

ADMINISTRATOR APPRAISAL COMMITTEE POLICIES

(Approved by the Boulder Faculty Assembly on September 3, 2009)

Purpose

- These policies are intended to guide the process by which the Administrator Appraisal Program (AAP) Committee, under the jurisdiction of the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA), conducts evaluations of CU-Boulder campus administrators.

Timeline

- Evaluations shall be conducted in the fall of each year, in time for the AAP Committee's summary to become part of the administrator's third- or fifth-year review process. The AAP Committee reports shall be submitted to the BFA Executive Committee by March 1. The BFA Executive Committee should schedule a meeting to receive the reports in the month of March. The Provost should meet with the deans being reviewed in the first 2 weeks of April. The reports shall be posted on the BFA web site by April 15, with an e-mail sent to all faculty members in the university letting them know that the reports have been posted and providing them with the appropriate web link.
- The AAP Committee will review these policies each year in time for the next evaluation cycle, to determine whether changes to them are necessary.

Positions evaluated

- Campus-wide: Chancellor; Provost, and Vice Chancellor for Research and Dean of the Graduate School
- System-wide: President
- Deans of schools, colleges, and libraries having a faculty constituency. Evaluated only by raters in the unit, although responses are also solicited from other eligible faculty raters familiar with that dean's work.
- The College of Architecture and Planning (A&P) is part of the University of Colorado Denver, but A&P undergraduate students are Boulder campus students, some A&P faculty are housed on the Boulder campus, and the A&P dean is part of the UCB Council of Deans. Presently, the A&P Dean is not evaluated via the BFA Administrator Appraisal Program.

Eligible raters

- All individuals (except administrators who are being evaluated) with active faculty appointments on the Boulder Campus in any eligible job title are eligible raters. Those on paid leave (e.g., sabbatical) are also eligible raters.

Eligible job titles

- Regular, tenured and tenure-track, faculty and research faculty
 - Distinguished Professor
 - Professor
 - Associate Professor
 - Assistant Professor
 - Senior Instructor
 - Instructor
 - Research Professor

- Research Associate Professor
- Research Assistant Professor
- Research Associate and Senior Research Associate, other than post-doctoral fellows
- Other eligible job titles
 - Museum Curator
 - Museum Associate Curator
 - Faculty Chair
 - Faculty Director
 - Institute Director

Ineligible job titles

- Adjoint, Adjunct, Attendant, Clinical, In-residence and Visiting faculty
- Post-doctoral fellows
- Professional Research Assistant and Senior Professional Research Assistant
- Lecturer
- Museum Associate

Notes

- The committee may make exceptions to these rules on a case-by-case basis in extraordinary circumstances.
- Final authority for determining eligibility of raters lies with the AAP committee.

Materials Provided to Raters

- A letter of invitation and instructions
- A Statement of Achievements and Activities for each administrator being evaluated
- A Satisfaction Survey focused on campus-wide issues and policies
- An Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire focused on the performance of the administrator being evaluated

Appraisal Questionnaire Construction

- Prior to each evaluation cycle, the AAP Committee reviews the Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire and decides whether to modify, delete, or add items for all administrators being evaluated.
- Administrators being evaluated are offered the opportunity to suggest additional items for the Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire. However, the AAP Committee is the final arbiter of what items are included.
- Raters are given the opportunity to evaluate each administrator on the set of common items, as well as on any items provided by the administrator that are included by the AAP Committee.

Information Collected from Raters

- Responses to items on the Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire. These items are rated using a 5-point Likert-type effectiveness scale (5 = *Very Effective*, 4 = *Effective*, 3 = *Neither Effective nor Ineffective*; 2 = *Ineffective*, 1 = *Very Ineffective*), with a response category of "Don't know/not applicable" also included.
- Responses to items on the BFA Satisfaction Questionnaire. These items are rated using a 5-point Likert-type satisfaction scale (5 = *Very Satisfied*, 4 = *Satisfied*, 3 = *Neither*

Satisfied nor Dissatisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, 1 = Very Dissatisfied), with a response category of "Don't know/not applicable" also included.

- Opportunity is provided on both the Administrator Appraisal Questionnaire and on the BFA Satisfaction Questionnaire for raters to submit comments. Instructions to raters clearly state that all comments will be given verbatim (with no editing, including no removal of self-identifiers) to the members of the AAP Committee but will not be seen by anyone else. Raters shall be provided a reasonable means to elect whether their comments shall be reported verbatim.
- Information that is necessary for monitoring response rates (e.g., e-mail address) and that would permit identification of individuals will be kept strictly confidential and disassociated from survey responses prior to data analysis or storage.

Data Collection Methods

- E-mail invitations, with background information on the Administrator Appraisal Program, instructions for participation, and a link to the web-based questionnaires, are sent by the Office of Planning, Budget, and Analysis (PBA) to all raters on the same day. These invitations typically are sent in the first half of October.
- Rater's responses to the items on both questionnaires are collected online by PBA.
- A deadline for responding is provided to raters, which is typically the end of November.
- Approximately 7-10 days after the invitations are mailed, PBA sends a reminder e-mail to all raters who have not yet responded. This e-mail is followed by another reminder, approximately 7-10 days later. Additional reminders may be sent (by e-mail or other means, such as telephone) by PBA or by the AAP Committee Chair and/or members.
- Data collection ends when the response deadline has passed and the agreed-on *60% response rate criterion* (<http://www.colorado.edu/FacultyGovernance/MOTRES/BFAM11-1101.html>) has been satisfied for each administrator. If the deadline has passed and the response rate criterion has not been met, the AAP Committee will continue follow-up efforts until the criterion is met or until the second week of January, whichever occurs first.
-

Data Processing

- Quantitative and qualitative data are handled only by PBA staff members who can be relied on to maintain confidentiality.
- Quantitative ratings will be processed by PBA using standard statistical procedures, and summary statistics will be given to the chair of the AAP Committee.
- Raters' comments to the extended-response items are provided verbatim and anonymously (other than self-identifiers) to the chair of the AAP Committee.

AAP Committee Report

- The AAP Committee will write a separate report on each administrator being evaluated that year.
- In addition to whatever other information is included in the report, the report will conclude with an evaluation made by the AAP Committee in terms of whether the administrator being reviewed "Exceeds Expectations," "Meets Expectations," or "Needs Improvement."
- The AAP Committee reports are presented to the BFA Executive Committee, with the Provost invited to those meetings.
- The AAP Committee Chair and/or Vice-Chair may subsequently meet with the Provost to discuss the reports in more detail.
- The Provost provides the administrators being reviewed with the AAP Committee written report about them.

- The BFA posts the AAP Committee reports on its web site.

The role of the Office of Planning, Budget and Analysis

- Serve as a consultant to the AAP Committee, advising the Committee on logistical, statistical, and psychometric issues, and on policy issues
- Implement AAP Committee decisions (including any revision of the questionnaires)
- Collect data from raters
- Analyze the data acquired from raters and provide summary statistics of ratings as well as verbatim raters' comments to the AAP Committee Chair
- Review AAP Committee reports and provide input to the Committee Chair
- Attend the BFA Executive Committee where the Committee reports are presented, if requested to do so by the AAP Committee Chair
- Maintain the AAP budget
- Maintain confidentiality of all ratings and comments provided by raters