Minutes of March 7, 2019 AEC meeting – revised draft with revised questionnaire

Present:

Sarah Lippert, Scott Masten, Eli Matthews (via Skype), Keith Riles (chair, minutes), Wayne Stark, Don Winsor

Announcements

SACUA has instructed us to include Flint faculty in this year's survey, for the first time. SACUA has concluded that the original University Senate mandate to the AEC in 2004 included Dearborn and Flint faculty by default and that both campuses should have been participating since then. Although the Flint faculty did not pass a measure in 2017 to dispense with its faculty survey (which has resulted in leaked comments), whether Flint continues to issue other surveys does not change its required participation in the Senate's process. The hope is that participation in the AEC system, including access to a process that ensures anonymity and secure responses, as well as access to the evaluation of the President and participation in the Opinion of Faculty survey, will demonstrate why the Senate voted to adopt the system for all three campuses.

Although we were also asked by SACUA this year to try to migrate the AEC affiliation compilation and survey hosting to a university-hosted platform, meetings with IT and HR folks back in the fall made it clear that the hurdles are higher than we appreciated. Keith and Don are in their 15th year on the committee and hoping to map out an exit strategy. Some de-scoping of the technical features of the system, particularly the survey reporting machinery, may be necessary, to pass on the responsibilities. We will revisit this issue in summer 2019.

Reviewing the current list of administrators to be evaluated

There was a brief discussion of whether or not any new administrators should be added to the survey. It was decided not to add any new administrators this year.

Reviewing the current questionnaire questions for administrators

In last year's AEC "suggestion box" we received a request from Rob Sellers (UM Chief Diversity Officer) that we add more DEI questions concerning administrator performance. Currently there is a question on the President's questionnaire about "actively promoting diversity, equity and inclusion", but not for other administrators. After some discussion, it was decided to replace this question with one that addresses whether or not the President should "increase efforts" in promoting DEI and to place a corresponding question on other administrator questionnaires. No other changes will be made to administrator questionnaires.

Defining the questions for the "Opinion of Faculty" questionnaire

To avoid allowing the opinion questionnaire to balloon (and possibly thereby depress response rates), it is important to review the continued need for old opinion questions each year, while incorporating new questions of timely interest. In that spirit, it was decided to delete several questions from last year's survey, to tweak the wording of one question (but to preserve its longitudinal data from past years), to split two questions that need to target Ann Arbor and Flint faculty differently (Dearborn has already submitted its own survey to be included in the process– see below) and to add several new topical questions:

- Questions to be deleted from last year's survey:
    - Q4– satisfaction with public safety
    - Q21 – satisfaction with MHealthy
    - Q22 – satisfaction with University Health Services
    - Q27-28 – awareness of / satisfaction with CRLT
    - Q29 – awareness of International Center for international students

- Revised questions:
    - Rewording of Q26 on time spent on clerical duties
    - Split of Q11 on Ombuds services to reflect Ann Arbor / Flint differences
    - Split of Q17 on course management systems to reflect Ann Arbor / Flint differences

- New questions:
    - Support of new SPG on felony disclosure
    - Support of new SPG on romantic relations between faculty & students
    - ~~Support of Assembly resolution on due process~~
    - ~~Support of Assembly resolution on governance at unit levels~~
    - ~~Awareness of template requirements for solicitation of letter writers for promotion cases~~ [decided in post-meeting email discussions not to include this question because of its complexity]
    - Freedom to choose whether or not to write letters of recommendation

After discussions between the AEC chair and SACUA on March 11, 2019, it was decided not to include the two questions concerning the Assembly resolutions, to reword the question on the romantic relations SPG revision and to add an explicit question regarding adequate consultation before the new SPGs were issued.

- The draft revised faculty opinion survey is appended below.

Status of the survey infrastructure and AEC server.

Keith has completed compiling administrator changes (including adding Flint administrators), but still has much work left to deal with faculty affiliations. Don confirmed that the AEC server hardware is ready for use.

Target dates for starting & ending the survey

It was decided tentatively to aim at launching the survey on Wednesday March 20, 2019, with an end date four weeks later on April 17, 2018, but if the launch slips a week, it could still run for four weeks and end on study day (April 24).

Improving faculty response rates

For the last three years President Schlissel has kindly sent out an endorsement and encouragement to faculty to participate in the survey. Last year, the overall response rate topped 30% for the 3rd year in a row, an upward trend undoubtedly assisted by the President's encouragement. His endorsement will be requested again this year.

Other suggestions for enhancing participation, to be looked into this year, include
- Customizing the kickoff & reminder letters with names in the salutations
- Sending out a request to deans to endorse the survey after the President's letter goes out (assuming he agrees to endorse again)
- Asking SACUA to encourage Senate Assembly members to send out endorsements to their colleagues

It was noted that unit administrator endorsements are known in several cases in recent years to have boosted faculty participation.

Dearborn survey

The Dearborn faculty have been requested to provide an updated set of questions for their "Opinions of Faculty" survey. Last year a turnover in faculty governance and the departure of a Dearborn staff member led to there not being an update.

Flint participation

The Flint chancellor and provost will be evaluated, following the model of Dearborn, along with all deans and chairs. By default, Flint faculty will see the same opinions of faculty survey seen by Ann Arbor faculty since most of the questions would be applicable to Flint faculty, and it will introduce them to the kinds of input in institution-wide matters that the AEC process provides. Flint faculty governance may wish in the coming years to supply their own campus-specific survey questions, as Dearborn has done.

Other issues?

The only other substantive comment from last year's suggestion box was a complaint that dry faculty find certain chair-specific questions hard to answer, particularly those regarding the supplying of resources. It was decided that answering "no basis for judgment" or not answering a particular question at all would be the simplest solution for such faculty. Customizing questionnaires to recognize dry faculty for whom certain questions don't apply is not feasible (even some dry faculty do benefit from department resources, including lab space, office space and graduate students).

Appendix A – Draft of 2018-2019 Opinion of Faculty survey

Q1 – I support this statement concerning freedom of speech on campus.
Q2 – I should be able to decline to write a letter of recommendation, for any reason, without penalty.
Q3 – I support the new policy requiring felony charge disclosure by faculty and staff (SPG 601.38). [https://spg.umich.edu/policy/601.38]
Q4 – I am comfortable with the definition of "covered relationship" [link – see below] used in the revised policy regarding romantic relationships between faculty and students (SPG 601.22). [[https://spg.umich.edu/policy/601.22]
Q5 – The University community was adequately consulted before issuance of the above two Standard Practice Guide policies.
Q6 – I am satisfied with the current level of communication regarding responsible faculty response to sexual misconduct by faculty, staff or students.
Q7 – I have adequate access to resources in preparing for safety emergencies.
Q8 – I am aware of the services provided by the ADVANCE Program.
Q9 – The ADVANCE Program benefits the academic mission of my college or school.
Q10 – Recent and ongoing construction / renovation projects for administrative buildings represent responsible choices in allocating capital funds.
Q11 – I am aware of a "Fitness for Duty" policy that could relieve faculty of teaching and other duties. (SPG 201.15)
Q12 – I am aware of the faculty grievance procedures of the University (link).
Q13 – I am aware of the role of the Ombuds in my college or school.
Q14A – **Ann Arbor:** I am aware of the role of the Central Ombuds.
[https://ombuds.umich.edu]
Q14B – **Flint:** I am aware of the role of the Ombudsman.
[https://www.umflint.edu/ombuds]
Q15 – I actively participate in the Initiative on Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI – link).
Q16 – My participation in the DEI Initiative is given positive weight in promotions and merit evaluations.
Q17 – I actively participate in public outreach and education activities that articulate and support the mission of the University of Michigan.

Q18 – My participation in public outreach and education is given positive weight in promotions and merit evaluations
Q19 – Services provided by the Office of Vice President for Research meet my needs.
Q20A – **Ann Arbor:** Services provided by <u>Canvas</u> meet my needs.
Q20B – **Flint:** Services provided by <u>Blackboard</u> meet my needs.
Q21 – Services provided by the University Library meet my needs.
Q22 – Services provided by Facilities & Operations meet my needs.
Q23 – Services provided by the Department of Public Safety meet my needs.
Q24 – Services provided by centralized IT services meet my needs.
Q25 – Services provided by centralized administrative services (Shared Services) meet my needs with respect to travel and other expense reimbursements.
Q26 – Services provided by centralized administrative services (Shared Services) meet my needs with respect to employee benefits support.
Q27 – Too much of my professional time is consumed by clerical duties.

Linked text for "covered relationship":
A *Covered Relationship* includes any relationship which may reasonably be described as sexual, romantic, amorous, and/or dating. Physical contact is not a required element of such relationships. A *Covered Relationship* may exist on the basis of a single interaction.

Appendix B – Draft of new DEI questions for administrators:

President: (replaces Q9):
…should increase efforts to promote diversity, equity and inclusion across the campus.

Chancellor: (new Q11, Dearborn and Flint)
…should increase efforts to promote diversity, equity and inclusion across the campus.

Provost: (new Q9, Ann Arbor):
…should increase efforts to promote diversity, equity and inclusion across the campus.

Provost: (new Q8, Dearborn and Flint):
…should increase efforts to promote diversity, equity and inclusion across the campus.

Dean: (new Q17 for large school, new Q30 for small school):
…should increase efforts to promote diversity, equity and inclusion across the college or school.

Dean of Rackham (new Q11):
…should increase efforts to promote diversity, equity and inclusion across the campus.

Dean of Libraries (new Q9):
…should increase efforts to promote diversity, equity and inclusion across the libraries.

Chair: (new Q22):
…should increase efforts to promote diversity, equity and inclusion in the department.