

TO: Brian Barkdoll, Senate President

DATE: April 28, 2014

FROM: Glenn D. Mroz, President

SUBJECT: Comments on 2014 Evaluation

CC: Mary Babcock
Gerald Caneba
Kelly Kallio
Madhukar Vable,

Chair

Thank you for conducting the Presidential review and review of the Executive Team.

There is a lot of interesting information in the report as usual, and it will be helpful in moving Michigan Tech forward. In this response, I will also reiterate some improvements that I think should be implemented to make this an even more robust evaluation in the future.

We were encouraged to see that 71% of faculty, 89% of professional staff, and 91.6% of represented staff who replied to the survey enjoy working here. Likewise it is good to see their optimism about Michigan Tech's future.

There were comments related to employees pursuing more education as well as the inability to do so and we will work to do a better job of letting people know of the educational opportunities that are open to Michigan Tech employees. Continuing to provide education opportunities for leadership and career growth is perhaps the most important issue to ensure Michigan Tech's future.

If one looks at the overall picture (Table 5), the most concern from respondents was expressed about three major issues: compensation, budgeting, and information technology (IT). We will be working on each of these in the coming months with Deans, Directors and others. A follow-up survey has already gone out to the campus community to get a better sense of the issues related to IT. After July 1, 2014, Information Technology will report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and a new governance structure for IT will be developed which will include representation by Senate constituents. Work on compensation, and budgeting will proceed over the next few months.

With regard to perceptions that past surveys did not result in positive action, here are just a few examples where these have made a difference.

- We have initiated an advanced training program in conjunction with Gogebic for many of the Office Professionals this spring.
- We have conducted more budget forums so people can learn more about the budget process and its relationship to the strategic plan.
- With the expectation of comments regarding IT on the survey, there is currently a follow up survey to more precisely define some of the issues there.

- And many more day to day changes – many related to implementing Lean processes.

Similarly, here are a few examples related to compensation issues mentioned in previous surveys:

- Changes to health care this past year were minimized: The HDHP/HSA plan was unchanged, and monthly premiums for the PPO increased by only \$4 per person. The reimbursement for eye care was reset to the full \$350 and dental remained unchanged. All are within the bounds set by the state legislature.
- The FY 15 budget includes funding to increase the promotion increment to Professor from \$10,000 to \$11,000 on top of whatever merit raise a chair might allocate; the promotion increment to Associate Professor with tenure will be increased from \$7,500 to \$8,000.

Finally, the Chair of the Administrative Affairs Committee requested responses to the seven items listed below:

Senate Recommendation 1. The executive team creates a list of action items that is distributed to all employees of Michigan Tech with updates given periodically on the progress of accomplishment.

Response: The executive team develops action items each year in conjunction with the Board related to the strategic plan. Action items are reflected in the plan as well as the Milestones and are addressed over the year. Results are presented at Open Forums, Board of Control meetings, Senate meetings, Budget Forums, Academic Affairs meetings to name a few.

Senate Recommendation 2. The Senate needs to identify the issues that should be addressed in the next annual survey of the President and if warranted then slightly different survey instruments should be designed for each group.

Response: To assist the Senate with next year's survey, there are faculty members on campus who specialize in the development and evaluation of surveys. We suggest that the Senate Administrative Policy Committee enlist their help to make changes that will better inform us all.

In particular, demographic information such as age, gender, income level, longevity, tenure status, academic rank, union affiliation and perhaps others would help in identifying needs of the respondents. Also, while Deans and Chairs are included in an "administrative" group, there is no equivalent administrative group for staff (e.g. directors, research center directors, executive directors, associate vice presidents etc.). Research staff might be an additional group to consider separately as their numbers grow.

All of these along with the inclusion of common statistical measures would make for a more robust review. Finally, conclusions related to the motivations of the 55% of the

people who did not provide data, would seem to be outside the bounds of normal statistical analysis and amount to speculation on the part of the authors as there are no data as to why anyone chose not to fill out the survey.

Senate Recommendation 3. Unit administrators should clearly explain the reasons for salary increases given to individuals to dispel the perception of unfairness in salary and benefit allocations.

Response: In most academic units, merit raises are defined through algorithms that take into account contributions to teaching, research and service. Administrative units have analogous procedures. At times, promotional or equity adjustments are also used to reflect changes such as assignments that increase responsibility or rapid changes in the regional and national compensation market. Each VP along with the CFO and CIO relate to their staff the need for adequate explanation of an individual's salary increase. However, explanations of co-worker's performance are personnel matters protected by law.

Recently, Human Resources has introduced an Annual Performance Management process that is being piloted for those in the Vice President for Administration and Vice President for Research areas. Go to <http://www.mtu.edu/hr/training-event-services/training-event-services/> to read more.

Senate Recommendation 4. A study over 20 years should be conducted to determine if the strategy of retaining exceptional individuals by giving a large salary increase works. The result of the study should be released to dispel the perception of unfairness in salary and benefit allocations.

Response: It is within the purview of the Senate to do this sort of analysis and meaningful input would be welcome.

Senate Recommendation 5. The Ombuds should conduct confidential one-on-one interview with the IT employees and make a recommendation to the executive team whether there is a morale problem in IT and the causes of it.

Response: The Ombuds is an independent and impartial arbiter, receiving and investigating concerns that are brought forward by individuals or groups of individuals. The Ombuds can respond if individuals initiate contact and people with concerns are encouraged to do so.

Senate Recommendation 6. The Senate should develop an annual review process of IT leadership the way it did for academic leadership.

Response: The survey package did include biographic information for Executive Team Member and Chief Information Officer, Walt Milligan. IT has reported to Dr. Milligan since 2006 but it seems there were no data reported by the committee for his performance. The committee may want to review the survey results to see if data were collected, and if so, to report it.

Senate Recommendation 7. Issues on which the President or the executive team got an

average below 3 for any group should be examined seriously and made part of the action list referred to in recommendation 1 that would be sent to Michigan Tech. community.

Response: The executive team has reviewed these and they will be addressed over the coming year. Results will be presented at Open Forums.