THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
REGENTS COMMUNICATION

SUBJECT: Faculty Governance Update

As you know, the faculty of the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor and Dearborn recently carried out the third annual web-based evaluation of administrators, including a survey on a variety of general administration issues. We summarize here the final results for all general administration issues and for the evaluation of the President. You can find the full Administration Evaluation Committee's (AEC) results on the web at http://aec.umich.edu, including evaluations of the Dearborn Chancellor, the Ann Arbor & Dearborn Provosts, all Deans, and all department Chairs. We restrict the results reported here to responses from participating Ann Arbor & Dearborn faculty (33% of those eligible responded), although surveys were also carried out in parallel of lecturers and clinical faculty in the Dental School, with a total of 1504 respondents. The possible responses to the multiple choice questions were Strongly Agree(SA), Agree(A), Neutral(N), Disagree(D), Strongly Disagree(SD), and No Basis for Judgment(NBJ). Below are results on general administration issues, (number of respondents and percentage of NBJ responses in parentheses). The SA+A and D+SD responses have been grouped here for greater clarity.

	Agree (%) [SA+A]	Neutral(%) [N]	Disagree(%) [D+SD]
Q1: I support the proposed addition of skybox seating to the Michigan Stadium (875, NBJ = 15%)	24.3	23.3	37.4
Q2: There should be faculty input into designing the planned web-based system for evaluation of instructors (878, NBJ = 3%)	90.1	5.6	1.4
Q3: The present faculty grievance procedures are effective (862, NBJ = 36%)	27.1	25.8	10.7
Q4: Faculty hiring should give strong preference to underrepresented minority applicants (870, NBJ=1%)	46.3	22.9	29.8
Q5: Elected faculty representatives should be more involved in searches to fill administrative positions at the level of Dean or higher (876, NBJ=7%)	69.7	16.4	7.2
Q6: Elected faculty representatives should have a stronger role in the setting of university budget priorities (873, NBJ=6%)	64.4	19.4	10.5
Q7: The University Regents should formally consult the faculty when appointing or reappointing executive officers (876, NBJ=3%)	79.7	12.0	5.4
Q8: The administration's efforts to limit tuition increases have been reasonable (873, NBJ=19%)	43.0	23.6	14.6

The responses to Q1, Q3, Q4, and Q8 can best be described as mixed, but the responses to Q2, Q5, Q6, and Q7 all suggest a strong feeling by responding faculty that they should be involved more deeply in the decisions and policies that affect the university community. Below are responses to evaluation questions concerning President Coleman.

	Agree (%) [SA+A]	Neutral(%) [N]	Disagree(%) [D+SD]
Q1: Actively promotes an environment for scholarly excellence (789, NBJ=9%)	64.9	14.8	11.4
Q2: Actively promotes an environment for teaching excellence (789, NBJ=12%)	56.8	20.2	11.0
Q3: Consults the faculty adequately before making important decisions (788, NBJ=25%)	21.6	25.1	28.3
Q4: Makes excellent administrative appointments (785, NBJ=15%)	39.2	28.9	16.4
Q5: Effectively represents the interests of the university to the Regents and state officials (788, NBJ=15%)	59.6	15.4	9.9
Q6: Is attentive to long-term, strategic issues that affect the university (786, NBJ=8%)	59.9	15.8	16.2
Q7: Successfully raises funds to support the mission of the university (787, NBJ=22%)	58.9	14.0	5.0
Q8: Inspires confidence in leadership overall (786, NBJ=5%)	57.3	17.7	20.2

The responses above suggest strong overall satisfaction from responding faculty with President Coleman's performance, with scores on every question slightly stronger than last year's. The number of responding faculty agreeing or strongly agreeing with each statement outweigh those disagreeing or strongly disagreeing in every category except one (Q3).

The anomalous responses to Q3 (consultation of faculty) merit attention, however. Inadequate consultation of the faculty is a recurring sentiment seen in evaluations of many other individual administrators, particularly at the level of Dean or higher, a pattern seen in previous years, too. We on SACUA share this feeling of the faculty at large. Although we are pleased at steps taken by Provost Sullivan since taking office to involve faculty more deeply in deliberations, especially on purely academic matters, we remain concerned that major policy decisions will continue to be made by the President without adequate consulting us or the faculty at large.

We were encouraged by positive sentiments expressed by some Regents at our recent luncheon regarding stronger communication with faculty and faculty governance. These monthly updates you receive from us are meant to foster that communication, but we propose two additional steps to strengthen communication from the faculty to you: 1) a schedule of regular meetings between SACUA and the Regents (more frequent and formal than the annual social luncheon); and 2) addition of a "Comments for Regents" questionnaire as part of the annual AEC survey.

SUBMITTED: December 2006