

Report of the Boulder Faculty Assembly Administrator Appraisal Committee Concerning

David Ikenberry, Dean of the Leeds School of Business

Spring, 2014

Administrator Appraisal Program

The Administrator Appraisal Program (AAP) of the Boulder Faculty Assembly (BFA) seeks to provide substantive feedback about administrators based on a high rate of response reflecting a representative survey of the faculty. Faculty members have the opportunity to provide AAP feedback to the review/reappointment process when the president, chancellor, provost, or the dean of their school or college is undergoing the third- or fifth-year review.

This was the third-year or interim review of David Ikenberry, Dean of the Leeds School of Business.

Methods of Review

The Office of Planning, Budget and Analysis (PBA), under the direction of the AAP committee administers an online questionnaire, including the option for open ended responses, to the faculty under the administrator and to faculty nominated by the administrator. Details about the survey are given in Appendix A.

All faculty members of the Leeds School, the population of interest (hereafter referred to as the "Population"), designated as eligible by the BFA were sent an e-mail requesting that they complete the online administrator appraisal questionnaire. In keeping with past practices, the AAP Committee requested Dean Ikenberry to nominate as raters people he judged especially likely to be knowledgeable about his role as dean. These will be referred to as the Administrator-nominated (AN) raters. All AN raters who are also members of the unit's faculty are included only in the AN group and not the Population.

The Dean nominated 21 faculty of whom 15 (71%) responded to the survey. There were 74 invitations sent to the Population and 61 respondents (82%). The AAP Committee and BFA have agreed, on the advice of faculty who specialize in survey methods, that a 60% return rate is needed for a representative statistical study. This survey far exceeds this requirement.

Results: Item Analysis

Figure 1 presents item content (abbreviated) of all survey items, item means (on a 1-5 scale), and categorizations of items as reflecting strengths and weaknesses of the dean. Data are presented separately for the two groups of raters. The items are ordered by the average of the item means for the Population and the Administrator-nominated raters with higher values appearing at the top and lower values at the bottom. In calculating the means, responses of "Don't know/not applicable" were

considered missing values; that is, means are based only on respondents who provided an effectiveness rating.

The columns labeled “R” use the raw percentages including all those who replied “don’t know” to an item. This scoring is consistent with past AAP reports. Columns labeled “A” use adjusted percentages that eliminated all “don’t know responses” before calculating the item category.

The category ratings shown in Figure 1 are color coded to indicate relative strengths and weaknesses of the dean based on percentages of raters who rated him as more effective or less effective on each of the 25 survey items (see the key to Figure 1 and Appendix A for details). As was done for the calculation of item means, responses of “Don’t know/not applicable” were treated as missing values. In previous AAP reports, presentation of these “categories” data included respondents who replied “Don’t know/not applicable” to an item.

There was significant agreement on the items means between the Population and the AN raters (Pearson correlation = 0.57), suggesting that both sets of raters generally perceive the same strengths and weaknesses. Item means, however, are consistently and noticeably different across the two groups of raters with AN faculty giving markedly higher average ratings (ranging from 3.6 to 4.8) than Population faculty (average ratings ranging from 2.7 to 3.8).

Both sets of raters agree on the following strengths:

- Constructively acting on undergraduate student concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions)
- Having a solid understanding of faculty governance processes, university policies, and budget procedures
- Actively supporting high-quality faculty research (e.g., mentoring and funding opportunities)
- Providing leadership (e.g., infrastructure and resources) for high-quality undergraduate teaching
- Having the vision to lead the industry/profession rather than merely following it or keeping up with it
- Taking responsibility for office logistics, systems, and support staff

Data from the Population raters indicate a noticeable amount of disagreement in perceptions of the dean’s performance as well as negative perceptions of the dean’s performance on six of the 27 survey items. The grey boxes in Figure 1 indicate bimodal distributions on the Population group’s evaluation of the dean. That is, sizeable numbers of raters made positive ratings and sizeable numbers of raters made negative ratings on these eight items. Disagreement is expressed on topics including fairness, integrity, trust, and decision-making.

Both sets of raters agreed that the Dean received his lowest ratings on issues of women and underrepresented faculty and salary distribution. The relevant items are:

- Constructively acting on the concerns of women faculty
- Actively recruiting and retaining underrepresented faculty
- Fostering an equitable, merit-based salary system
- Making progress toward diversity goals

Note that the fourth of these items was considered a strength by the AN raters, It was, however, the lowest rated strength. Interestingly, there was disagreement between the two sets of raters on the item “Constructively acting on the concerns of faculty of color.” It had a low mean rating among the Population, while the AN group gave it a higher rating.

Results: Comments from Raters

Thirty-one faculty (eight of whom were in the NR group) commented on Dean Ikenberry’s performance. Thirteen raters were positive and supportive and ten negative; the rest were neutral or mixed. Many comments praised the Dean’s vision for the Business School. Two examples:

- “He brings relevance and a sense of urgency to what the school can become.”
- “I have been extremely pleased with Dean Ikenberry’s leadership, vision, and passion for building a top business school.”
- “The Dean has advanced new educational initiatives on many fronts, incorporating an unprecedented amount of faculty and student input.”

Three themes dominated the comments. The first was the Dean’s commitment to changing student education, mostly at the undergraduate level, but a few comments also mentioned the MBA and professional master’s programs and one the Ph.D. program. The majority of these comments were positive, singling out the Dean’s commitment to “make improvements in the delivery of education to business students.” A representative statement is “I am impressed with the sincerity of his effort toward improving the undergraduate educational experience.”

A few comments were neutral—they noted the Dean’s efforts but mentioned that the consequences must be “determined in future years, when the outcomes of the initiatives can be assessed.” A dissident opinion held that the resources devoted to undergraduate education and new “M.S. programs” were compromising research infrastructure. Finally, one rater suggested that more attention needs to be directed to the traditional MBA program.

A second theme was the Dean’s leadership style. Five faculty reported a “top-down style” with a lack of transparent decision making that does not involve faculty collaboration. “Dean Ikenberry believes he knows the answers to all of our questions and gives little more than lip service to the ideas of mere faculty members.” A sixth took a neutral stand, commenting on the Dean’s style without negative or positive spin: “Dean Ikenberry has a small group of faculty he draws upon, but does not involve the faculty in general.” A few commenters had concerns that the financial structure of the many new initiatives was not transparent.

Two commenters, however, gave the Dean positive marks. One wrote, "I am indeed impressed with Dean Ikenberry's personable leadership style, friendly and kind to all." The second praised him as "a strong supporter of faculty governance."

A final theme was the Dean's treatment of women and instructors and possibly minorities. Two lengthy and sharply worded comments that were not among the open comments sent to the Dean--as well as one brief comment--criticized his treatment of women. They lamented that the Business School has lost senior women faculty and administrators during his tenure and that white males were appointed to top administrative positions. One said that this has demoralized the remaining women and minorities in the School.

In addition to these comments, one rater—whose overall evaluation was positive—wrote "I do not know enough about issues regarding faculty of color. I do not think that we have a problem, but it may be something worth greater attention from our college."

Conclusions

Both the item analysis and open-ended comments indicate that Dean Ikenberry has taken a strong lead in revamping education in the School, particularly at the undergraduate level. Although some faculty expressed a wait-and-see attitude about the effectiveness of the changes, all but the odd dissident voice praised his efforts at change. Change in graduate education, particularly in developing professional master's degrees, was also noted.

There was disagreement between the item ratings and those who commented on the Dean's leadership style. The commenters presented the picture of a hierarchically structured administration that does not pay sufficient attention to faculty input. The relevant items related to such behavior, however, received intermediate ratings: "Sharing the bases of the major decisions he makes;" "Constructively acting on faculty concerns (whether or not you agreed with his decisions);" and "Earning the trust of the faculty." The AAP survey has insufficient information to resolve this issue. Perhaps the Dean does have a top-down style but many faculty respect his decisions. On the other hand, the Dean may wish to adopt a more collaborative approach to decision making.

The one issue that requires attention is the Dean's attitude to and treatment of women and possibly minorities. It is not the provenance of the AAP committee to explore factual events in this regard, but data from both the ratings and the comments suggest that the Dean must seriously reflect on his behavior and improve his efforts in this direction.

The AAP committee considered that Dean Ikenberry is meeting expectations.

Figure 1: Item means and AAP categories.

David Ikenberry

Item	Means:		Pop		AN	
	Pop	AN	R	A	R	A
10 Constructvly acting on ugrad stu concerns	3.8	4.8	■	■	■	■
23 Solid undrstndng: fac gov, Univ pol, & budget	3.8	4.6	■	■	■	■
4 Actively supporting high–qual faculty rsrch	3.8	4.5	■	■	■	■
1 Prvdng ldrship high–qual ugrad teaching	3.7	4.6	■	■	■	■
6 Having vision to lead industry/profession	3.7	4.5	■	■	■	■
24 Tkng resp office logstcs, sys, & supprt stff	3.8	4.3	□	■	■	■
11 Constructvly acting on grad stu concerns	3.3	4.8	□	□	■	■
9 Constructively acting on staff concerns	3.3	4.8	□	■	□	■
25 Treatng faculty of all ranks fair, inclsv way	3.5	4.5	■	■	■	■
18 Rspndng rspctflly, tmly mnnr: fac inquiries	3.7	4.2	■	■	■	■
26 Acting with integrity	3.4	4.4	■	■	■	■
21 Sharing bases of major decisions he makes	3.5	4.3	■	■	■	■
13 Constructvly acting on faculty of color cncrns	3.2	4.6	□	□	□	■
2 Prvdng ldrship high–qual teach profes mast	3.3	4.4	□	■	■	■
27 Earning the trust of the faculty	3.3	4.3	■	■	■	■
8 Constructively acting on faculty concerns	3.3	4.3	■	■	■	■
3 Prvdng ldrship hi–qual teach res mast & doc	3.5	4.1	□	■	■	■
19 Approp involving faculty in decision making	3.4	4.1	■	■	■	■
17 Constructvly managing conflicts among staff	3	4.5	□	■	□	■
7 Positioning Schl/Coll as ldr amng AAU peers	3.3	4.2	□	□	■	■
5 Rewarding high–quality service	3.4	4	□	□	■	■
20 Making decisions in a timely manner	3.3	3.9	□	■	■	■
16 Constructvly managing conflicts among faculty	3.1	3.8	□	■	■	■
14 Making progress toward diversity goals	3.2	3.7	□	■	□	■
22 Fostering equitable, merit–based salary sys	3.1	3.5	■	■	■	■
15 Actively recrtng & retaining underrep faculty	3	3.6	□	■	□	■
12 Constructvly acting on women faculty concerns	2.7	3.6	□	■	□	■

Codes and Abbreviations:

- No consensus
- Bimodal (more than one)
- Areas that need improvement
- Issues to be mindful of
- Assets to protect
- Strengths to build on

AN = Administer–nominated raters
 Pop = General faculty population

R = Consensus based on raw percents, including
 A = Consensus based on adjusted percents, exc

Appendix A: Procedures

The administrator appraisal questionnaires (posted at <http://www.colorado.edu/pba/aap/index.htm>) contained 25 core items addressing the effectiveness of the administrator's performance in key areas, such as administrative/leadership style; support for teaching, research, and service; meeting faculty, staff, and student concerns; and making progress toward diversity goals. Deans had the option submitting additional items on topics they consider of importance to their roles and performance. Faculty members responded to the items using a 5-point Likert-type effectiveness scale (5 = Very Effective, 4= Effective, 3= Neither Effective nor Ineffective, 2= Ineffective, 1= Very Ineffective), plus a "Don't Know/Not Applicable" option, with higher scores indicating more effectiveness.

In addition, space was provided for respondents to write open-ended comments about the dean. The rater had an option to have the open-ended comments transcribed and transmitted to the dean or to have them available only to the AAP committee. The questionnaire was completed online.

In keeping with past AAP practices, item responses were categorized as:

- a) *Strengths to build on*: items rated as effective or very effective by a substantial majority of the faculty (specifically, 60% or higher of respondents gave a rating of 4 or 5 on the scale);
- b) *Assets to protect*: items where at least half of the respondents found the dean's performance to effective or very effective (50-59% of respondents gave a rating of 4 or 5 on the scale);
- c) *Issues to be mindful of*: items judged to be ineffective or very ineffective by a significant minority of respondents (25-39% of respondents gave a rating of 1 or 2 on the scale);
- d) *Areas that need improvement*: items judged by a significant portion of respondents to be ineffective or very ineffective (40% or more of respondents gave a rating of 1 or 2 on the scale)
- e) *Bimodal*: items that meet criteria for two of the above categories. Note that one of these categories must be (a) or (b) and the other (c) or (d). Hence, a bimodal category implies significant disagreement among the group about the dean's strength or weakness in this area.

In the past the percentages used to construct categories were based on all non missing values, including raters who responded to an item with "Don't know/Inapplicable." This year the committee included an additional set of categories based on the above criteria that eliminated "don't know" responses from the denominator.

Members of the AAP committee were Sanjai Bhagat, Gregory Carey (chair), Judith Packer Jesudason, Henry Kapteyn, Susan Mart, Lorrie Shepard, Conrad Stoldt, and James Williams. Frances Costa was the PBA liaison and Cathy Kerry was the PBA statistician.