Appraisal of Provost Russell Moore

Conducted by the BFA Administrator Appraisal Committee

Spring 2023

Table of Contents

Survey Background, Development, and Administration 4
Response Rates 5
Respondents Familiarity with Russell Moore's Work as Provost 5
Assessment of Provost Moore 6
Item Analysis by Competency Areas 7
Color Key for Summary Tables to Indicate Strengths and Weaknesses 7
1. Visionary Leadership 8
2. Ethics and Integrity 8
3. Communication 9
4. Building Collegiality 10
5. Leading Through Conflict and Managing Conflict 10
6. Values and Cultivates an Environment of Diversity and Inclusion 11
7. Creative and Strategic Problem Solving 12
8. Developing Self and Others 13
9. Planning, Managing, and Organizing 13
Summary of Key Messages from Open Comments 14
Summary of Key Messages from Interviews with Stakeholders 15
Major Take Away Messages 16
Appendix A: Summary of Responses by College 18
Response Rates 18
Respondents Familiarity with Russell Moore's Work as Provost 18
Overall Assessment of Provost Moore 19
Item Analysis by Competency Areas 19
Color Key for Summary Tables to Indicate Strengths and Weaknesses 19
1. Visionary Leadership 21
2. Ethics and Integrity 21
3. Communication 22
4. Building Collegiality 22
5. Leading Through Conflict--Managing Conflict 23
6. Values and Cultivates an Environment of Diversity and Inclusion 23
7. Creative and Strategic Problem Solving 24
8. Developing Self and Others 24

9. Planning, Managing, and Organizing 25
Appendix B: Comments by Faculty 26

Survey Background, Development, and Administration

In spring 2023, the CU Boulder Administrator Appraisal Committee (AAPC) was tasked with assessing Russell Moore's performance as Provost. The University of Colorado Regents require a five-year comprehensive evaluation for all campus officers—chancellors, vice chancellors, and provosts (see https://www.colorado.edu/policies/evaluations-officers). Provost Moore's evaluation includes an assessment by the AAPC to be delivered to Chancellor DiStefano as part of a range of information that will inform the decision about the Provost's reappointment. The AAPC included the following members: Tim Kuhn from CMCI, Deborah Cantrell from the Law School, Susan Jurow from the School of Education, and Fernando Rosario-Ortiz from the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences.

AAPC Chair Fernando Rosario-Ortiz oversaw the development of a survey to assess the Provost's performance based on the University's Academic Leaders Institute Competency Model. The survey assesses nine leadership competencies: visionary leadership, ethics and integrity, communication, building collegiality, leading through conflict-managing conflict, values and cultivates an environment of diversity and inclusion, creative and strategic problem solving, developing self and others, and planning, managing, and organizing. The additional two competencies (resource and financial management, and external relations and fund raising) were assessed via targeted interviews with 6 stakeholders chosen by the AAPC because of their knowledgeability of the areas being assessed.

Most questions were asked on a 5-poin,t disagree-agree scale. Higher scores indicate a more positive evaluation (1=strongly disagree…5=strongly agree). There were 43 such items in the survey. One overarching question asked respondents for their "overall assessment of the Provost's performance." This question used a 5-point scale with a higher score indicating a more positive evaluation (1=very poor … 5=very good).

The survey also included one open-ended item: "What do you see as the 2-3 most important university issues that the Provost needs to address?" Respondents had an option to share their verbatim comments with the Provost or to have them available only to the committee. The comments that were meant to be shared with the Provost are included in Appendix B and the major themes from all the submitted comments are presented in this report. No identifying information was attached to any of the comments seen by the committee or by the Provost.

The survey was developed in collaboration with the Assessment, Insights, and Measurement (AIM) unit of the CU Boulder Office of Data Analytics (ODA). The AIM survey team sent invitations to 149 faculty officers and 367 general faculty on April 3, 2023:

- Faculty officers include members of the University Executive Leadership Team (UELT), institute directors, faculty directors, members of the Boulder Faulty Assembly Executive committee, and department chairs.
- General faculty comprise a 20% representative sample of faculty in the following categories –
  - Tenured and tenure track (T/TT) Full Professors (incl. Professor, Distinguished Professor, Professor Adjoint, Research Professor)
  - T/TT Associate Professors (incl. Associate Professor, Associate Professor Adjoint, Associate Professor Research)
  - T/TT Assistant. Professors (incl. Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor Adjoint, Assistant Professor Research)
  - T/TT Other (Artist/Scholar in Residence)
  - Teaching and Clinical Faculty (faculty on multi-year contracts)

The survey closed on April 17, 2023. Four reminder emails were sent during the period when the survey was available.

AIM staff administered the online survey, managed the dataset, analyzed the numerical data, and summarized the findings. Summary data were sent to the AAPC for use in this report. Members of the Committee reviewed and summarized the written comments.

The following pages include the results from the survey, organized by responses of two main faculty groups, general faculty and faculty officers. Appendix A includes the responses for the survey split between members of the College of Arts & Sciences (A&S) and the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences (CEAS). Appendix B contains all comments that were meant to be shared directly with the Provost.

Response Rates

The overall survey response rate was 55% (Table 1). The response rate was higher among faculty officers (65%) than among general faculty (51%).

Table 1: Response Rates by Population

Population	# Invited	# Responded	Response Rate (%)
General Faculty	367	187	**51%**
Faculty Officers	149	97	**65%**
TOTAL	516	284	**55%**

Respondents Familiarity with Russell Moore's Work as Provost

Table 2 below shows the responses to the initial survey question, which assessed how familiar the respondents are with "Russell Moore's work as Provost of the University of Colorado Boulder."

Table 2: Familiarity with Provost Moore's Work by Population

Please indicate how familiar you are with Russell Moore's work as Provost of the University of Colorado Boulder.				
	General Faculty		**Faculty Officers**	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
Not at all familiar	57	30%	8	8%
Somewhat familiar	97	52%	42	43%
Very familiar	33	18%	47	48%
Grand Total	**187**		**97**	

Survey respondents who indicated at the beginning of the survey that they were "Not at all familiar" with "Russell Moore's work as Provost of the University of Colorado Boulder" were directed to the end of the survey and answered no further questions.

As would be expected, a lower proportion of faculty officers (8%), compared with members of the general faculty (30%), reported that they were "not at all familiar" with the Provost's work. Of the 219 survey respondents who continued with the survey and provided information about their perceptions of the Provost's performance, 130 are general faculty members and 89 are faculty officers.

Assessment of Provost Moore

A majority of faculty officers (58%) and less than half of general faculty members (43%) rated the Provost's overall performance as "good" or "very good" (Table 3). About 30% of officers and general faculty (27% and 32%, respectively) rated the Provost's performance as "poor" or "very poor."

Table 3: Overall Assessment of the Provost

What is your overall assessment of the provost's performance?						
	General Faculty		Faculty Officers		Total	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
Very poor	13	11%	6	7%	19	9%
Poor	26	21%	18	20%	44	21%
Neutral	31	25%	13	15%	44	21%
Good	25	20%	24	27%	49	23%
Very good	28	23%	27	31%	55	26%

The Committee additionally investigated the question of how faculty in the two main colleges, College of Arts & Sciences and the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences, viewed the performance of the Provost. Table A1 in Appendix A shows the results of the survey questions by College. Overall, the faculty at the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences had a stronger positive impression of the performance of the Provost compared to faculty from the College of Arts & Sciences. This was the case across most of the surveyed items. Note that data comparing other colleges were not available due to the low number of respondents surveyed.

The AAPC also considered the question of the overall assessment of the Provost by faculty role (Table 4). For the Tenure Track faculty overall, 34% had a low assessment of the Provost, compared to 45% with a high assessment. For the Teaching faculty, 27% had a low assessment compared to 33% with a high assessment. Looking within the three ranks of the TT faculty, we note a high overall assessment for assistant and full professors; full professors had the highest level of low assessment at 41%.

Table 4: Overall Assessment of the Provost by Faculty Role

Faculty Rank		Very poor		Poor		Neutral		Good		Very good	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
TTT	(N = 92)	8	9%	23	25%	19	21%	18	20%	24	26%
Asst Prof	(N = 12)	1	8%	0	0%	3	25%	5	42%	3	25%
Assoc Prof	(N = 36)	4	11%	6	22%	11	31%	6	17%	7	19%
Prof	(N = 44)	3	7%	15	34%	5	11%	7	16%	14	32%
Instructor	(N = 26)	4	15%	3	12%	11	42%	4	15%	4	18%

Item Analysis by Competency Areas

For the survey items that used a five-point rating scale, higher scores indicate a more positive evaluation (1=strongly disagree…5=strongly agree). The summary tables provided in the item analysis sections below use the following color key to categorize items as strengths or weaknesses of the Provost based on the percentage of lower ratings (1=strongly disagree and 2=disagree) and higher ratings (4=agree and 5=strongly agree) that were received.

Color Key for Summary Tables to Indicate Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths to build on: items rated "4=agree" or "5=strongly agree" by a substantial majority of the survey respondents (i.e., % 5-6's > 60%)
Assets to protect: items where half to 60% of the respondents responded "4=agree" or "5=strongly agree" (i.e., % 5-6's: 50%-60%)
Issues to be mindful of: Items rated "1=strongly disagree" or "2=disagree" by a sizeable minority of respondents (i.e., % 1-2's: 25-40%)
Areas that need improvement: Items rated "1=strongly disagree" or "2=disagree" by a large portion of respondents (i.e., % 1-2's > 40%)
Bimodal: Items that meet the criteria for a strength to build on or an asset to protect and also meet the criteria for an issue to be mindful of or an area for improvement (i.e., % 4-5's > 50% and % 1-2's > 25%)
No consensus: Items that do not meet any of the above criteria (i.e., % 4-5's < 50% and % 1-2's < 25%)

Both the percentages and averages shown in the summary tables below are based on non-missing values and exclude responses of "don't know/not applicable" as well as instances where respondents skipped an item; that is, reported percentages and averages are based only on respondents who answered the survey item using a numerical rating. Note that for some survey items the numbers of responses are noticeably lower. In almost all such instances, the "missing" respondents are those who answered, "don't know/not applicable."

In the sections below, we present results of the item analysis for each of the nine competencies:

1. Visionary leadership
2. Ethics and integrity
3. Communication
4. Building collegiality
5. Leading through conflict - Managing conflict
6. Values and cultivates an environment of diversity and inclusion
7. Creative and strategic problem solving
8. Developing self and others
9. Planning, managing, and organizing

1. Visionary Leadership

The responses to the first six of the seven survey items assessing "visionary leadership" show a distinct bimodal pattern, with just over half of faculty officers and general faculty members giving high ratings on the items and about a quarter of both groups giving low ratings. On the final item assessing this competency—*The Provost inspires people to commit to their roles on campus*— 34% of faculty officers and 39% of general faculty disagreed or strongly disagreed that this is the case.

Table 5: Visionary Leadership

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Articulates a compelling shared vision for the campus					
General Faculty	120	27%	23%	50%	**3.3**
Faculty Officers	84	26%	19%	55%	**3.5**
Is perceptive about the needs of different stakeholders (e.g., students, faculty, administration, academic leaders)					
General Faculty	121	31%	15%	54%	**3.3**
Faculty Officers	86	23%	17%	59%	**3.6**
Articulates a vision for the future of the University					
General Faculty	120	25%	23%	52%	**3.3**
Faculty Officers	85	29%	19%	52%	**3.3**
Leads initiatives on campus that will improve sense of community and belonging					
General Faculty	121	31%	18%	51%	**3.3**
Faculty Officers	85	24%	22%	54%	**3.4**
Is strategic (i.e., able to establish a vision, mission, and goals)					
General Faculty	116	25%	22%	53%	**3.4**
Faculty Officers	85	26%	20%	54%	**3.4**
Is tactical (i.e., able to identify tactics, measurements, and action plans, to achieve a vision)					
General Faculty	107	22%	27%	50%	**3.4**
Faculty Officers	83	24%	23%	53%	**3.4**
Inspires people to commit to their roles on campus					
General Faculty	114	39%	25%	36%	**2.9**
Faculty Officers	86	34%	17%	49%	**3.2**

2. Ethics and Integrity

The data in Table 6 indicate mixed impressions on indicators of the Provost's ethics and integrity:

- Large percentages members of both respondent populations agree or strongly agree that the Provost "is a role model of ethical behavior" (70% of faculty officers and 55% of general faculty members).
- Although majorities of the respective populations (59% and 52%) agree or strongly agree that the Provost "fosters trust through the consistent demonstration of integrity," noteworthy proportions disagree or strongly disagree that this is the case (21% of faculty officers and 55% of general faculty members).
- Finally, only about a third of the two groups agree or strongly agree that the Provost "confronts others when shared values are threatened;" and 29% of faculty officers and 19% of general faculty disagree or strongly disagree with that statement.

Table 6: Ethics and Integrity

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Is a role model of ethical behavior					
General Faculty	96	14%	31%	55%	**3.6**
Faculty Officers	82	7%	23%	70%	**4.0**
Fosters trust through the consistent demonstration of integrity					
General Faculty	105	25%	23%	52%	**3.4**
Faculty Officers	80	21%	20%	59%	**3.7**
Confronts others when shared values are threatened					
General Faculty	69	19%	46%	35%	**3.2**
Faculty Officers	65	29%	34%	37%	**3.2**

3. Communication

Table 7 below shows findings from eight items that assessed Provost Moore's communication skills. Key findings on this topic are:

- The positive ratings from 62%-83% of faculty officers and members of the general faculty indicate that the following are strengths that the provost can build on:
  - Speaks clearly and convincingly
  - Writes clearly and convincingly
  - Models civility and mutual respect in his communication with others
  - Engages in communication practices essential to the work of the campus
- In addition, high proportions of faculty officers agree or strongly agree that the Provost "listens perceptively to others" (64%) and "responds to others in a way that reflects an understanding of their perspective" (63%).
- About a quarter of faculty officers (24%) and general faculty members (27%) disagree or strongly disagree that the Provost "knows when and how to hold crucial conversations.
- About a third of faculty officers (30%) and general faculty members (33%) disagree or strongly disagree that the Provost "Demonstrates alignment between words and deeds (communication and actions)."

Table 7: Communication

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Listens perceptively to others					
General Faculty	106	26%	19%	55%	**3.4**
Faculty Officers	81	17%	19%	64%	**3.7**
Responds to others in a way that reflects an understanding of their perspective					
General Faculty	109	28%	26%	46%	**3.3**
Faculty Officers	81	21%	16%	63%	**3.7**
Knows when and how to hold crucial conversations					
General Faculty	97	27%	29%	44%	**3.2**
Faculty Officers	67	24%	24%	52%	**3.5**
Speaks clearly and convincingly					
General Faculty	115	15%	21%	64%	**3.7**
Faculty Officers	82	16%	17%	67%	**3.8**
Writes clearly and convincingly					
General Faculty	115	12%	18%	70%	**3.8**
Faculty Officers	77	10%	18%	71%	**3.9**
Engages in communication practices essential to the work of the campus					

General Faculty	116	18%	20%	62%	**3.6**
Faculty Officers	80	18%	14%	69%	**3.8**
Models civility and mutual respect in his communication with others					
General Faculty	119	10%	20%	70%	**3.8**
Faculty Officers	83	4%	13%	83%	**4.3**
Demonstrates alignment between words and deeds (communication and actions)					
General Faculty	110	33%	24%	44%	**3.2**
Faculty Officers	79	30%	18%	52%	**3.4**

4. Building Collegiality

Table 8 presents findings on three indicators of building collegiality. The survey data indicate that this is the competency area where faculty perceive the Provost most needs to improve:

- 37% of general faculty and 33% of faculty officers disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Provost "creates a sense of belonging and camaraderie."
- 40% of general faculty and 35% of faculty officers disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Provost "fosters a culture of trust."
- 50% of general faculty and 45% of faculty officers disagreed or strongly disagreed that the Provost "is transparent with all campus constituencies."

Table 8: Building Collegiality

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Creates a sense of belonging and camaraderie					
General Faculty	115	37%	29%	35%	**3.0**
Faculty Officers	83	33%	18%	49%	**3.3**
Fosters a culture of trust					
General Faculty	116	40%	28%	33%	**2.9**
Faculty Officers	81	35%	19%	47%	**3.2**
Is transparent with all campus constituencies					
General Faculty	104	50%	21%	29%	**2.7**
Faculty Officers	78	45%	15%	40%	**3.0**

5. Leading Through Conflict and Managing Conflict

The findings shown in Table 9, with respect to the Provost's competency in managing conflict, show that faculty officers rate the Provost more positively than do general faculty members:

- On four of the five indicators of this competency, over a quarter of general faculty (27%-29%) disagree or strongly disagree that the Provost:
  - Views conflict as an opportunity for growth for all parties
  - Anticipates conflicts between stakeholders
  - Takes multiple stakeholders' perspectives into account during conflicts
  - Identifies and handles disruptive behavior while maintaining the dignity of the people involved

This compares with 12%-19% of faculty officers who disagree or strongly disagree with those statements.

- More than half of faculty officers (54%-63%) agree or strongly agree that the Provost:
  - Anticipates conflicts between stakeholders
  - Takes multiple stakeholders' perspectives into account during conflicts
  - Identifies and handles disruptive behavior while maintaining the dignity of the people involved

- Nearly 60% of survey respondents (59% of faculty officers, 57% of general faculty) agree or strongly agree that the provost "Is willing to make decisions on contentious issues after gathering feedback."

Table 9: Managing Conflict

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Views conflict as an opportunity for growth for all parties					
General Faculty	68	28%	40%	32%	**3.0**
Faculty Officers	62	16%	40%	44%	**3.4**
Anticipates conflicts between stakeholders					
General Faculty	75	27%	31%	43%	**3.2**
Faculty Officers	63	19%	27%	54%	**3.5**
Takes multiple stakeholders' perspectives into account during conflicts					
General Faculty	94	29%	29%	43%	**3.2**
Faculty Officers	70	17%	20%	63%	**3.7**
Is willing to make decisions on contentious issues after gathering feedback					
General Faculty	98	22%	20%	57%	**3.5**
Faculty Officers	70	21%	20%	59%	**3.6**
Identifies and handles disruptive behavior while maintaining the dignity of the people involved					
General Faculty	63	27%	40%	33%	**3.1**
Faculty Officers	57	12%	30%	58%	**3.7**

6. Values and Cultivates an Environment of Diversity and Inclusion

As shown in Table 10, faculty officers and members of the general faculty diverge somewhat in their assessment of the extent to which the Provost values and cultivates an environment of diversity and inclusion at CU Boulder.

The groups are in accord in their generally positive assessment of whether the Provost "creates and maintains an environment where diverse opinions are considered" and "creates an infrastructure to promote the recruitment and retention of a diverse community," with 68% and 59% of officers and 53% and 59% of general faculty indicating that they agree or strongly agree with the respective statements.

The groups disagree, however, in their assessment of whether the Provost "addresses deficiencies when members of the team act in ways that do not create a welcoming, diverse & inclusive environment." Half of faculty officers agree or strongly agree that this is the case. Only 39% of general faculty agree or strongly agree that this is the case.

About 20% to 25% of each group disagrees or strongly disagrees that the Provost fulfills any of these three indicators of competence in the area of diversity and inclusion.

Table 10: Diversity and Inclusion

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Creates and maintains an environment where diverse opinions are considered					
General Faculty	113	21%	24%	55%	**3.5**
Faculty Officers	81	19%	14%	68%	**3.7**
Creates an infrastructure to promote the recruitment and retention of a diverse community					
General Faculty	116	27%	21%	53%	**3.3**
Faculty Officers	80	25%	16%	59%	**3.5**

Addresses deficiencies when members of the team act in ways that do not create a welcoming, diverse & inclusive environment					
General Faculty	66	26%	35%	39%	**3.2**
Faculty Officers	54	17%	33%	50%	**3.4**

7. Creative and Strategic Problem Solving

Faculty officers and members of the general faculty diverge in their perception of the Provost's performance, with officers generally rating the provost more favorably than do general faculty members. With respect to "Creative and Strategic Problem Solving":

- The Provost "models open-mindedness and flexibility when making decisions"—31% of general faculty disagree or strongly disagree; 62% of faculty officers agree or strongly agree.
- The Provost "intentionally utilizes collaboration as a method of problem solving"—32% of general faculty disagree or strongly disagree; 60% of faculty officers agree or strongly agree.
- The Provost "fosters a problem-solving process that creates innovative solutions"—35% of general faculty disagree or strongly disagree; 54% of faculty officers agree or strongly agree.

The above three characteristics may be seen as reflecting the application of interpersonal skills and human management in problem solving and decision-making processes.

High proportions of both groups agree or strongly agree that the Provost:

- "considers and relies on facts and data for problem solving and making decisions"—68% of officers, 60% of general faculty
- "understands the impact of decisions on the operation of the university" —71% of officers, 57% of general faculty

The above two characteristics may be understood as reflecting strategic and operational skills.

Table 11: Creative and Strategic Problem Solving

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Considers and relies on facts and data for problem solving and making decisions					
General Faculty	99	19%	21%	60%	**3.6**
Faculty Officers	73	10%	22%	68%	**3.8**
Models open-mindedness and flexibility when making decisions					
General Faculty	99	31%	28%	40%	**3.1**
Faculty Officers	79	25%	13%	62%	**3.6**
Intentionally utilizes collaboration as a method of problem solving					
General Faculty	90	32%	26%	42%	**3.1**
Faculty Officers	72	22%	18%	60%	**3.6**
Fosters a problem-solving process that creates innovative solutions					
General Faculty	93	35%	28%	37%	**3.1**
Faculty Officers	74	22%	24%	54%	**3.5**
Understands the impact of decisions on the operation of the university					
General Faculty	108	24%	19%	57%	**3.4**
Faculty Officers	77	17%	12%	71%	**3.8**

8. Developing Self and Others

Of the five indicators of the competency "Developing Self and Others," the two faculty groups are in accord in their positive ratings of the Provost on two of them:

- 59% of general faculty and 62% of faculty officers agree or strongly agree that the Provost "is intentional in creating a learning environment for self and others."
- 54% of general faculty and 62% of faculty officers agree or strongly agree that the Provost "demonstrates self-awareness across situations."

On the other three indicators, opinions again diverge across the two faculty populations:

- With respect to whether the Provost "provides appropriate support for the professional development of academic leaders," 68% of officers agree or strongly agree, as do 54% of general faculty. In addition, however, 26% of general faculty disagree or strongly disagree with that statement.
- With respect to whether the provost "is empathetic," 61% of officers agree or strongly agree, as do 50% of general faculty. Additionally, however, 31% of general faculty disagree or strongly disagree with that statement.
- Only 40% of general faculty agree of strongly agree that the Provost "learns from his mistakes," as do 60% of officers. Non-trivial percentages of both groups, however, disagree or strongly disagree that the provost "learns from his mistakes"—31% of general faculty and 25% of faculty officers.

Table 12: Developing Self and Others

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Is intentional in creating a learning environment for self and others					
General Faculty	83	19%	22%	59%	**3.5**
Faculty Officers	66	18%	20%	62%	**3.7**
Provides appropriate support for the professional development of academic leaders					
General Faculty	104	26%	20%	54%	**3.3**
Faculty Officers	76	16%	16%	68%	**3.7**
Demonstrates self-awareness across situations					
General Faculty	87	22%	24%	54%	**3.4**
Faculty Officers	69	14%	23%	62%	**3.8**
Is empathetic					
General Faculty	98	31%	19%	50%	**3.3**
Faculty Officers	75	21%	17%	61%	**3.7**
Learns from his mistakes					
General Faculty	77	31%	29%	40%	**3.1**
Faculty Officers	57	25%	16%	60%	**3.5**

9. Planning, Managing, and Organizing

Table 13 presents findings on four indicators of planning, management, and organization. The survey data indicate that this is the competency area where faculty see the Provost's greatest strengths. Among faculty officers, nearly two thirds (62%-65%) agree or strongly agree that the Provost fulfills the four indicators used to assess this competency. Among the general faculty, 50%-60% agree with the indicator statements. It is worth noting that nearly a quarter of both groups disagree or strongly disagree that the Provost "structures meetings to solicit diverse perspectives."

Table 13: Planning, Managing, and Organizing

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Utilizes time effectively (i.e., allocates time proportionally to relevant issues, responds promptly and with follow through, is appropriately available, balances waiting with responsiveness)					
General Faculty	62	15%	34%	52%	**3.5**
Faculty Officers	58	22%	14%	64%	**3.6**
Meets regularly but judiciously, ensuring that meetings are productive					
General Faculty	65	14%	28%	58%	**3.7**
Faculty Officers	74	16%	19%	65%	**3.7**
Facilitates effective meetings					
General Faculty	72	22%	18%	60%	**3.5**
Faculty Officers	73	16%	22%	62%	**3.7**
Structures meetings to solicit diverse perspectives					
General Faculty	72	24%	26%	50%	**3.4**
Faculty Officers	73	23%	12%	64%	**3.6**

Summary of Key Messages from Open Comments

From 284 completed surveys, 138 comments were received. The vast majority of commenters agreed that their comments could be shared with the Provost (See Appendix B). The open-ended comments should be assessed in concert with the quantitative information presented above. The AAPC reviewed the comments and summarizes the most common themes below (the number in parentheses refers to the frequency of the comment). We encourage the Provost to read the specific comments in Appendix B to appreciate the full set of responses. In the Major Take Away Messages section, the AAPC assesses the themes from the open comments in relation to the Provost's specific job responsibilities and performance.

1. Salary Frustrations (59)
    a. Salaries & benefits not competitive (25)
    b. Low salaries for (and high course load of) teaching faculty (12)
    c. Too much reliance on adjuncts/lecturers (6)
    d. Compression (4)
    e. Hiring and Retention (9)
    f. Graduate salaries (3)

2. Campus-Wide Issues (39)
    a. Lack of attention to CU's research and creative work mission (14)
    b. Lack of vision of excellence to guide practice and strategic decisions (9)
    c. Attention to experiences of teaching faculty (6)
    d. Space and need for a master plan (5)
    e. Lack of cross-unit collaboration and debate (4)
    f. No systematic approach to campus-wide investments (3)
    g. Sexual assault and gun violence (2)
    h. Proliferation of strategic initiatives (1)
    i. Support mental health services (1)

3. Lack of DEI Investment (35)
    a. Lack of DEI on campus as a whole (and responses referencing multiple issues) (11)
    b. In faculty hiring, development, and retention (10)

c. Among undergrad and grad student population (7)
d. Lack of internationalization (2)
e. Become an HSI (2)
f. Poor support for Chancellor's Postdoc and FDAP programs (2)
g. Lack of diversity among leadership (1)

4. Budget (13)
    a. Lack of budget transparency, including in development of new model (8)
    b. Insufficient staff support (2)
    c. Need to stem rising tuition costs (1)
    d. Inability to contain costs (1)
    e. Inadequate fundraising (1)

5. Faculty Life (12)
    a. Inadequate approach to shared governance; Provost ignores faculty feedback and committee work (7)
    b. Succession planning for leadership (2)
    c. Faculty and staff burnout (2)
    d. Faculty conflict and toxic departmental cultures (1)

6. Cross-unit challenges (10)
    a. Inequities and conflicts between College of Arts & Sciences and College of Engineering and Applied Sciences (6)
    b. Lack of attention to arts and humanities (3)
    c. Inequities between Music and others (1)

7. Decision-Making (6)
    a. Lack of decision transparency and dialogue (3)
    b. Lack of decisiveness (2)
    c. No follow-up to Academic Futures (1)

8. Learning (5)
    a. Create more support for and offer more online learning opportunities (4)
    b. Student-centered pedagogy and flexible academic plans (1)

9. Concerns about Administrators (4)
    a. Too many administrators (3)
    b. Poor and opaque hiring practices for Deans and CFO (1)

Summary of Key Messages from Interviews with Stakeholders

We interviewed 6 stakeholders about the Provost's performance regarding budget issues, along with advancement and external relations. Those two areas were only assessed via these interviews and the topics were not included in the survey sent to faculty. The Committee identified the following set of themes that were evident across the interviews.

1. External Relations and Fund Raising
    a. Interviewees reported that the Provost should have greater involvement in advancement, including setting priorities and communicating those to members of the University executive team. For example, deans have fundraising responsibilities and, given that the deans report to the Provost, the Provost should have a certain level of responsibility with

setting the overall vision and a rigorous and transparent method to assess the capacity and performance of the deans.
    b. Interviewees reported that the Provost should establish better procedures to determine the differential needs and resource demands of the administrators reporting to him.
    c. Regarding external relations, interviewees reported that the Provost needs to be better at facilitating collaboration and coordination across programs and units to develop a consistent and coherent narrative.
    d. As the lead spokesperson on campus for the academic enterprise, interviewees reported that the Provost needs to develop a stronger capacity to communicate (both internally and externally) how specific successes within academic units help everyone on campus. If the Provost did so, the multiple and divergent campus constituencies could feel like they are part of a larger, institutional endeavor. This is a critical need as different constituencies on campus have reported that they feel as if they are being left behind in the service of others. Additionally, the Provost should highlight a greater diversity of successes across campus to illustrate his attentiveness to the entire campus enterprise.
2. Resource and Financial Management
    a. Interviewees reported that the Provost has assembled a knowledgeable budgetary staff that supports his capacity to understand the budget.
    b. Overall, stakeholders believed that the Provost understands the budget well.
    c. Interviewees reported that the Provost should be more aware of the diverse needs stemming from different stakeholder groups.
    d. Interviewees reported that the Provost needs to be more strategic with budget decisions, follow a long-term vision for the University, and be forward-thinking with upcoming challenges (e.g., the development of South Campus).
    e. Interviewees reported that the Provost needs to be more strategic on the use of reserves that units have accumulated, possibly guiding unit leaders in using those funds.
    f. Interviewees reported that the Provost uses an appropriately holistic approach toward supporting the overall academic mission and that decisions are not made solely on budgetary considerations.
3. Other Reflections
    a. Interviewees reported that there could be more coordination amongst the Chancellor, CFO, and Provost to develop and narrate a common vision that guides CU across all its functions.
    b. Interviewees reported that when the Provost makes decisions, he is deliberate, careful, and a good listener. Such an approach is often a strength, but it can create challenges when decisions require quick and nimble responses.

Major Take Away Messages

Based on consideration of all the collected data, the AAPC summarizes below the major themes and take away messages for the Provost.

1. Respondents commended the Provost for being deliberative and judicious when making decisions.
2. The Provost could further develop a capacity to engage in agile decision-making when warranted by situational needs.
3. Faculty expressed a desire that the Provost articulate a more compelling and collective vision for the university. This vision should clearly demonstrate how all units are needed on campus in order to achieve our shared goals.
4. Stakeholders note that building collegiality, trust, and transparency are significant concerns that the Provost needs to address more fully.
5. The Provost needs to continue and deepen campus efforts to build a strong infrastructure for recruiting and retaining diverse faculty.

6. There were a notable number of responses that indicated concerns with faculty salaries. Stakeholders urge the Provost to be more proactive, expeditious, and strategic in finding solutions to this pressing problem.
7. There is a disconnect in the assessment of the performance of the Provost across CEAS and A&S. From the data that the AAPC collected, we could not precisely assess the source of that difference; this is an area for further inquiry and management.

Appendix A: Summary of Responses by College

Response Rates

The overall survey response rate among general faculty was 55% (Table A1). The response rate was higher among CEAS faculty (65%) than among CEAS Faculty (44%).

Table A1: Response Rates by Population

Population	# Invited	# Responded	Response Rate (%)
A&S Faculty	171	76	**44%**
CEAS Faculty	77	50	**65%**

Respondents Familiarity with Russell Moore's Work as Provost

Table A2 below shows the responses to the initial survey question, which assessed how familiar the respondents are with "Russell Moore's work as Provost of the University of Colorado Boulder."

Table A2: Familiarity with Provost Moore's Work by Population

Please indicate how familiar you are with Russell Moore's work as Provost of the University of Colorado Boulder.				
	A&S Faculty		**CEAS Faculty**	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
Not at all familiar	22	29%	16	32%
Somewhat familiar	36	47%	28	56%
Very familiar	18	24%	6	12%
Grand Total	**76**		**50**	

Survey respondents who indicated at the beginning of the survey that they were "Not at all familiar" with "Russell Moore's work as Provost of the University of Colorado Boulder" were directed to the end of the survey and answered no further questions.

Overall Assessment of Provost Moore

A majority of CEAS faculty members (53%) and less than a quarter of A&S faculty members (24%) rated the provost's overall performance as "good" or "very good" (Table A3). A quarter of CEAS faculty members and nearly half (47%) of A&S faculty members rated the provost's performance as "poor" or "very poor."

Table A3: Overall Assessment of the Provost

What is your overall assessment of the provost's performance?						
	A&S Faculty		CEAS Faculty		ALL Faculty	
	N	Percentage	N	Percentage	N	Percentage
Very poor	8	16%	2	6%	13	11%
Poor	15	31%	6	19%	26	21%
Neutral	14	29%	7	22%	31	25%
Good	6	12%	8	25%	25	20%
Very good	6	12%	9	28%	28	23%

Item Analysis by Competency Areas

For the survey items that used a five-point rating scale, higher scores indicate a more positive evaluation (e.g., 1=strongly disagree … 5=strongly agree). The summary tables provided in the item analysis sections below use the following color key to categorize items as strengths or weaknesses of the provost based on the percentage of lower ratings (1=strongly disagree and 2=disagree) and higher ratings (4=agree and 5=strongly agree) that were received.

Color Key for Summary Tables to Indicate Strengths and Weaknesses

Strengths to build on: items rated "4=agree" or "5=strongly agree" by a substantial majority of the survey respondents (i.e., % 5-6's > 60%)
Assets to protect: items where half to 60% of the respondents responded "4=agree" or "5=strongly agree" (i.e., % 5-6's: 50%-60%)
Issues to be mindful of: Items rated "1=strongly disagree" or "2=disagree" by a sizeable minority of respondents (i.e., % 1-2's: 25-40%)
Areas that need improvement: Items rated "1=strongly disagree" or "2=disagree" by a large portion of respondents (i.e., % 1-2's > 40%)
Bimodal: Items that meet the criteria for a strength to build on or an asset to protect and also meet the criteria for an issue to be mindful of or an area for improvement (i.e., % 4-5's > 50% and % 1-2's > 25%)
No consensus: Items that do not meet any of the above criteria (i.e., % 4-5's < 50% and % 1-2's < 25%)

Both the percentages and averages shown in the summary tables below are based on non-missing values and exclude responses of "don't know/not applicable" as well as instances where respondents skipped an item; that is, reported percentages and averages are based only on respondents who answered the survey item using a numerical rating. Please note that for some survey items the numbers of responses are noticeably lower. In almost all such instances, the "missing" respondents are those who answered "don't know/not applicable."

In the sections below, we present results of the item analysis for each of the nine competencies:

10. Visionary leadership
11. Ethics and integrity
12. Communication
13. Building collegiality
14. Leading through conflict- Managing conflict
15. Values and cultivates an environment of diversity and inclusion
16. Creative and strategic problem solving
17. Developing self and others
18. Planning, managing, and organizing

1. Visionary Leadership

Table A4: Visionary Leadership

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Articulates a compelling shared vision for the campus					
Arts & Sciences	50	36%	28%	36%	**3.0**
Engineering & Applied Science	34	24%	24%	53%	**3.4**
Is perceptive about the needs of different stakeholders (e.g., students, faculty, administration, academic leaders)					
Arts & Sciences	51	47%	20%	33%	**2.8**
Engineering & Applied Science	32	25%	13%	63%	**3.5**
Articulates a vision for the future of the University					
Arts & Sciences	50	36%	22%	42%	**3.0**
Engineering & Applied Science	33	18%	24%	58%	**3.5**
Leads initiatives on campus that will improve sense of community and belonging					
Arts & Sciences	50	50%	16%	34%	**2.7**
Engineering & Applied Science	33	18%	24%	58%	**3.6**
Is strategic (i.e., able to establish a vision, mission, and goals)					
Arts & Sciences	49	31%	22%	47%	**3.1**
Engineering & Applied Science	32	25%	25%	50%	**3.4**
Engineering & Applied Science					
Arts & Sciences	47	34%	34%	32%	**3.0**
Engineering & Applied Science	29	17%	17%	66%	**3.6**
Engineering & Applied Science					
Arts & Sciences	48	54%	27%	19%	**2.4**
Engineering & Applied Science	34	32%	26%	41%	**3.1**

2. Ethics and Integrity

Table A5: Ethics and Integrity

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Is a role model of ethical behavior					
Arts & Sciences	39	23%	36%	41%	**3.2**
Engineering & Applied Science	26	4%	38%	58%	**3.8**
Fosters trust through the consistent demonstration of integrity					
Arts & Sciences	45	38%	29%	33%	**3.0**
Engineering & Applied Science	28	21%	21%	57%	**3.6**
Confronts others when shared values are threatened					
Arts & Sciences	29	21%	45%	34%	**3.1**
Engineering & Applied Science	19	21%	53%	26%	**3.1**

3. Communication

Table A6: Communication

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Listens perceptively to others					
Arts & Sciences	45	42%	22%	36%	**2.9**
Engineering & Applied Science	26	15%	19%	65%	**3.7**
Responds to others in a way that reflects an understanding of their perspective					
Arts & Sciences	47	47%	30%	23%	**2.7**
Engineering & Applied Science	26	12%	23%	65%	**3.8**
Knows when and how to hold crucial conversations					
Arts & Sciences	43	40%	35%	26%	**2.7**
Engineering & Applied Science	22	9%	32%	59%	**3.6**
Speaks clearly and convincingly					
Arts & Sciences	46	22%	24%	54%	**3.5**
Engineering & Applied Science	32	9%	16%	75%	**3.8**
Writes clearly and convincingly					
Arts & Sciences	48	25%	17%	58%	**3.5**
Engineering & Applied Science	31	3%	10%	87%	**4.0**
Engages in communication practices essential to the work of the campus					
Arts & Sciences	48	27%	21%	52%	**3.3**
Engineering & Applied Science	31	10%	23%	68%	**3.8**
Models civility and mutual respect in his communication with others					
Arts & Sciences	49	22%	27%	51%	**3.3**
Engineering & Applied Science	34	0%	15%	85%	**4.2**
Demonstrates alignment between words and deeds (communication and actions)					
Arts & Sciences	48	44%	27%	29%	**2.8**
Engineering & Applied Science	29	28%	21%	52%	**3.4**

4. Building Collegiality

Table A7: Building Collegiality

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Creates a sense of belonging and camaraderie					
Arts & Sciences	49	57%	31%	12%	**2.3**
Engineering & Applied Science	32	17%	33%	50%	**3.5**
Fosters a culture of trust					
Arts & Sciences	49	59%	27%	14%	**2.3**
Engineering & Applied Science	25	25%	31%	44%	**3.3**
Is transparent with all campus constituencies					
Arts & Sciences	48	71%	13%	17%	**2.2**
Engineering & Applied Science	15	44%	16%	40%	**3.0**

5. Leading Through Conflict--Managing Conflict

Table A8: Managing Conflict

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Views conflict as an opportunity for growth for all parties					
Arts & Sciences	32	39%	35%	26%	**2.7**
Engineering & Applied Science	15	13%	53%	33%	**3.3**
Anticipates conflicts between stakeholders					
Arts & Sciences	32	34%	31%	34%	**2.9**
Engineering & Applied Science	17	18%	47%	35%	**3.2**
Takes multiple stakeholders' perspectives into account during conflicts					
Arts & Sciences	43	42%	30%	28%	**2.7**
Engineering & Applied Science	22	14%	36%	50%	**3.5**
Is willing to make decisions on contentious issues after gathering feedback					
Arts & Sciences	44	39%	20%	41%	**3.1**
Engineering & Applied Science	26	12%	23%	65%	**3.7**
Identifies and handles disruptive behavior while maintaining the dignity of the people involved					
Arts & Sciences	30	40%	40%	20%	**2.8**
Engineering & Applied Science	14	14%	43%	43%	**3.4**

6. Values and Cultivates an Environment of Diversity and Inclusion

Table A9: Diversity and Inclusion

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Creates and maintains an environment where diverse opinions are considered					
Arts & Sciences	47	36%	32%	32%	**2.9**
Engineering & Applied Science	30	3%	30%	67%	**3.8**
Creates an infrastructure to promote the recruitment and retention of a diverse community					
Arts & Sciences	48	38%	21%	42%	**2.9**
Engineering & Applied Science	30	10%	30%	60%	**3.7**
Addresses deficiencies when members of the team act in ways that do not create a welcoming, diverse & inclusive environment					
Arts & Sciences	30	33%	37%	30%	**2.9**
Engineering & Applied Science	16	19%	38%	44%	**3.2**

7. Creative and Strategic Problem Solving

Table A10: Creative and Strategic Problem Solving

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Considers and relies on facts and data for problem solving and making decisions					
Arts & Sciences	41	29%	24%	46%	**3.2**
Engineering & Applied Science	25	12%	28%	60%	**3.7**
Models open-mindedness and flexibility when making decisions					
Arts & Sciences	44	48%	32%	20%	**2.6**
Engineering & Applied Science	25	20%	28%	52%	**3.5**
Intentionally utilizes collaboration as a method of problem solving					
Arts & Sciences	37	57%	24%	19%	**2.5**
Engineering & Applied Science	23	17%	30%	52%	**3.4**
Fosters a problem-solving process that creates innovative solutions					
Arts & Sciences	39	54%	33%	13%	**2.5**
Engineering & Applied Science	24	21%	29%	50%	**3.4**
Understands the impact of decisions on the operation of the university					
Arts & Sciences	45	38%	27%	36%	**2.9**
Engineering & Applied Science	27	15%	11%	74%	**3.7**

8. Developing Self and Others

Table A11: Developing Self and Others

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Is intentional in creating a learning environment for self and others					
Arts & Sciences	36	28%	31%	42%	**3.1**
Engineering & Applied Science	21	10%	14%	76%	**3.9**
Provides appropriate support for the professional development of academic leaders					
Arts & Sciences	43	42%	19%	40%	**2.8**
Engineering & Applied Science	26	4%	23%	73%	**3.9**
Demonstrates self-awareness across situations					
Arts & Sciences	38	37%	32%	32%	**2.8**
Engineering & Applied Science	21	10%	14%	76%	**3.8**
Is empathetic					
Arts & Sciences	42	55%	21%	24%	**2.6**
Engineering & Applied Science	25	12%	24%	64%	**3.8**
Learns from his mistakes					
Arts & Sciences	36	44%	39%	17%	**2.5**
Engineering & Applied Science	18	28%	22%	50%	**3.3**

9. Planning, Managing, and Organizing

Table A12: Planning, Managing, and Organizing

(Rating scale: 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=neither agree nor disagree, 4=agree, 5=strongly agree)

The provost …	# Responses	% Low (1-2's)	% Mid (3's)	% High (4-5's)	Mean
Utilizes time effectively (i.e., allocates time proportionally to relevant issues, responds promptly and with follow through, is appropriately available, balances waiting with responsiveness)					
Arts & Sciences	24	21%	42%	38%	**3.2**
Engineering & Applied Science	16	6%	38%	56%	**3.8**
Meets regularly but judiciously, ensuring that meetings are productive					
Arts & Sciences	24	21%	29%	50%	**3.4**
Engineering & Applied Science	17	12%	18%	71%	**3.8**
Facilitates effective meetings					
Arts & Sciences	26	35%	15%	50%	**3.7**
Engineering & Applied Science	17	18%	18%	65%	**3.7**
Structures meetings to solicit diverse perspectives					
General Faculty	25	40%	24%	36%	**2.9**
Faculty Officers	19	16%	21%	63%	**3.5**

Appendix B: Comments by Faculty

All surveyed faculty had the opportunity to submit comments and whether the comments were to be shared with the Provost. The table below contains all comments that participants wished to share with Provost.

What do you see as the 2-3 most important university issues that the Provost needs to address?
More inclusion of the research perspective increased donor resources Have a better advancement organization
Inequity in funds allocation between A&S and Engineering. Over the last 10+ years there has been outrageously imbalanced net resources flow from A&S to Engineering. In Physics we are left with subpar labs, classrooms, staff, funding, bleeding at the seams while begging for a faculty line each year, and some minor renovation. We are a top department on campus and internationally recognized, highly ranked nationally by many measures but until last year had zero chaired faculty positions; now we have two tiny ones. All this while Engineering is hiring 10s of faculty per year (one year CS had 17 faculty offers out!) have large fraction of their faculty in chaired positions, getting more donors even when the donors are physics and A&S former graduates and having brand new building put up for them, while Physics has been in the queue for 4 decades to even have the H-wing to Duane finished, never mind a sourly needed new physics building - we are having difficulties to hire experimentalists into these subpar laboratory conditions. The level of imbalance is outrageous, but the provost continues to ignore it. This is unacceptable! The provost must change his course and start paying attention to the top science departments on campus and supporting them with resources not just empty rhetoric
How does the Benson Center get away with making academic hiring decisions based on political criteria when that is expressly forbidden for the rest of the campus?
We are too decentralized across the schools and colleges. We can't improve processes because they are all held too locally. The new budget model will help will allocations for school and colleges, but we don't have a consistent and reliable funding source for important campus-wide investments. We need to create more funds for investment.
Salaries, budget, and hearing grievances
Salary equity in line with peer institutions Prioritizing and rewarding high quality learning experiences
The university is getting really far away from its research mission. It is the provost's job to protect this mission and yet he has failed to do that. Resources are instead devoted to an ever growing number of initiatives and related admin positions -- of which almost none are related to the research mission of the university. The university has basically become really inefficient both with its financial resources and with faculty time. Prioritize and reward faculty for doing research, just like an R1 university is supposed to do.
He has been in office way too long. He needs to step away.

Faculty recruitment and retention in the face of increasing competition. Value for money for students paying ever increasing tuition. Has the administration really grown faster than any other constituency, or is this a myth?
The Provost has been in the position for far too long. He is tired and uninspired, and stuck in the past. He appears to be trying to create transparency, maybe, or thinks he is, but it's not working. It is more than past time to make room for fresh ideas, new visions, less provincial outlooks. Diversity needs to start at the top, with the leadership, not just by hiring BIPOC people as diversity officers.
transparency with budget and allocation from college to college
Faculty/staff salaries, new building space, student retention
My central frustration with university administration is the proliferation of initiatives such as CTL, Academic Futures, common curriculum, and QTI, all in the name of improving teaching outcomes and the undergraduate experience, yet faculty are leaving in droves because they are poorly paid and/or (in the case of teaching faculty) overworked. There appears to be little recognition that paying to hire and retain excellent scholars and excellent teachers is what makes a university great--not all of this window dressing and programming.
Strongly supporting the research enterprise (resources and staffing) as it expands and continues to incorporate process and oversight changes. Increase transparency in the budget model and distribution and recognition of the value of research support to students, faculty, and the university's reputation
Instructor workload and pay - It is not enough to "equalize" our titles. Instructional faculty (full time and lecturer positions) pay - payment of a LIVING WAGE - must be a top priority, along with opportunity for advancement (professionally and financially). CU's phenomenal instructional faculty are what keep students coming back, paying large amounts of tuition, and seeking education. The fact that we care deeply about our students, so we show up fully and give everything that we have to them, is exploited by the administration of this institution. It is time to start advocating for the financial well being and quality of life of ALL faculty and staff at CU so that we can continue to serve and provide a quality education to our students.
Salary compression for teaching professors. My department is in the process of hiring a brand-new instructor (assistant teaching professor) and the starting salary is only 8-10k less than I make - and I've been at the University for over 20 years. (That works out to a 'raise' of $500/year, which is certainly way less than even a cost of living increase.)
Retention of our outstanding faculty Compensation and Benefits Diversity, Equity and Inclusion
How to recruit and retain excellent and diverse faculty when we can't put together competitive packages or provide strong supports once hired.
Reinvesting in in-person teaching in upgraded physical learning environments (not on-line as bandaid nor as venture capitalism). Rescue teaching spaces from the twin towers of Student Services and Financial Futures (not saying they don't do good work, just that Faculty Affairs seems to have little to say.) We poor money is student life--the classrooms are ancient. Embracing the race-inclusive, economic and historical role of a urban, regional university, which means becoming more like CSU (ouch!) in that locality is consider an asset more than the obstacle UCB seems to project (long history of isolation and elitism here--not exclusive to the Provost)

1. A stronger commitment of resources and priority to recruitment of traditionally marginalized groups as well as to enhancing diversity in both the classroom and the laboratory. UCB's timid and anemic response thus far is below standards established by other universities.
2. As certain factions in this country wage a culture war against LGBTQ+ people, it is imperative to demonstrate BOLD and meaningful support, protection, and aid for this population, especially for our trans students, staff, and faculty.
3. A greater appreciation and fiscal support for teaching faculty. Yes, some overdue and glacial progress on promotion has been made in recent years. However, as the anti-work movement grows, it is critical for the Provost and others to recognize that universities can be as guilty as corporations in creating work conditions that are overly demanding and demoralizing. Our university has created an environment for teaching faculty that is far equitable in terms of salary, sabbaticals, and respect.

Address rising tuition costs
Continue to maintain a strong Liberal Arts and Humanities presence on campus
Continue to communicate that CU is an important and positive institution in the state.

This university has a provincial feel compared to its peers. International students and faculty often do not feel valued. Undergraduate students from the US do not take advantage of the international opportunities that exist. Foreign language learning and area studies do not feel valued. We have faculty who have worked to set up MOUs with universities around the world, and who are deeply involved in important collaborative relationships with colleagues overseas. These relationships support research and have potential benefits for students. Yet we lack a dean position that is dedicated to managing and promoting international relationships and international programs on the Boulder campus, especially for those of us in the College of Arts and Sciences. It's quite embarrassing when negotiating such MOUs with foreign partners -- as a faculty member in the College I'm not even which dean should be signing off on them, and I have had to undertake this work with little administrative support. Other universities in Colorado, notably Colorado State, have done far more to recruit international students and develop international programs. They thus offer a more ethnically/racially diverse environment which both international students and US students of color find to be more appealing.

It is easy to say that (1) more resources are needed and (2) DEI is a pervasive and sticky issue. But these are hard problems, and we have tried many similar approaches over and over again, or at least that's how it seems to me. I am skeptical about performing yet another strategic planning exercise.

I think we are likely to see a challenge with respect to unionization. This is going to have differential effects across colleges and will need to be handled in a nuanced way.

A subtle but pervasive challenge is the changing attitude in the younger generation of faculty who often don't have the same sort of single-minded dedication to the (academic) enterprise. It's happening across all of society, but we need to figure out how to cope with the fact that our most dedicated faculty will be retiring.

I don't know if we can continue to maintain the status quo indefinitely. Maybe some new ideas are needed.

Free Speech, allowing/promoting diverse opinions in a safe environment, including those right of center. At one time Berkeley lead in free speech. That has gone away at major institutions as seen by the recent Stanford Law School verbal shout down attack by law school students on a sitting Federal judge - the uprising actually supported by the DEA Dean. Maybe CU can lead in bringing free speech back to campus? I doubt it will happen. Promote some free speech type of course in the core curricula, assuming anything ever happens with common core. Encourage Departments that fly the rainbow flag 365 days a year to at least fly the US flag for the week before and after July 4. Some of us have loved ones who have permanent disabilities fighting for freedom so we can actually fly the rainbow flag. There is no problem promoting the rainbow flag, but not flying the US flag around July 4 is a kick in the face to those who have sacrificed for this country to be free. I know some rich people who will not donate to CU anymore because of "woke-ness". I suspect that this is a problem? Somehow this perception needs to change as it has shifted too far to the left. Think about how this can be done as college enrollments are decreasing and funds need to come in from gifting, etc.
Supportive infrastructure for interdisciplinary education; bolstering a culture of cooperation and generosity across all academic units; more efficient use of space across campus
Financial picture supporting diversity in student recruitment. Salary compression among caring colleges/departments. Load adjustments so faculty don't feel so overwhelmed.
1) Even with all the talk about DEI, the University hasn't reckoned with a long history of underpaying women and minorities. 2) Faculty salaries are too low. 3) Staff support in departments is too low.
In CMCI we seriously and urgently need to see the ARPAC Review report. The perception in this college is that CU has buried this report because senior leaders do not want faculty to see it, and/or the Provost is protecting the CMCI Dean because it is a critical report. We would all feel much better about how CU is handling this if the report were released. It may not even be critical or critical of the Dean, but because it is not being released there is a lot of speculation. I see it as the Provost's task to ensure openness and transparency in relation to ARPAC reports. We all put a huge amount of work into this and we have seen nothing back. Now people in CMCI view the ARPAC process as a waste of time. Please can the Provost do whatever he can to move this situation along so that we can trust the process and our leadership?
Faculty Salaries Representation in Leadership (gender, race) Reducing facility cost in F&A for research grants
Overuse and exploitation of adjunct faculty (lecturers) Better conditions for teaching track faculty (instructors) Pay equity for all faculty

salaries for faculty, including high performers promoting a cohesive vision across departments supporting instructors with dignity and job security
Budget and cost-containment, given that our enrollment is likely to plateau or even drop over the next few years. We are not doing a good job of that right now. Facilitating recruitment of BIPOC students (and secondarily, faculty and staff), especially from the local Colorado area, since we do poorly with that demographic, and the enrollment pressures I just mentioned make this even more important.
1) How to support continuing scholarly excellence in the face of declining funding. This includes ongoing efforts to raise salaries so that we can compete with peers in the region 2) How to ensure that recruiting racially diverse faculty, especially Black faculty, remains a priority --- Not an issue, but rather a comment: on the whole Provost Moore is one of the best Provosts I have encountered over a long career in the academy. His is a difficult job, and yet even with the hardest tasks he models judicious, engaged leadership that makes stakeholders feel valued. We are lucky to have him.
* Keeping incredibly hard working and talented young faculty here; they want to stay but the recruitment packages elsewhere are very strong * Provide remuneration for administrative support that is commensurate with the incredible amount of work that is provided. Living in this area is becoming increasingly unaffordable for many staff members and we can't continue to operate if we don't ensure that these AMAZING individuals aren't supported at the levels that they deserve.
The lack of continuing covid precautions (masking, increased ventilation and filtration, stay-home-when-sick policies, freely & easily available testing, reporting of exposures, etc.) excludes from the campus community people who are immunocompromised or otherwise high-risk, or have family members in such situations. Studies in elementary schools indicate that improving indoor air quality not only results in significant reduction in spread of disease but also significant improvements in learning outcomes. Surely these also apply to colleges and universities. I urge campus leadership to pay attention to published statements from scientists around the world (even in high-visibility venues such as Nature, Science, The Lancet, JAMA, NEJM, etc.) about the status of the ongoing pandemic, and the severity and frequency of long-term effects of covid.
His replacement.

I believe the provost office has very good intent to build a thriving and inclusive academic enterprise; however, the implementation of the vision and policy in academic units may not be ideal or as intended. I am happy to talk further with the provost if it is helpful. Below are three suggestions from me. 1) Promoting real and meaningful progress of diversity, equity, and inclusion of faculty and staff members: Please eliminate lip service, performative behaviors, box checking, or biased/selective/nepotistic/questionable DEI practices (e.g., friends-only target hiring) in some academic units, which trigger feelings of cynicism, hopelessness, or even resentment. DEI is not for show or for some individuals' cliques or agendas, but rather matters to people's wellbeing and work/life meaning. Please encourage academic units to practice DEI respectfully and responsibly. Relatedly and importantly, our staff members deserve respect from full professors and others, and yet a number of staff members have experienced uncivil treatment. 2) While valuing and rewarding academic excellence (letting star performers shine), fostering a culture of respect, trust, fairness, and empowerment. Some academic units have a political/cliquish/hostile culture (e.g., based on regional/cultural origin such as the U.S. South), give little say to those who are not full professors (e.g., full professors asserting dominance or giving explicit/implicit pressure on others to go along with their judgments/decisions), lack transparency and accountability, or selectively acknowledge or praise clique members, and/or selectively emphasize certain categories of diversity (e.g., gender diversity only, rather than all types of diversity), completely against the principles of equity and inclusion and of collaborative faculty governance). Such culture building effort may require the provost office's more systematic/detailed understanding of each academic unit (e.g., through direct communication with faculty members instead of department chairs and deans) and (persistent) determination to crack down cliques. Please choose the right people who are willing to serve others (rather than self-serving academic politicians, or those with the wrong motives) for power positions. 3) Holding full professors and those in power positions accountable for their behaviors and decisions. Possible mechanisms include implementing confidential evaluations of department chairs, deans, associate deans, etc.; creating safe helplines for whistleblowers; creating corrective action plans regarding problematic/unethical behaviors. Also, please empower those not in power positions for voice and participative decision making and initiate frequent communication directly with faculty members. Some faculty and staff concerns may not be conveyed by administrators of academic units to the provost office through the hierarchy of communication.
1) New campus budget model was intended to be more transparent than previous "historic" budget, and certainly the input parameters in model are known to all. The implementation of the budget model has been less transparent- "hold harmless" has mitigated budget harm to Colleges/Units who were already heavily subvented by campus, and has induced budget harm to Colleges providing the budget for those subventions (supplements). This is becoming known to campus community at large and is having negative impact on morale of those in units receiving budget cuts. 2) There are several, interdisciplinary areas of expertise on campus (specifically in climate and sustainability) that have not been leveraged to not only improve visibility of CU in these areas but also to attract more student interest. Bottom up initiatives to create "schools" or interdisciplinary programs in this area have failed, not for lack of interest, but because there are simply too many players to reach any consensus. This is where campus and Provost needs to take a lead and indicate that building a visible, interdisciplinary, school in this area is required. Without such direction from campus, CU will not be able to build its reputation in this area, even though by some measures it is a top 5 university in climate/earth systems research worldwide (unbeknownst to many potential undergraduate students). The lack of progress on implementing "Academy" model for undergraduate education has not helped either.

Faculty retention. Faculty training/education. Academic quality standards
There is a huge disconnect between the stated goals of DEI leadership and concrete actions eg: a cluster hire for BIPoC faculty at all ranks, colleges, and schools, more graduate student funding to recruit and retain BIPoC doctoral students (allowing the dismantling of FDAP without concrete actions beyond Deans saying we are waiting for the provost to approve whatever there plan might be, provost constantly asks committees to develop huge and detailed plans (academic futures, teaching faculty and so on) and then after the committee does their hard work makes very prudent, doable and grounded recommendations, provost "pumps" the brakes to avoid implementation. So faculty perceive it as a huge waste of time and causes morale issues at all levels, especially the teaching faculty situation. Although there is more hiring of BIPoC staff, why are there are so few BIPoC Deans at CU Boulder? and BIPoC leadership beyond student affairs? Why is there not more investment in BIPoC serving undergraduate services and so on. So again big disconnect. Provost is too risk-averse I guess and prefers the status quo to doing anything bold and visionary that is also prudent and methodical. ---Also, this survey is problematic and seemed to focus almost entirely on conflict resolution types of questions and almost nothing on DEI issues and faculty issues and other pertinent issues. So who can answer truthfully if provost is good at conflict mediation if they are not part of upper adminstration and in day to day meetings and so on, or if Provost is called into departments in receivership because of infighting and so on which probably is not the standard protocol for these issues anyway. So glad these surveys are up and running again but the questions are way too limited to get insightful and truthful responses from faculty and whoever else is being asked to respond.
Salaries that lag behind other universities (this lies with the Regents) Implementing campus-level initiatives rather than unit-driven initiatives. In other words, big ideas seem to be constrained to work within the framework that is already in place, rather than adjusting the framework to support big ideas. I think there are areas in which CU should lead that span multiple units, yet they don't evolve, because the thinking seems to be more "what can we do with the current structure" rather than "What do we want to do, and how can the current structure either support those objectives or be modified to support them.
Improved working conditions, workload, and compensation for teaching faculty. This is paramount--25% of all rostered faculty are teaching faculty. The conditions under which they work are also the conditions under which our students learn.
1. elevate the role of instructor-rank faculty and encourage the use of such full-time faculty over the use of lecturers 2. identify ways in which cost-of-living increases can be provided to faculty, staff, and graduate students on appointment. 3. continue to develop and fund programs that address justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion issues within our faculty, staff, and student communities.
The provost treats faculty with contempt and lacks respect for shared governance.
(1) Retention. (2) Fostering diversity in a non-diverse city.
1. Not responsive to BFA requests for promotion increases for teaching faculty, whereas Tenure Track faculty were given such promotion increases last year. 2. Not responsive to the BFA requests for returning to a 3-3 load as the full-time load for teaching faculty; but rather deflects this request to a possible 12-month contract, asking teaching faculty to perform more work (with more pay), which is not a real change.
More transparency about the budget model and how decisions are made about the pool of money at the very top. Working to actually IMPLEMENT the new budget model instead of having a hold harmless period that seems to grow longer with each update.

The Provost regularly solicits faculty input on huge projects (most recently, the Budget realignment process), and then PROMPTLY IGNORES every single recommendation that is offered to him, pursuing his own agenda. What a total waste of faculty time. (If you're going to ASK for faculty input, ACT on it. If you're going to do whatever you want regardless of what we say, then DON'T WASTE OUR TIME. We are not here to provide legitimacy or "cover"--we literally have better things to do.
Establish respect for the authority of faculty governance over the domains that Regent Laws explicitly describe as such (as the areas in which faculty governance has the primary decision-making responsibility) Strengthen the University as a center of genuine scholarly and research excellence, across the colleges and schools, and articulate a clear and compelling rational, both to internal and external constituents, for the importance of this goal Build trust between faculty and administration
A great administrator and leader and a kind person. But I saw no attention to or interest in DEI expressed and I believe this is a failing. There have been instances when someone more sensitive to the systemic treatment of minorities might have caught issues that have left some feeling frustrated and mistreated. One I remember was when all Jewish faculty in one area (of which an entire highly qualified committee could have been drawn) were excluded from a search for a dean to replace a Jewish dean--why did that happen? at the time it seemed "natural", but was it? I don't think anything was intentional, but iI felt it deeply at the time, and the area is still suffering similar issues (so I hope things like this do get addressed). Again, I commend this leader overall and hope he continues in his position.
First - accepting plans and the work of various committees who have written reports but not acting on them, or not clearly articulating which parts of the reports will be implemented and which are rejected. Second - helping to complete the changes necessary to improve the position of Teaching Professors/Instructors, particularly the 3/3 workload, but also issues of salary compression and helping to create a pathway to more leadership positions for this cohort - just like our students they need a sense of belonging and a sense that their work is valuable and respected and that they contribute equally to this campus Third - doing something concrete to make interdisciplinary work more possible on this campus - particularly in the area of team teaching, but also more generally. We talk a lot about how the future is more interdisciplinary, but we don't do much to support faculty who want to excel in interdisciplinary work - there are still too many barriers.
Please help the schools/colleges and other stakeholders understand the challenges that we face with the new budget funding model and unit allocations. This is a complex issue (how budgets are determined and the many factors that influence those decisions) that most faculty do not understand and it seems likely that this will lead to highly increased contentious discussions based on individual unit priorities and (mis)understandings of the needs of the university, college/schools, and how budgets actually work in order to maintain a COMPREHENSIVE research institution. It's already bubbling up and the Provost's silence is troubling (though understandable) and I'm guessing based on his sense of losing decision-making based on his overall understanding of how the campus and units look.
Support initiatives for retention including salary equity for all faculty and staff. Ensure that we are engaging with the state to maximize the opportunities for the state to support our institutional mission. Ensure that the space master plan has a clear path for execution.

1. Increasing tenure-track faculty so as to meet all parts of the university's academic mission (and not just increasing instructors) 2. Improving the academic reputation of our campus so that student admissions can become more selective (e.g., should be in top 50 of US News, not 97th) 3. Compensation and budgets (the perennial issue, but still crucial. we can't be innovative and state of the art if we don't have the resources.
The role of computing on campus has been a real weak spot. The curriculum is scattered across campus in multiple colleges and there are constant turf wars. Other universities have been much more forward thinking in creating academic homes for computing that unite multiple disciplines rather than divide them and create greater visibility and synergy. There has been a failure to follow up on the Academic Futures report, particularly the Academy concept. That effort was derailed by adding the requirement for cross-college degrees and turning what could have been an incremental, low-investment concept into something financially unworkable. We should set a campus goal of becoming a Hispanic Serving Institution over the next X years (not sure what X should be). Sure there are other dimensions of diversity that are important but that one is highly relevant to our state and (in my view) far more achievable than chasing enrollments for out-of-state BIPOC groups. The report champions the Chancellors Post-Doctoral Fellowship program, but that has been severely underfunded to the extent that in my department anyway, we no longer apply to this because the chance of acceptance is so small and the requirement that the college commit to a future hire with no support from the campus is onerous and doesn't mesh with how hiring decisions in colleges and departments are made.
1 Faculty salary equity issues (beyond protected class), we are losing established outstanding faculty to other institutions, to early retirement, and to "remain-in-place disengagement" with the status quo policies. 2 At a micro-level, the campus budget refit has created massive uncertainty, especially as related to the "hold harmless" situation. It's clear that the hold harmless policy can't go on indefinitely (otherwise its simply the old model in new clothes), it is also clear that the current window for hold harmless isn't serving any purpose. It isn't like the impacted units are in a position to do anything about the situation. 3 At a global level, the fact that the new model is agnostic to the campus research mission lends credence that the campus has adopted a "community college" view of its budget (and mission). Units will follow the budget incentives, and those incentives do not reward high risk, grand challenge research.
Compensation and retention of top-quality, Research faculty Teaching faculty compensation and retention DEI
I have met Provost twice in informal setting and he is approachable and answers question simply and clearly without using jargon. I have been impressed with his clarity of vision for the University.

'- Retention of faculty in an equitable manner - Investing in infrastructure and safety: buildings, PROACTIVELY addressing the potential for gun violence/school shooting - Inviting new people into administrative positions who are well qualified
Number one seems like compensation. We can't fall behind during this inflationary period, and beyond that, stable and equitable salary processes are essential to retaining people and to our overall campus culture. Number two is more long-term, and it involves imagining in a compelling way just what our mission as a public R1 can and should be in an era with paltry public investment and a ceiling on how much we can grow in terms of enrollment. It can't just be necessity that drives us, by which I mean the necessity of generating revenue, while we seek to change as little as possible. Instead, we have to ask questions of meaning: what does it mean that the public does not value what we are? What is our knowledge mission? Whom do we serve? What are we losing and what are we gaining by the decisions we are going to make? Leaders on campus (I am thinking of the deans in particular) are usually focussed on how to maximize what they have, how to grow, innovate, etc. I think the Provost should create space for thinking about these questions of meaning, mission, and purpose as well, else we are simply a jangly marketplace subject to the vagaries of market forces, endlessly reacting. Universities have always served a vital function in their ability to critique and resist such forces, even while they are obviously also affected by them.
1) Continue to speak more compellingly about WHY UG & G student success is so critical to CU Boulder's success and publicize key metrics much more frequently so that all rank and file staff and faculty are alerted to "row in the same direction." Consider raising the profile/awareness of the embedded budgetary incentives in the new RCM approach. 2) Focus on big ideas that will raise the perceived quality of the campus across the state and across the nation (some of this is PR, but some of this is highlighting true quality already existing within the campus). Much progress has been made (say relative to our 4/20 days), but we have much further to go if we are to reach where the great publics already are today. 3) Begin to drive a sense of internal pride and accomplishment for who we already are and where we're going at all levels (campus, college & dept.) which in turn helps facilitate item 2) above. 4) DEI is great and needed and overall is welcomed. However, campus leadership from the Chancellor on down should remember that Inclusiveness also means embracing people of all backgrounds, not just those coming from traditionally marginalized backgrounds. This campus (and its collective leadership) does not follow that mantra. If the current trend to be exclusionary in our various systems is to continue, then replace the word "inclusive" with another word that does not convey a comprehensive, contractual obligation that CU Boulder is currently not living up to. Hiring and firing decisions must be perceived as free from any form of prejudicial bias on factors not related to merit. Currently, in so many searches, perceived excellence (in whatever form that might present) is typically secondary to candidate identity issues, unless no suitable minority/non-traditional candidate exists in a given pool.
Adapting university policies and structures to better support, sustain, and include those who are actually doing the work. We are largely still structured around a model in which (white, male) tenure stream faculty are central and have failed to adapt in ways that acknowledge and support the diverse range of staff, research faculty, instructors, and others who are carrying much of the day-to-day work of the university and (frankly) much of the work that the university touts (such as dei work).
1. grade inflation and the devaluation of a CU undergraduate degree. A very simple step would be to post the average grade of each class next to the student's achieved grade on transcripts. 2. helping research institutes hire faculty by having an explicit policy that departments will not lose future lines by accepting faculty with lines through the institutes
1. Recruitment of the brightest and best, diverse faculty 2. Retention of the brightest and best, diverse faculty

Reduce administrative bloat that affects affordability of education and competitiveness of the research enterprise.
CU worked hard and smart to create a leading strategic comms program. Now, we're going to merge with environmental design? Why? It makes NO sense. Landscaping classes with ad strategy? Again, it makes NO sense. And if it does, neither the Provost nor his staff has explained it to our faculty. If you are going to make a major decision like this, make it with open, transparent, collaborative and visionary communication.
Retention of faculty from minority groups
1. Mental health wellness of students, faculty, and staff. (This should not be understood narrowly as affording CAPS, Health and Wellness Services, OVA, etc., more funding. Rather, what I have in mind is changing the academic and professional culture here at CU -- including, but not limited to, building a strong commitment to student-centered pedagogy and flexible academic plans; paid mental health wellness days for all faculty and staff; mandatory mental health wellness training for faculty, staff, and students (which was an initiative that the BFA Student Affairs Committee began to develop a proposal for during my time as SAC Chair); campus-wide mental health wellness days a couple times a semester (like reading days at the end of the term when no work or deadlines may be assignment); greater peer-to-peer mentoring opportunities and incentivizing greater faculty mentoring of students. 2. Preventatively safeguarding campus from possible gun violence. 3. Improving teaching and clinical professor salaries (and/or reducing teaching loads). These are challenging issues, some of which may seem like the exceed the purview of campus policies, and I appreciate the consideration. I would look forward to being part of these conversations. Sincerely, Lev SzentkirÃ¡lyi, Ph.D.
Retention of faculty. Anything under a 7% raise for faculty in 2022 was a pay cut. Anything under a 6% raise for 2023 is a pay cut. Help the Regents understand how precarious the economic position is for so many of our faculty, not to mention staff, grad students, and undergrads from less affluent backgrounds. If you care at all about diversity, equity, or inclusion, you need to start fighting for a standard annual cost of living adjustment for faculty and university staff. Relying on a merit pool, especially as we transition out of the pandemic and its disruptions, will exacerbate compression and equity issues. Retention of students. Failure to fill vacant positions degrades the student experience.
Communicating strategic direction Enabling research growth and impact Making difficult decisions to address budget issues
Utilize shared governance to DESIGN solutions rather than use shared governance as a rubber-stamp for already decided upon courses of actions and then saying "consulted with [or with input from] faculty governance."
University Funding Enrollment trends Measuring impact of university engagement around state of CO
Why he so consistently disregards the will of the faculty, precisely as expressed in the processes he himself has initiated. College Re-org, esp as regards budget transparency and the hollowing out of CAS funds in favour of Engineering, is a prime example.

Provost Moore has already identified 2-3 most important university issues and his continued leadership is critical to the university's success: 1. diversity, equity and inclusion for faculty, staff and students (e.g. the FDAP program); 2. transparency in values decision-making to build trust, e.g., Academic Futures, Common Curriculum, etc.; and 3. responsible stewardship of university resources, i.e., in partnership with SRS and with attention to the current "stresses on strains" on students, faculty and staff.
1.) Instructor salaries are too low. In 20 years, there have been no cost-of-living raises. It is impossible for faculty to buy or even rent in Boulder. 2.) There has been a bait-and-switch when its comes to instructor course loads. For years, 3/3 was considered full-time. That was switched to 4/4. Instructors were then promised by the administration that there would be a return to 3/3 full-time. For reasons that were not explained to us, that promise was retracted. CMCI instructors have a 3/3 load. Why is this not the case in A & S? 3.) Salary compression. There are virtually no benefits for faculty to stay at CU Boulder longterm. New faculty make as much or more than those who have been here for years.
Full professor salaries; focus on excellence
Continue to promote inclusion while stopping the illegal discrimination in faculty hiring that is occurring through FDAP and in departments. Strengthen CU's climate for civil discourse on difficult issues. Lessen the impression that CU is politicized and politically captured.
Pay equity, diversity
Taxing A&S for growth and improvement in e.g., engineering is no longer productive. The contrast in freedom to hire, faculty salaries, and staff salaries, particularly in the light of equal pay for equal work, has become corrosive. The provost has an opportunity here to lead by restoring equity.
faculty morale; respect for faculty and the teaching mission of the university (while there is a lot of "discussion" around this and "lip-service" paid to teaching), those of us who are actually in teaching/ instructor roles know that this is not a priority and that we are not given the tools we need to teach nor the respect we deserve, nor the salaries we need; university climate: CU is toxic and it is a demoralizing place to work. If it weren't for my students and for my love of teaching, I would not stay. I am often so tempted to look for different work, but when I am in the classroom I forget the university environment and am reminded of my true calling.
We need to move faster with regards to online and hybrid offerings so that we can connect our space based campus with the rest of the world that needs our best credential offerings. We must use the new budget model to enable spousal hires and other needs for long-term retention of both faculty and staff. We need to invest in more flexible IT infrastructure that supports our online and hybrid offerings at scale.

Competitiveness in salaries, particularly in the professional schools. We are under-paying compared to peer schools, and great professors are being lured away. For example, at the law school, we under-pay by between $80k - $100k compared to peer schools, or schools slightly ranked higher. We are unable to competitively counter-offer with even much smaller counter-offers. For example, one of our faculty members got an offer at Georgetown paying $100,000 more. We counter-offered with $10,000 more, which was insulting. She would have stayed if we had merely given a reasonable offer of $30,000 that was much lower than the $100,000 increase, but at least was not a brush-off counter-offer. The current methodology used to rate competitive of salaries is wrong, because it confuses how "associate" and "assistant" professors are used differently in different law schools. The organization that created the current comparative chart used by the university has no idea how it actually works in legal academia, and is just using generic knowledge that doesn't apply to law schools. Comparisons should be based upon years upon the tenure track, and how many years pre-tenure and post-tenure the law applicant is, not based upon the titles "assistant" and "associate" which mean something totally different in the legal space than it does in other academic units.
We have had the same higher administration team (namely DiStefano and Moore) for the last 14 years or so, and yet we have been operating in what appears to be a constant succession of crisis modes. Decisions and "initiatives" are handed down arbitrarily and dumped on college deans who then dumped them on department chairs. Allocation of resources to Engineering (a black hole of funds), and Engineering aligned programs (like ATL&S) at the expense of Arts & Sciences demonstrates favoritism and lack of concern for the SCH workhorse that A&S is. Have the Provost budget pay for the CO Shakespeare Festival and the Museum of Art from its own funds, not bleed AHUM.
Create excitement for faculty and academic leaders. Bring new opportunities so people are motivated to work toward a shared goal. CU has been doing well but also appears to have been stagnant--the university can/should move up to a higher whole different level given its strategic location and the growing economy in the state.
Take advantage of online learning capabilities in all classes - Develop a strategic plan for online capabilities such as when and how they will be used. Remove bureaucracy - especially in employment decisions. For example, why are we considering a 5-year contract for instructors? Instructors are already covered by employment at will and a yearly evaluation. Why do we need contracts at all? The contract renewal process is time-consuming and redundant. Mine the potential of diverse students all over the state of Colorado AND our sister schools (Hawaii?).
CU Boulder has lagged behind in large fundraising campaigns when compared to our peer and aspirational institutions. It's imperative that CU Boulder make changes, as we are missing a huge opportunity. The new budget model has the potential to financially disincentivize strong research programs on our campus. It's important that there is a balance between the education and research mission of the campus and this should come from campus leadership.
1. Research competitiveness and increased sponsored research dollars coming into CU Boulder 2. Faculty Retention 3. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion across faculty and staff, along with accountability for civility.

'- adequate and equitable distribution of campus resources (e.g., faculty lines, raises, space), particularly in light of new program development/growth relative to legacy program stagnation/contraction
- decision-making about campus organization and priorities in collaboration with the faculty whom these decisions effect. (There have been more than a few instances on Provost Moore's watch in which faculty input was either promised and then not elicited or outright ignored when organizational decisions have needed to be made -- Dean appointments, movement of programs from one unit to another, allocations of space and budget -- that have significant and material effect on faculty success and the relationships among faculty and to the university, more broadly.)
- the consistent growth of the university's administration (vice provost of this, associate vice chancellor for that) over the last 7 years seems significantly out of step with the stagnated growth in lines and salary for the university's front-line teaching and research faculty. Are all of these new support offices and administrative titles (and associated salaries) really needed, and how do these initiatives benefit the University's students -- and the faculty, who are continually asked to do more while front-line retirements and resignations are replaced at a leisurely pace (if at all) and faculty growth to support new and growing programs is lacking?

Help CU Boulder become a world leader in implementing climate change solutions.
Assist faculty to improve the CU Boulder brand within the State of Colorado.
Improve budget transparency - work more consistently with established BFA and faculty budget committees.
Listen and respond immediately to any and all student concerns that trigger widespread anxiety.

The Provost's report states that the FDAP was created and implemented, but what happened to it? This is unclear and frustrating. I haven't seen the demonstrated dedication to increasing faculty diversity that this plan intended to accomplish. This would be the #1 most important issue to me.

Increasing faculty diversity is directly related to the University's ability to recruit and retain a diverse student body. It also helps spread the burden of DEI service work that the few BIPOC faculty who are here typically shoulder. Numerous universities across the country are leading in this area and leaving CU Boulder behind. Successful strategies include cluster hire initiatives that bring in a cohort of faculty across colleges in order to provide a support system. It would be encouraging to see CU Boulder invest this sort of effort and resources in recruiting a more diverse faculty body.

The Case for Cluster Hiring to Diversify Your Faculty https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-case-for-cluster-hiring-to-diversify-your-faculty/

Cluster Hiring Grows in Popularity as Institutions Act to Increase Faculty Diversity https://www.insightintodiversity.com/cluster-hiring-grows-in-popularity-as-institutions-act-to-increase-faculty-diversity-and-advance-social-justice/

Recruiting and securing diverse faculty and staff
Working with CU programs (notably graduate and faculty/staff housing) to promote DEI-friendly perspectives for residents
Finding ways to get faculty and staff living closer to campus (more housing options, better subsidization programs). Students are residents, everyone else is increasingly a commuter (grad students, faculty, staff).

I am very concerned about the fact that A&S is continuing to supplement other Colleges while itself undergoing a budget cut.

We are an R-1 institution that doesn't sufficiently value and support our Research Institutes.
RIO should get a portion of the ICR to fuel innovation within the Institutes, as a start. It's astonishing that they do not have a budget.

Our research mission connects to our teaching mission -- we'll get more "butts in seats" by doing better with integrating students into our scholarship. So many lost opportunities. UROP was desperately underfunded and now STUDIO Lab has stepped in to take its place, supported by A&S and departments because the university's program wasn't working.