengths identified in 2002, no items were categorized that year as Asserts.

With respect to Issues, the Population identified 3 items: (a) constructively acting on staff concerns, (b) constructively acting on faculty concerns, and (c) constructively managing conflicts among staff. The Knowledgeables identified 1 item as an Issue: rewarding high-quality service. In 2002, 1 item—managing conflicts among faculty, staff—was identified as an Issue by the Population, and 8 items were identified as Issues by the Knowledgeables. Hence, the number of items identified as Issues increased slightly for the Population but decreased considerably for the Knowledgeables.

With respect to Improvements Needed, the Population and the Knowledgeables both identified 1 item: constructively managing conflicts among faculty. The Population did not identify any additional items as Improvements Needed; the Knowledgeables identified 3 other items: (a) constructively acting on staff concerns, (b) constructively acting on faculty concerns, and (c) constructively managing conflicts among staff. In 2002, no items were identified as Improvements Needed by either the Population or the Knowledgeables. Hence, there has been some downward shift, such that there now are some Improvements Needed.

Five items demonstrated Bimodal responses by the Population or by the Knowledgeables, meaning that the members of each of these sets of respondents were divided in how they viewed these items. Specifically, the Population viewed 3 items as Assets/Issues: (a) having the vision to lead the industry; (b) fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system; and (c) appropriately involving faculty in decision making. The Knowledgeables rated 1 item—taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff—as a Strength and as an Issue, and another item—responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries—as an Asset/Issue.

Comparisons for Dean Williams revealed that the Population rated him higher than did the Knowledgeables on 21 items (with effects sizes small for 12 items, small to medium for 7 items, and medium to large for 2 items), lower on 2 items (both small effect sizes), and the same (0 effect size) on 4 items. The largest differences occurred for the items of responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries (considered a Strength by the Population and an Asset/Issue by the Knowledgeables) and acting on the concerns of women faculty members (considered a Strength by the Population and no categorization for the Knowledgeables), with

the Population rating Dean Williams higher than did the Knowledgeables. Hence, counterintuitive to what might be expected, those who worked with Dean Williams most closely had a less favorable view of him than did the Population.

This general difference between Dean Williams's Population and Knowledgeable was also reflected in the comparisons of Dean Williams with the other deans assessed this year on the 27 common items across the administrator appraisal questionnaires, taking into account, again, that such comparisons for some items may not be appropriate. These comparisons showed that Dean Williams's Population rated him lower on 13 items (with effect sizes small for 8 items and small to medium for 5 items), higher on 10 items (with effect sizes small for 6 items and small to medium for 4 items), and the same on 4 items compared to the Populations for the other deans. Hence, on balance, there were few significant differences between Dean Williams's Population and the Populations of the other deans. In contrast, Dean Williams's Knowledgeables rated him lower on 21 items (with effect sizes small for 6 items, small to medium for 10 items, medium to large for 3 items, and large for 3 items) and higher on 6 items (with effect sizes all small) than did the Knowledgeables for the other deans. The largest negative discrepancies for the Knowledgeables were the items of (a) constructively acting on faculty concerns, (b) constructively acting on staff concerns, and (c) making decisions in a timely manner.

### **Open-Ended Comments**

Eighteen people (38% of all those surveyed; 41% of those who completed the questionnaire), 8 from the Population (23% of the Population surveyed; 26% of those who completed the questionnaire) and 10 from the Knowledgeables (77% of the Knowledgeables surveyed and who completed the question) provided comments. A content analysis revealed that 8 respondents (44%) gave comments that could be categorized as entirely positive, 6 (33%) gave entirely negative comments, and 4 (22%) gave mixed comments that included both positive and negative points (with one of those overwhelmingly negative). Overall, the positive and negative comments were generally equal in number. Although these responses did not come from a representative sample of the Population (the Knowledgeables exceeded the 60% return rate needed for a representative survey), they offer potentially valuable information about what these respondents view as Dean Williams's strengths and weaknesses.

A number of the positive comments, as might be expected, were relatively short, simply expressing respondents' support of the dean (e.g., "The Dean is a nationally recognized leader in future directions for libraries" and "Dean Williams is an exceptional director"). Respondents also praised Dean Williams for his "respect for faculty," "collegiality," "fairness," "and "integrity," as well as his support for shared governance and diversity goals. Moreover, many respondents acknowledged that Dean Williams worked under difficult university conditions, such as the lack of proper funding, and that he was a good advocate for the libraries and "remarkably effective with the resources provided."

Many comments addressed items related to the challenges of digital transition of the libraries and the issues listed previously. The dean's ability and "vision to lead the profession" and "position the libraries among AAU peers" generated several different mentions of the same critical incident: rejection (after several months) of the expensive advice of the consulting firm on the

technologically required reorganization of the Acquisitions and Collections Department, and the hiring of technically qualified directors. The cost of this decision included comments of recent faculty losses (including diverse faculty) and future moves underway, as well as talk of a “no confidence” vote in the dean. However, an alternative explanation for this critical incident was mentioned by more than one respondent: Lack of understanding by campus administrators of the operational funding, space, faculty, and resource needs of an academic library, despite Dean Williams’s attempts to educate them. Other explanations for the dean’s decision included that he was too nice a guy, unable to censure problem faculty members, away from the office a lot, valued consensus when tough decisions needed to be made (pointed to by many respondents), and placed greater (and perhaps unnecessary) emphasis on research productivity at the expense of improved library services.

In terms of other concerns, a couple of comments focused on Dean Williams’s unwillingness to discuss the viability of the 40% librarianship, 40% research, and 20% service workload. Other comments focused on the internal appointment of department heads responsible for service delivery without national searches, with achieving tenure considered the qualification rather than competence in the provision of a particular service.

### **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 (see Appendix B). 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 Williams, 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 Williams. The mean and standard deviation is 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 identified with respect to the four categories 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. Again, caution is urged in comparing Dean Williams against the other deans assessed this year because of the different type of unit that Dean Williams administers. 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 both the Population and the Knowledgeables rated the following 10 items (out of the 20 items assessed) as satisfactory: (a) library access of outside resources; (b) relationships with colleagues; (c) teaching responsibilities; (d) education/training by the library; (e) faculty involvement in the library; (f) other benefits, including retirement; (g) support for outside money; (h) department support services; (i) classroom facilities; and (j) university support for research and creative work. The Population also was satisfied with the number of graduate teaching assistants; the Knowledgeables were also satisfied with university efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty, and with faculty governance.

Three items were rated by both the Population and the Knowledgeables as neutral (neither satisfied nor dissatisfied): (a) current health plan, (b) university efforts to retain diverse undergraduates, and (c) space and facilities. The Population also rated 3 other items as neutral—evaluation of teaching, university efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty, and faculty governance—and the Knowledgeables rated 2 other items as neutral—equitable salary distribution and salary compared with peer institutions.

Only 2 items were rated as unsatisfactory (dissatisfaction) by the Population (both of which constituted Improvements Needed): equitable salary distribution and salary with peer institutions. The Knowledgeables did not rate any item as unsatisfactory; however, they did view space and facilities and equitable salary distribution as Improvements Needed.

A comparison of the effect sizes for the Population and the Knowledgeables for Dean Williams revealed that the Population was more satisfied on 11 items (with effects sizes small for 3 items, small to medium for 6 items, medium to large for 1 item, and large for 1 item), less satisfied on 6 items (with effect sizes of small for 3 items and small to medium for 3 items), and similar (0 effect size) on 1 item (2 items could not be compared because of a lack of answers by the Knowledgeables). Comparisons also revealed that Dean Williams's Population was less satisfied than the Populations of the other deans assessed this year for 10 (of the 20) items: (with effect sizes small for 3 items, small to medium for 5 items, medium to large for 1 item, and large for 1 item). Dean Williams's Knowledgeables were more satisfied than the Knowledgeables of the other deans on 8 items (with effect sizes small for 3 items, small to medium for 3 items, and medium to large for 2 items), less satisfied on 7 items (with effect sizes of small for 3 items, small to medium for 3 items, and large for 1 item), and similar (0 effect size) on 3 items. The item that demonstrated the largest negative effect size was technological teaching support, with both sets of respondents for Dean Williams significantly less satisfied than their those respondents for the other deans assessed this year.

Nine respondents (19% of all those surveyed; 20% of those who completed the questionnaire) provided comments on the satisfaction questionnaire. Two respondents indicated that the items on the satisfaction questionnaire were not applicable to their situation, and two others said that had difficulty answering some of the items because of a lack of applicability. Other respondents commented on university concerns and issues. Those who spoke directly about the University Libraries pointed to the issue of having adequate facilities and resources (e.g., equipment and staff), especially compared to other universities with newer or renovated libraries; and the need for an increased travel budget for professional development. The sole comment about Dean Williams said that he has worked “strenuously” to use the funds offered “equitably and intelligently.”

### **Conclusion**

Dean Williams received particularly high ratings (with means of 4.0 or greater) on the administrator appraisal questionnaire from both the Population and the Knowledgeables on his understanding of faculty governance, acting with integrity, and treating faculty fairly. He also received high ratings (with means of 3.8-3.9) from both sets of respondents for making progress toward meeting diversity goals and acting on the concerns of faculty of color. The open-ended comments confirmed many of these and other Strengths and Asserts, with respondents perceiving Dean Williams as a positive, forward-looking dean with a significant national reputation. There were few differences between the ratings of Dean Williams by the Population and the Knowledgeables and between Dean Williams’s Population and the Populations of the other deans assessed this year. Dean William’s Knowledgeables, however, rated him lower than the Knowledgeables for the other deans on 21 of the 27 items on the questionnaire, demonstrating that those who work most closely with him perceive some difficulties.

Respondents also expressed concerns about Dean Williams’s ability to constructively manage conflicts among faculty and among staff, make timely decisions, and act on the concerns of faculty and staff. A significant concern expressed in many respondents’ comments was Dean Williams’s unwillingness or inability to make tough decisions to bring the libraries more fully into the digital age if it meant going against his cabinet of associate directors. Evidence of this concern was based on several months of inaction, followed by his rejection of rank-and-file welcomed advice from his consultants on how to update the organizational structure and technology use. A consequence of not making this decision was low morale and low ratings on constructively managing conflicts among faculty and among staff. Such difficulty also was identified in the assessment of Dean Williams in 2002.

The survey results, thus, showed that Dean Williams has many Strengths and Assets. There are, however, some difficulties that are perceived by respondents to characterize his administration of the University Libraries, and with some of these difficulties increasing from his 2002 review. The Administrator Appraisal Program Committee believes that if Dean Williams can maintain his Strengths and Assets, and seriously confront the difficulties identified, his effectiveness ratings would significantly increase. 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 Williams *Meets Expectations*.

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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.

<sup>2</sup>Questionnaire 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 Williams*

| Item   | Dean Williams            |             |                              |                | Other Deans        |                      | Effects |     |     |
|--|--------------------------|-------------|------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------|-----|-----|
|  | Population (A)<br>M (SD) | Category    | Knowledgeables (B)<br>M (SD) | Category       | Pop. (C)<br>M (SD) | Knowl. (D)<br>M (SD) | B-A     | A-C | B-D |
| 23. Understanding faculty governance                     | 4.5 (.8)                 | Strength    | 4.3 (.8)                     | Strength       | 4.0 (1.3)          | 4.1 (1.3)            | -.4     | .5  | .2  |
| 26. Acting with integrity                                | 4.4 (1.0)                | Strength    | 4.2 (1.0)                    | Strength       | 4.0 (1.3)          | 4.1 (1.2)            | -.2     | .3  | .1  |
| 25. Treating faculty fairly                              | 4.3 (1.0)                | Strength    | 4.2 (.7)                     | Strength       | 3.7 (1.4)          | 4.1 (1.3)            | -.1     | .4  | .1  |
| 12. Act on women faculty concerns                        | 4.0 (.8)                 | Strength    | 3.6 (.8)                     | -              | 3.6 (1.3)          | 3.7 (1.3)            | -.6     | .3  | -.1 |
| 15. Recruiting and retaining<br>underrepresented faculty | 3.9 (.8)                 | Strength    | 3.7 (1.0)                    | Strength       | 3.7 (1.2)          | 3.6 (1.1)            | -.1     | .1  | .1  |
| 14. Making progress diversity goals                      | 3.9 (.9)                 | Strength    | 3.8 (.8)                     | Strength       | 3.8 (1.1)          | 3.8 (1.1)            | -.1     | .1  | .1  |
| 18. Responding to faculty                                | 3.9 (1.1)                | Strength    | 3.3 (1.1)                    | Asset/Issue    | 3.8 (1.3)          | 3.8 (1.4)            | -.6     | .1  | -.4 |
| 4. Supporting high-quality research                      | 3.8 (.9)                 | Strength    | 3.5 (1.1)                    | Strength       | 3.7 (1.2)          | 3.9 (1.3)            | -.3     | .1  | -.4 |
| 10. Act on undergraduate concerns                        | 3.8 (.9)                 | Strength    | 3.7 (.6)                     | Strength       | 3.9 (1.1)          | 3.8 (1.2)            | 0       | -.1 | -.1 |
| 13. Act on faculty of color concerns                     | 3.8 (1.1)                | Strength    | 3.8 (.7)                     | Strength       | 3.7 (1.3)          | 3.7 (1.2)            | 0       | 0   | .1  |
| 27. Earning faculty trust                                | 3.8 (1.2)                | Strength    | 3.5 (1.2)                    | -              | 3.6 (1.3)          | 3.6 (1.4)            | -.3     | .1  | -.1 |
| 11. Act on graduate concerns                             | 3.7 (.9)                 | Asset       | 3.7 (.5)                     | Strength       | 3.8 (1.2)          | 3.9 (1.2)            | .1      | -.1 | -.1 |
| 1. Undergraduate leadership                              | 3.7 (1.1)                | Strength    | 3.5 (1.3)                    | Strength       | 3.9 (1.1)          | 3.9 (1.3)            | -.2     | -.1 | -.3 |
| 24. Taking responsibility for office                     | 3.6 (1.0)                | Strength    | 3.4 (1.2)                    | Strength/Issue | 3.9 (1.1)          | 3.9 (1.2)            | -.3     | -.2 | -.5 |
| 3. Research MA and PhD leadership                        | 3.6 (1.1)                | Asset       | 3.2 (1.1)                    | Asset          | 3.6 (1.3)          | 3.7 (1.3)            | -.4     | 0   | -.4 |
| 5. Rewarding high-quality service                        | 3.6 (1.2)                | Asset       | 3.2 (1.0)                    | Issue          | 3.5 (1.3)          | 3.6 (1.3)            | -.3     | .1  | -.3 |
| 7. Positioning College as leader                         | 3.6 (1.3)                | Strength    | 3.5 (1.1)                    | Asset          | 3.8 (1.2)          | 4.0 (1.3)            | -.1     | -.1 | -.3 |
| 2. Professional MA leadership                            | 3.5 (1.0)                | Asset       | 3.3 (1.1)                    | Strength       | 3.7 (1.2)          | 3.8 (1.3)            | -.2     | -.2 | -.4 |
| 21. Sharing bases of major decisions                     | 3.5 (1.3)                | Asset       | 3.5 (1.1)                    | Asset          | 3.7 (1.3)          | 3.9 (1.4)            | 0       | -.1 | -.3 |
| 6. Vision leading industry/profession                    | 3.5 (1.5)                | Asset/Issue | 3.4 (1.1)                    | -              | 3.8 (1.3)          | 3.9 (1.3)            | -.1     | -.2 | -.4 |
| 22. Fostering equitable salary system                    | 3.4 (1.1)                | Asset/Issue | 3.5 (1.4)                    | Strength       | 3.4 (1.3)          | 3.7 (1.3)            | .1      | 0   | -.2 |
| 19. Involve faculty decision making                      | 3.4 (1.3)                | Asset/Issue | 3.5 (1.0)                    | -              | 3.5 (1.4)          | 3.8 (1.4)            | 0       | 0   | -.2 |

---

| Item                           | Dean Williams  |          |                    |          | Other Deans |            | Effects |     |      |
|--------------------------------|----------------|----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|------------|---------|-----|------|
|                                | Population (A) |          | Knowledgeables (B) |          | Pop. (C)    | Knowl. (D) | B-A     | A-C | B-D  |
|                                | M (SD)         | Category | M (SD)             | Category | M (SD)      | M (SD)     |         |     |      |
| 9. Act on staff concerns       | 3.1 (1.2)      | Issue    | 2.8 (1.1)          | Improve  | 3.6 (1.3)   | 3.8 (1.2)  | -.2     | -.4 | -.8  |
| 8. Act on faculty concerns     | 3.1 (1.3)      | Issue    | 2.5 (1.3)          | Improve  | 3.6 (1.3)   | 3.8 (1.2)  | -.4     | -.3 | -1.0 |
| 20. Making timely decisions    | 3.1 (1.3)      | Issue    | 2.8 (1.1)          | Issue    | 3.8 (1.2)   | 3.8 (1.3)  | -.2     | -.6 | -.8  |
| 17. Managing staff conflicts   | 2.8 (1.1)      | Issue    | 2.6 (1.3)          | Improve  | 3.6 (1.2)   | 3.3 (1.2)  | -.2     | -.7 | -.5  |
| 16. Managing faculty conflicts | 2.8 (1.2)      | Improve  | 2.6 (1.3)          | Improve  | 3.3 (1.4)   | 3.4 (1.3)  | -.2     | -.3 | -.7  |

---

Table 2

*Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire Results by Category for Dean Williams*

---

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

- Understanding faculty governance ((Population without Knowledgeables [P] and Knowledgeables [K])
- Acting with integrity (P & K)
- Treating faculty fairly (P & K)
- Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty (P)
- Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty (P & K)
- Making progress toward diversity goals (P & K)
- Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries (P)
- Actively supporting high-quality faculty research (e.g., mentoring and funding opportunities) (P & K)
- Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P & K)
- Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color (P & K)
- Earning the trust of the faculty (P)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality undergraduate teaching (P & K)
- Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff (P)
- Positioning the School/College as a leader among AAU peers, both nationally and internationally (P)
- Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (K)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program (K)
- Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system (K)

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

- Constructively acting on graduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the research-oriented master's and doctoral programs (P & K)
- Rewarding high-quality service (P)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality teaching in the professional master's program (P)
- Sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes (P & K)
- Positioning the School/College as a leader among AAU peers, both nationally and internationally (K)

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

Constructively acting on staff concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P)  
 Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (P)  
 Constructively managing conflicts among staff (P)  
 Rewarding high-quality service (K)

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

Constructively managing conflicts among faculty (P & K)  
 Constructively acting on staff concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (K)  
 Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions) (K)  
 Constructively managing conflicts among staff (K)

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

A. Strengths/Issues

Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff (K)

B. Assets/Issues

Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it or keeping up with it (P)  
 Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system (P)  
 Appropriately involving faculty in decision making (P)  
 Responding respectfully and in a timely manner to all faculty inquiries (K)

**No Category** (Items that did reflect any category)

Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty (K)  
 Earning the trust of the faculty (K)  
 Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it or keeping up with it (K)  
 Appropriately involving faculty in decision making (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 Williams*

| Item   | Dean Williams  |               |                    |               | 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)      |           |           |     |     |      |
| 11. Library access outside resources                         | 4.3 (.8)       | S             | Strength           | 4.3 (.5)      | S           | Strength    | 4.1 (.8)  | 3.8 (.8)  | .1  | .2  | .6   |
| 8. Relationship with colleagues                              | 4.1 (.9)       | S             | Strength           | 4.1 (1.2)     | S           | Strength    | 4.1 (1.0) | 4.0 (.9)  | 0   | 0   | 0    |
| 1. Teaching responsibilities                                 | 4.0 (.8)       | S             | Strength           | 4.2 (.8)      | S           | Strength    | 4.1 (1.0) | 4.3 (.9)  | .2  | -.1 | -.1  |
| 12. Education/training by library                            | 4.0 (1.0)      | S             | Strength           | 3.6 (1.1)     | S           | Asset       | 4.0 (.8)  | 3.8 (.8)  | -.4 | 0   | -.2  |
| 10. Faculty involvement in library                           | 3.8 (1.1)      | S             | Strength           | 3.6 (1.2)     | S           | Asset/Issue | 3.8 (.8)  | 3.5 (.8)  | -.2 | 0   | .1   |
| 4. No. graduate teaching assistants                          | 3.7 (1.0)      | S             | Strength           | No answers    |             |             | 3.6 (1.1) | 3.7 (1.1) |     | .1  |      |
| 16. Other benefits, inc. retirement                          | 3.6 (.9)       | S             | Strength           | 3.9 (.8)      | S           | Strength    | 3.5 (.9)  | 3.4 (1.1) | .4  | .1  | .5   |
| 6. Support for outside money                                 | 3.6 (.9)       | S             | Asset              | 3.9 (.6)      | S           | Strength    | 3.3 (1.1) | 3.6 (1.1) | .4  | .3  | .3   |
| 5. Departmental support services                             | 3.4 (1.0)      | S             | Asset              | 3.7 (.5)      | S           | Strength    | 3.8 (1.1) | 4.0 (.9)  | .4  | -.4 | -.4  |
| 2. Classroom facilities                                      | 3.4 (1.0)      | S             | -                  | 3.7 (.5)      | S           | Strength    | 3.8 (1.2) | 3.7 (1.3) | .3  | -.4 | 0    |
| 3. Technological teaching support                            | 3.4 (1.1)      | S             | -                  | 2.9 (.8)      | N           | Issue       | 4.1 (.9)  | 4.0 (.9)  | -.5 | -.8 | -1.2 |
| 9. University support for research and creative work         | 3.3 (1.0)      | S             | -                  | 3.5 (1.3)     | S           | Asset/Issue | 3.6 (1.1) | 3.7 (1.1) | .2  | -.3 | -.1  |
| 20. Evaluation of teaching                                   | 3.2 (.6)       | N             | -                  | No answers    |             |             | 3.2 (1.1) | 3.2 (1.1) |     | 0   |      |
| 18. University efforts to recruit and retain diverse faculty | 3.1 (1.0)      | N             | Issue              | 3.4 (.8)      | S           | Asset       | 3.3 (1.0) | 3.2 (1.0) | .3  | -.2 | .2   |
| 15. Current health plan                                      | 3.1 (1.1)      | N             | Issue              | 3.0 (1.4)     | N           | Asset/Impr  | 2.9 (1.2) | 2.6 (1.3) | -.1 | .2  | .3   |
| 17. Faculty governance                                       | 3.0 (.8)       | N             | -                  | 3.7 (.6)      | S           | Strength    | 3.2 (1.0) | 3.3 (1.0) | .9  | -.2 | .4   |
| 19. University efforts to retain diverse undergraduates      | 3.0 (1.0)      | N             | Issue              | 2.8 (.5)      | N           | Issue       | 3.2 (1.0) | 3.1 (1.0) | -.3 | -.2 | -.3  |
| 7. Space and facilities                                      | 2.9 (1.1)      | N             | Improve            | 2.8 (1.3)     | N           | Improve     | 3.7 (1.3) | 3.4 (1.4) | -.1 | -.6 | -.4  |
| 14. Equitable salary distribution                            | 2.5 (1.1)      | D             | Improve            | 2.9 (1.1)     | N           | Improve     | 2.9 (1.2) | 2.9 (1.3) | .4  | -.3 | 0    |
| 13. Salary with peer institutions                            | 2.4 (.9)       | D             | Improve            | 3.0 (1.0)     | N           | Issue       | 2.7 (1.2) | 2.8 (1.3) | .6  | -.3 | .1   |

## **Appendix A: Items on Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire for Dean Williams**

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