

To: SACUA

From: Donald S. Likosky, Ph.D., Chair, Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action

Subject: Report on Activities of Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action for 2022-2023

Members:

Donald Likosky - Med School
Hani Bawardi - College Arts & Sciences (Dearborn)
Naomi Binnie - University Library
Adam Burak - Engineering
Arlo Clark-Foos - CASL (Dearborn)
Gabriela Hristova - College Arts & Sciences (Flint)
Jacob Lederman - Dept Behavioral Sciences (Flint)
Massy Mutumba - Nursing
Karen Staller - Social Work
Chuanwu (Wu) Xi - Public Health
Eric Vandenberghe - U-M Faculty Senate *ex officia*
Lucas McCarthy - U-M Faculty Senate *ex officia*

SACUA Liaison: Tom Braun

Meeting Dates: 9/16/22; 10/21/22; 11/17/22; 12/16/22; 1/20/23; 2/17/23; 3/17/23; 4/28/23

Phase One: Evaluation

- September: Introductions and overview of committee charge
- October: Determine specific goals for the year and review of charge
- November: Identify key stakeholders to meet with; review of the grievance process
- December: Review of differences in policies across all U-M campuses

Phase Two: Develop and refine recommendations

- January: Overview of Ann Arbor Process for the Provost Review of Deans
- February: Feedback to enhance and add precision to Provost Review of Deans
- March: Draft of recommendations to send to SACUA
- April: Finalize recommendations; look ahead to next academic year

Committee Charge

1. Evaluation of Deans and Department Chairs
 1. Critically review processes (and their strengths and weaknesses) across UM Schools, Departments and campuses
 2. Recommend specific modifications to existing workflows to enhance review processes and address persistently low evaluation scores
2. Evaluation of processes for UM employees experiencing harassment and retaliation



1. Recommend specific modifications to existing processes to enhance objectivity, fairness to all parties, and resources available to UM employees
2. Recommend specific modifications to faculty grievance resources (e.g., transitioning the grievance form to an electronically available portal on the Academic Human Resources website) to enhance their availability

The COAA strives to advance these two charges in collaboration with other SACUA Committees.

Committee Actions

During this academic year, the Chair of COAA met with the prior Chair, as well as with the Director of the Faculty Senate (Luke McCarthy) and the Faculty Governance Coordinator (Eric Vandenberghe). The purpose of these meetings was to set out a strategic vision for the COAA. In addition, *ad hoc* meetings were convened to discuss strategic planning. The Chair of COAA developed a roadmap for each monthly meeting to achieve tangible recommendations by the end of the academic term. All materials from the COAA (agendas, minutes, documents) were made available electronically to its members through Google Docs to facilitate transparency in communication.

Compilation of Agendas: [click here](#)

Compilation of Meeting Minutes: [click here](#)

Information Obtained

During the first part of the academic year, the Committee set out to discover what was known/unknown with regard to policies/procedures for harassment and retaliation towards U-M faculty. Members of the Committee identified liaisons from across U-M campuses (AA, Dearborn, Flint) who might be helpful in understanding which policies/procedures might be unique to the Central campus. Meetings with these liaisons revealed inter-campus variability in policies, as well as areas for enhancing uniformity in their implementation (e.g., through advancing specificity in the language of the SPGs). In addition, the COAA members discovered that there was a lack of a central website available to faculty to facilitate their process for: (1) understanding their rights; and (2) resources within or outside of U-M to support them in defending any accusations of harassment or retaliation.

2022-2023 Recommendations Stemming from the Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action

- [COAA Recommendations Regarding the Evaluation of Deans](#)
- [COAA Recommendations for a Central Web Page for Procedure Implementation for UM Employees Experiencing Harassment and Retaliation](#)

Appendices

1. COAA Recommendations Regarding the Evaluation of Deans
2. Process for the Provost Review of Deans (October 20, 2021)
3. COAA Recommendations for a Central Web Page for Procedure Implementation for UM Employees Experiencing Harassment and Retaliation

Appendix 1: COAA Recommendations Regarding the Evaluation of Deans

The Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action (COAA) has reviewed and recommended the following enhancements to the existing [Dean Evaluation practice](#). In addition, the COAA attaches a [track-change version](#) of the current Dean Evaluate form.

Problem Statement 1: Faculty often receive precise and measurable performance feedback during their annual reviews with their Department Chair and/or Division Chief. This constructive, evaluative feedback is meant to continuously advance the faculty. The Provost's existing, published annual review guidance for Deans lacks specificity and measurable feedback, which may limit their professional growth ability to succeed in their role.

Recommendation 1. The Provost's annual review of Deans should include precise, measurable and published criteria. These criteria should be published on the Provost's webpage.

Problem Statement 2: Faculty within each of the University of Michigan Ann Arbor's 19+ Schools as well as Dearborn and Flint [campuses](#) are appropriately equipped to provide feedback related to their Dean's performance. Further, despite the collection of annual review data (quantitative and qualitative) on each Dean: (1) there are limited structures in place to gather important unit-specific feedback to contextualize these data and (2) evaluation data are neither retained nor synthesized by members of each unit to inform the Provost's annual review of each Dean.

Recommendation 2.1. The Provost, after seeking input from each school's Executive Committee, should establish a unit-specific Faculty Advisory Committee to provide evaluative feedback for each Dean.

Note bene: Our committee respectfully provides some of the following guiding principles for consideration with regard to the composition and reporting structure for each Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC):

- There should be unit-specific FACs, while recognizing variability in the number of faculty across units (e.g., potentially increasing the risk of identification by a faculty member's direct reports).
- The FACs should be composed of a demographically diverse and representative (including across rank) pool of faculty.
- The member faculty should not have administrative responsibilities.
- The FACs should report directly to the Provost.

Recommendation 2.2. The Faculty Advisory Committee's synthesized recommendations to the Provost, informed by existing annual quantitative and qualitative survey responses, should be incorporated into the Provost's annual review for each Dean (especially for the consideration of their reappointment).

Note bene: Our committee had considerable discussion regarding the retention period for the FAC's synthesized recommendations, but was not able to reach consensus during this academic term.

Appendix 2: Process for the Provost Review of Deans (October 20, 2021)

The provost (working with members of the provost office team), evaluates the performance of each dean in a variety of ways and at a number of junctures. This document provides an overview of the provost's dean assessment process, and how it informs reappointment decisions.

1. Key Qualities

Deans are expected to demonstrate a number of qualities, listed below. This list is explicitly discussed with new deans during their on-boarding, is included in annual reviews and is the framework for the surveys conducted during mid-term reviews.

a. Academic leadership and vision:

In addition to longer-term vision for the school/college, deans are responsible for delivery of a high-quality academic experience for students, and stimulation of innovative, high-impact research, scholarship, or creative work by faculty.

b. Good management, including:

- I. accessibility and visibility to members of their school/college
- II. demonstrated track record of follow through and "getting things done"

c. Successful resource development, and efficient usage of resources

d. Commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion

e. Responsiveness to university priorities and challenges

f. Collaboration, including within the school/college, and with units across U-M

g. Creating a culture of ethics, integrity, and compliance

2. Annual Reviews

Every year, the provost conducts an individualized evaluation of each dean's performance, meeting with them to review areas of excellence as well as areas for focus and improvement. In preparation, deans are asked to assess their own progress towards accomplishing goals that were set at the beginning of the year, to set goals for the year ahead, to address challenges related to the key qualities of a dean and to comment on trends in key data metrics. As part of this annual process, the provost also reviews the available results of the Faculty Senate Administration Evaluation Committee's surveys. (NOTE: SACUA has indicated that the information available may change in the future).

3. Regular Meetings

The provost generally meets with each dean once a month during the academic year, with additional meetings scheduled as needed. While these are primarily focused on current developments, challenges, opportunities and/or matters arising, they also provide an opportunity for engagement related to success and progress in key areas. These discussions are informed by the prior annual review, mid-term review (if it has occurred), current goals and other relevant information.

Members of the provost office team also meet regularly with each dean as matters arise related to academic affairs, budget and other topics.

4. Mid-term Reviews

- a. Overview: This is a 360 review that solicits input from the range of key constituents relevant for successful performance as a dean. This feedback is collected through an electronic survey or email responses to designated group emails. After reviewing the full set of results, the provost meets with the dean to discuss the results, highlighting both identified strengths and focus areas. It is worth noting that all mid-term reviews generate a range of perspectives, including some negative feedback, and the results must be considered in context. For instance, some difficult decisions (such as prudent financial ones) may have been unpopular.
- b. Timing: Feedback for each dean is solicited in the third year of the first five-year term so as to enable the mid-term review results to provide valuable feedback to a dean, with time in their first term to make performance adjustments accordingly.
- c. Process:
 - i. Prior to the start of a dean's mid-term review, the provost is in close communication with the president and the Regents.
 - ii. The provost or special counsel to the provost informs the dean of the upcoming mid-term review.
 - iii. The provost solicits evaluation feedback from the school or college's faculty, staff, and student leaders, as well as from the Academic Program Group, Executive Officers, selected alumni, and deans or persons in equivalent positions at peer schools. The provost's office requests the dean to provide names of alumni and peer individuals at other universities. Faculty, staff, and student leaders have the option of responding anonymously.
 - iv. The full results of the feedback are shared with the provost.
 - v. The provost discusses the outcome of the mid-term review with the president.
 - vi. The provost meets with the dean to discuss feedback from the review so that they may act on it early in their deanship or directorship. After this meeting, only the feedback summary is retained. If significant areas of concern emerge through the evaluative process, the provost works closely with the dean to develop a plan to address the concern.
 - vii. During the remainder of the dean's term, the provost monitors progress on improvement regarding any concerns.

5. Dean Reappointment

- a. No later than the beginning of a dean's fifth year, the provost weighs all of the available information regarding their performance in order to make a decision about whether they have successfully demonstrated strong performance across the key assessment areas, and therefore merit reappointment. Criteria for reappointment are demonstration of excellence in many key areas, and if concerns have been raised, progress in addressing them. The most recent annual review is particularly relevant in this regard.

- b. The provost will contact ECRT, Academic Human Resources, and the Office of the General Counsel to ascertain if any complaints have been received about the dean and if so, the outcome. (Complaints are addressed promptly upon receipt; the reappointment inquiry is to ensure the current provost is aware of all responsive information).
- c. Beginning with the next round of reappointments (for FY2023), the provost will seek input from the school/college executive committee or similar body; the provost will also reach out to the school/college leadership team for input.
- d. Before making a decision on whether to recommend reappointment, the provost discusses the decision with the president.
- e. If the decision is made to recommend reappointment, the provost confirms that the dean is interested in a second term and if so, negotiates terms of the potential reappointment.
- f. Dean reappointments must be approved by the Board of Regents.

Appendix 3: COAA Recommendations for a Central Web Page for Procedure Implementation for U-M Faculty Experiencing Harassment and Retaliation

The Committee on Oversight of Administrative Action (COAA) recommends the development and continued curation of a central web page for faculty who are experiencing harassment and retaliation. The COAA has developed two recommendations to guide the development of this web page, along with some preliminary content to initiate this process.

Problem Statement 1: University of Michigan faculty may be subject to harassment and retaliation. These situations are noted for their associated induced stress, which is inadvertently compounded by a lack of centralized information to guide faculty regarding their rights and/or resources available to them (whether free and/or fee-based). While Academic HR does have a dedicated page for Faculty Grievance procedures, that page is primarily a collection of links to procedural documents. Other U-M specific offices have dedicated websites about services they offer (e.g., the Faculty and Staff Counseling and Consultation Office the University Ombuds). In addition, there are numerous SPGs that are relevant, in addition to the U-M Faculty Handbook. For faculty facing emotionally and mentally taxing harassment and retaliation issues, figuring out where to look for information to help guide their decision making can feel overwhelming.

Recommendation 1. The Provost's office should develop a centralized web page providing faculty-specific guidance (across all U-M campuses) for those experiencing harassment and retaliation.

Note bene: A similar model may be considered to address the needs of all U-M community members.

Problem Statement 2: The needs of and/or resources for faculty facing harassment and retaliation may differ across U-M campuses, schools and departments. In addition, the needs of the faculty are anticipated to be dynamic over time.

Recommendation 2. In partnership with the AAAC, The Provost's office should create a survey to solicit input regarding the perceived information and resource needs of the faculty (by campus, school and department) related to harassment and retaliation. The survey findings should guide the prioritization and phased development of the web page.

Draft Initial Content

- Primary Considerations
 - A more approachable and user-centered design description of the grievance process
 - Identify shared versus distinct pathways for implementing the U-M policies within different schools and campuses
 - Identify resources within and outside of U-M for faculty (e.g., legal counsel, mental health support)
- Additional Considerations

- Information linking to the University's faculty/staff counseling service (FASCCO)
 - Resources available for U-M faculty (e.g., those not involving non-U-M administrators)
 - Resources for U-M faculty facing harassment and retaliation (including those experienced externally through social media) that are free versus fee-based
 - U-M's public safety/police department (DPSS)
 - Idea of a panic button within one's department
 - Frequently asked questions (e.g., to address resources available to faculty who work remotely versus in-person)
-
- [SPG 201.89-1](#) for discrimination and harassment
 - [SPG 601.90](#) for protection from retaliation