

To: SACUA

From: Ivo Dinov, Chair, Administration Evaluation Committee (AEC)

Subject: Report on Activities of Administration Evaluation Committee for 2024-2025

AEC Members: Ivo Dinov (Chair), Audrey Bennett, Eric Beuerlein, Mihai Burzo, Yi-Su Chen (on sabbatical winter term 2025), James Wilson Gulvas, Hari Nathan, Kang Geun Shin, Patricia Tillman-Meakins, Camille Wilson

SACUA Liaison: Alex Yasha Yi

ITS Team Members: Bob Jones, Brian Cors, Haripriya Mahadevan, Christopher Gardner, Mandie Chapman

FSO Coordinator: Ann Marshall

Meeting Dates: September 16, October 21, November 18, January 13, February 17, March 17, April 21.

Committee Charge

1. In order to support the long-term longitudinal utility of the rigorous faculty assessment of the University administration, continue with the current AEC format and focus on survey clarifications, process improvements, and error corrections. Significant prospective changes to the AE survey may invalidate some of the temporal-trajectories of the results, or heavily confound time-dependent dynamics with reported outcomes.
 - a. Provide Human Resources (HR) with 2024 AEC survey error data to further enhance the accuracy of HR data for the 2025 survey.
2. Throughout AEC planning efforts maintain effective relationships with the administrators being evaluated and the Information and Technology Services (ITS) team that supports this valuable part of faculty governance at UM.
 - a. Support ITS's efforts to create ITS process documentation for the AEC survey, e.g. in the case of any ITS team staff member changes.
3. Simplify the AEC Committee Charter to reflect the core purpose of the committee and the fundamental principles of faculty self-governance.
 - a. For instance, AEC Charter may be stated more succinctly as follows: *The SACUA Administration Evaluation Committee (AEC) is charged with (1) reviewing the process of evaluating key University Administrators, from department Chairs/Heads, to Deans, Provost, and the University President; (2) planning, implementing, and completing the annual faculty evaluation of administrators survey (typically in early Spring towards the end of each academic year); and (3) supporting faculty, reporting findings, and addressing issues related to faculty assessment of University administration at different levels. To achieve these*



goals, AEC works closely with SACUA, University ITS, and HR to ensure smooth operations.

4. With Faculty Senate Office's support, work on better publicizing the AEC survey and address issues of potential low participation rates, e.g. announce the survey in the Faculty Senate newsletter.
5. Discussions around reinstating a question regarding the evaluations of Assistant Deans, as existed historically.

I. AEC and ITS Team 2024-2025 Action Items Completed

- At the September meeting, the ITS team presented the:
 - U-M Faculty Senate Office (FSO) Administration Evaluation Committee (AEC) Survey Project Overview & Run Book – 2024-2025
 - AEC Survey Project Timeline
- October was the AEC target deadline to finalize (1) the AEC survey questions, and (2) the survey audience. If the HR data is to change, that info is requested in October or earlier.
- At the October meeting, ITS team shared a 2024-2025 Qualtrics demo survey for AEC to review.
- At the February meeting, AEC reviewed the survey communications and made only minor updates (dates, SACUA Chair name, etc.).
- In late February/early March, FSO and ITS finalized the AEC email from President Ono as well as the heads-up administrator email.
- The AEC survey went live on March 18th and closed on April 18th. The final response rate was 25.13% (2,194 responses completed). This is similar to the 2024 response rate of 24.74% (2,099 respondents).
- The subsequent Impact Evaluation Poll (IEP) survey completed by UM administrators will move forward in May as in past years. The IEP is a post-hoc survey of UM administrators that invites feedback on the preceding AEC survey.
- The AEC survey results will be posted [online](#) with a target deadline of June. With FSO assistance, OGC may need to be consulted prior to releasing sensitive data outcomes. As in past years, open-ended AEC survey responses will be shared with the evaluated administrator for a limited time period and then deleted.
- Note that the Provost's Office reviews AEC survey results as part of the [annual reviews](#) of deans (See page 1, "Annual Reviews").

AEC 2024-2025 Review Items and Decisions

- The Dental School was added to the AEC Survey: Dentistry HR had not yet been aware of the AEC survey, and ITS team worked closely with Dentistry to explain the survey and request the needed HR data. On an annual basis, the ITS team needs to manually request data from HR contacts in Ross, Nursing, SMTD, UM-Flint, UM-Dearborn, and now Dentistry.
- Several UM Institutes were contacted for inclusion in the AEC survey, but most declined.



- AEC considered adding Assistant/Associate Deans to the AEC survey. After a review and with preliminary information provided by ITS, AEC decided not to add Assistant/Associate Deans for the following reasons:
 - This HR data is complex, potentially time-intensive to prepare, and presents unique issues related to data mapping. For example, LSA has nine associate deans and some of the deans are likely not relevant to all LSA faculty (social sciences, humanities, etc.). How would AEC determine which faculty would evaluate each associate/assistant dean? Associate dean data for UM-Flint could be similarly challenging. Other departments (not sure which ones) might also present challenges.
 - In addition, 1) associate/assistant dean positions may change more frequently, 2) there is not a full-proof way to pull HR data on associate/assistant deans and, doing so, would require manually trying to create a methodology to pull this HR data and there are concerns of data accuracy, 3) faculty with several appointments may have multiple assistant/associate deans to evaluate and this could make the survey longer, 4) AEC would need to review/draft survey questions relevant to assistant/associate deans and there would be changes to the Tableau report structure, 5) the number of dean-category administrators would increase significantly from 30 to 170+ administrators, 6) in the existing AEC survey, respondents can already provide associate dean feedback in the open-ended questions
 - Overall, it is recommended that AEC be cognizant of not overcomplicating the survey and to avoid confusion of ADs/Dean as well as Vice-Chair/Chair roles. If AEC decides at a future date to add some/all assistant/associate deans, significantly more time will be needed by the ITS team to build this into the AEC survey.
- AEC discussed various possibilities for increasing the response rate of the AEC survey. One idea that was raised several times was to better publicize the AEC survey results. Given the current environment, AEC may need consider how AEC survey results are publicized.
- AEC extended an invitation to the Institute for Healthcare Policy and Innovation (IHPI) to be a part of the AEC survey (ISR, LSI, Residential College directors are currently included). IHPI did not express interest (and has high faculty engagement) and was not added.
- After discussion, AEC chose to not make any changes to the evaluation of the Rackham Dean. All faculty, regardless of their official responsibilities with graduate students, have the opportunity to evaluate the Rackham Dean.
- AEC did not make any changes to DEI question on the AEC survey. At AEC's request, SACUA discussed the DEI AEC survey question that was added to the survey in 2023. SACUA recommended that AEC not remove this question for 2024. AEC then voted via SimplyVoting on the issue, with a majority of AEC members in favor of not removing the DEI survey question.

AEC 2024-2025 Recommendations

- It is recommended that AEC be charged with (1) reviewing the process of evaluating key University Administrators, from department Chairs/Heads, to Deans, Provost, and the University President; (2) planning, implementing, and completing the annual faculty evaluation of administrators survey (typically in early Spring towards the end of each academic year); and (3) supporting faculty, reporting findings, and addressing issues related to faculty assessment of University administration at different levels. To achieve these goals, AEC works closely with SACUA, University ITS, and HR to ensure smooth operations. Note that running the subsequent Impact Evaluation Poll (IEP) survey is not required and may not be necessary each year.
- AEC agenda items that may be considered for fall 2025:
 - AEC received feedback that the dean data was not correctly mapped for the Marsal Family School of Education. FSO/ITS/AEC could discuss the dean structure in Education and follow-up with HR.
 - AEC could review IEP results as one step in considering enhancements to the 2025-2026 survey.
 - Questions remain about whether to include and how to handle AEC DEI data. FSO, SACUA, ITS, and/or OGC may need to be consulted, both regarding posting AEC DEI data online and finalizing AEC 2026 survey questions. AEC could pursue various options for publicizing the AEC survey results in fall 2025.