





## Executive Summary

Purpose: Texas A&M University (TAMU) contracted with DataWorks Partners to analyze responses to a university stakeholder survey, which was sent to students, faculty, staff, and former students by President Banks when the TAMU [Comprehensive Review report](#) was released on October 25, 2021. The purpose of the survey and analysis is to inform President Banks and TAMU's actions in response to the *Comprehensive Review*.

Survey Response: There were 2,922 substantive responses to the president's request for feedback, 2,765 through the survey and 157 through emails. Of the respondents, nearly one-third were former students, one-fifth each were faculty and staff, nearly a quarter were students, and the remainder coming from the "other" group. (See Exhibit 1 for more detail.)

Data Volume: There were 10 sections of the Comprehensive Review, and the survey was organized into those same divisions and included an additional "General" section where respondents could provide input on one or more topics of their choosing. The survey as well as an option for emailed responses were open-ended, allowing respondents to submit unrestricted text input. The roughly 1.1 million words of feedback received translates into approximately 2,200 pages of single-spaced input to this effort from the TAMU community.

Survey Sections: The report section that respondents most frequently addressed was the Academic Realignment section, with over 62% of respondents commenting, and the General response section, with 54% of respondents commenting, was the next highest. These were followed by the Provost Office (32%), Information Technology (25%), and Academic and Strategic Collaborations (25%). The least frequently addressed section was Finance and Business Operations, with a little fewer than one in six (or 16%) of the respondents commenting on that section. (See Exhibit 2 for more detail.)

Keywords/Topics:

Keywords and phrases were extracted from the voluminous text data using entity analysis and further aggregated into similar or synonymous topics. (Exhibit 3 as well as exhibits in Appendix 3 provide summaries of the data.) Some of the themes that emerged include the following, which are reflections of the *Comprehensive Review* content as well as stakeholders' interests and priorities:

- Students;
- Academic programs and organization;
- Arts;
- Culture and tradition;
- Diversity, equity, and inclusion;
- Leadership, mission, and vision; and
- Efficiency and operations.



## Purpose

Texas A&M University (TAMU) contracted with DataWorks Partners to analyze responses to a university stakeholder survey, which was sent to students, faculty, staff, and former students by President Banks when the TAMU [Comprehensive Review report](#) was released. The purpose of the survey and analysis is to inform President Banks and TAMU's actions in response to the *Comprehensive Review*. An example of the request for community feedback is in [Appendix 1](#).

## Comprehensive Review Report

MGT Consulting and Martin+Crompton Group (M+CG) were hired by the Texas A&M University System in June 2021 to conduct a high-level, comprehensive review of major functional areas at Texas A&M University. This review focused on the organizational structure of central offices at the executive level and administrative units at the college level. The consultant team was charged with conducting interviews with a wide range of individuals in leadership positions, including faculty senate leadership, as well as providing the opportunity for input through surveys of faculty, staff, students, and former students. The consultant team was asked to identify changes that would restructure Texas A&M University in a significant way to increase effectiveness and transparency and to contribute to overall student success. The report is at

[https://cache.cloud.tamu.edu/feedback/TAMU\\_Comprehensive\\_Review\\_10192021.pdf](https://cache.cloud.tamu.edu/feedback/TAMU_Comprehensive_Review_10192021.pdf).

## The Survey

TAMU leadership is incorporating university stakeholders' input into its response to the *Comprehensive Review* report. Part of this input has come through a survey of stakeholders. Notice of and link to the report and the survey was sent to students, faculty, staff, and former students on the morning of October 25th, and the survey was open for responses for three weeks, closing at the end of the day on November 15th. The survey was structured according to the findings sections in the *Comprehensive Review* report, asking survey subjects to comment on each section of the report as well as providing the opportunity for general comments spanning multiple sections or not specific to any section. Survey subjects were asked to self-identify as one of five respondent types (student, faculty, staff, former student, other) and were also asked for some identifying information (Name and TAMU university identification number, or UIN, if available). Only a name and respondent type were required fields, all others being optional. In addition to providing feedback through the survey form, recipients were also provided with an email address through which to send comments. All survey responses and emails were open-ended, meaning the respondents were free to write as little or as much as they pleased. The survey instrument is in [Appendix 2](#).



### Recipients and Respondents

Emails with links to the report and the survey were sent to current students, faculty, and staff as well as former students. There were a total of 2,922 substantive

responses to the president’s request for feedback, 2,765 through the survey and 157 through emails. Exhibit 1 shows the distribution of those responses among the different stakeholder groups (faculty, staff, students, former students, others).

**Exhibit 1: Survey Population and Responses by Group**

Group	Number Who Responded to the Survey	Group as Percentage of the Total Respondents	Number in Group Who Received the Survey	Percentage of Survey Recipients in Group Who Responded
Faculty	562	19.2%	5,199	10.8%
Staff	590	20.2%	13,935	4.2%
Students	667	22.8%	73,463	0.9%
Former Students	917	31.4%	350,998	0.3%
Others	186	6.4%	N/A	N/A
TOTAL	2,922	100.0%	N/A	N/A

### Data Volume

The raw survey data - the full text responses to each of the 11 survey sections - were exported from the Qualtrics platform for the survey period of October 25 through November 15. Once duplicate responses were removed and the survey and email data (full text of 157 emails) were combined, the resulting analytical dataset contained approximately 1,100,000 words. Based on an estimate that a typical single-spaced

page with 1” margins is approximately 500 words, this means that the TAMU community offered roughly 2,200 pages of single-spaced input to this effort.



## Survey Sections

Exhibit 2 shows a summary of each stakeholder group's responses broken down by sections of the report to which they directed their responses. (The survey form was divided into 10 sections, aligned with the 10 report sections, as well as an eleventh section for general feedback. The emails responses were all categorized as "general" and added to this eleventh section for the purposes of the analysis.)

Academic Realignment was the section receiving the most comments overall (62% of respondents), and within stakeholder groups, this was true for Faculty, Students, and Others.

The General feedback section of the survey received the second most responses (54%), and many respondents aired their views on multiple issues at once through this section as well as specific issues not covered in the report. This was the survey section most often completed by Former Students.

In descending order, the next most common sections receiving feedback were the Provost Office (32%), Information Technology (25%), and Academic and Strategic Collaborations (25%). Even the section with the lowest frequency of responses, Finance and Business Operations, received input from nearly one in six (or 16%) of the respondents.



**Exhibit 2: Survey Sections and Responses by Group\***

Survey Section	<b>TOTAL, ALL RESPONDENTS</b> <i>Population Percentage in ()</i>	Faculty	Staff	Students	Former Students	Others
<b>TOTAL, ALL SECTIONS</b>	<b>2,922</b>	<b>562</b>	<b>590</b>	<b>667</b>	<b>917</b>	<b>186</b>
Provost Office	<b>939 (32%)</b>	273	238	127	257	44
Faculty Affairs	<b>612 (21%)</b>	213	114	57	208	20
Academic and Strategic Collaborations	<b>731 (25%)</b>	187	167	109	240	28
Academic Realignment	<b>1,817 (62%)</b>	450	264	497	502	104
Student Affairs	<b>680 (23%)</b>	142	168	111	240	19
Facilities	<b>596 (20%)</b>	139	169	67	198	23
Finance and Business Operations	<b>466 (16%)</b>	106	173	35	138	14
Human Resources and Organizational Effectiveness	<b>567 (19%)</b>	128	229	39	153	18
Information Technology	<b>736 (25%)</b>	205	277	60	166	28
Marketing and Communications	<b>505 (17%)</b>	107	161	32	183	22
General (no specific section)	<b>1,590 (54%)</b>	325	339	224	599	103





## Keywords/Topics (Entity Analysis)

Keywords and phrases were extracted from the voluminous text data using entity analysis. Entity analysis inspects the text for nouns and returns information about those entities (e.g., number of mentions).

The analysis focused on the most frequently mentioned substantive nouns or combinations of nouns (i.e., phrases, topics). Note that most of the items presented in this report are consolidated thematic groups of entities. For example, Money/Finances includes variations on those two words and variations on “budget,” “dollars,” and “funds” as well.

For more detail about the methods behind this analysis and the data preparation supporting it, see the [Methodological Notes](#) section of this report.

Exhibit 3 below lists the most commonly appearing topics, and following the exhibit is some discussion of the topics and some overarching themes that came out of that list and the thousands of responses that generated the list. The Methodological Notes section describes how these topical words/phrases were curated from the large body of text. And for more detail about these common topics, broken down by respondent type, see the additional two exhibits of the entity data in [Appendix 3](#).



**Exhibit 3: Most Common Topics Mentioned by Respondents**

Topics (“entities”)	Number of Mentions	Topics (“entities”), cont.	Number of Mentions, cont.
Students	10,710	Architecture	1,510
Colleges/Schools	10,360	Advising	1,468
Departments	7,687	Health/Healthcare	1,279
Programs	5,819	Human Resources	1,192
Sciences	5,062	Centralization/Consolidation	1,113
TAMU	4,963	Geosciences	1,096
Faculty	4,951	Leadership	1,041
Arts	3,557	Provost	1,014
University	3,526	Bush School	979
Money/Finances	3,064	Values	972
Recommendation	2,884	Community	946
Staff	2,875	Reorganization/Realignment	899
Campus	2,103	Mission/Vision	887
Research	2,007	Administration	753
Construction Science	1,989	Aggie	745
Engineering	1,961	Journalism	720
Change	1,878	Kinesiology	711
Library	1,760	Culture	565
Degrees	1,703	President	562
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	1,616	Corps of Cadets/Military	551
Facilities	1,610	Student Affairs	532
Marketing/Communication	1,593	College of Arts and Sciences	478
Education	1,520	Tradition	327





Students. Not surprisingly, “students” tops the list of topics mentioned and is at or near the highest-frequency topics for every stakeholder group. The *Comprehensive Review* report addresses specific student-related issues such as advising, student organizations, and counseling services, and it also makes recommendations regarding academic programs that generate high interest among and concerning students. The university’s student-focused mission is reflected in the survey responses, and regardless of their perspective on the recommendations in student-related areas, it seems clear that stakeholders expect the quality of students’ university experiences to be a priority.

Academic Programs and Organization.

Proposed changes in organizational structure, particularly with regard to academic offerings and organization, generate a lot of questions and feedback. General organizational entities like “colleges/schools,” “department,” and “programs” as well as specific divisions and programs about which recommendations were made (e.g., geosciences, engineering, architecture, arts and sciences, construction science, kinesiology) reflect deep interest in potential changes. A high number of references to “change” and to “reorganization/realignment” and “centralization/consolidation” further emphasizes this point.

Arts. High numbers of mentions of “art” and “arts” are driven by recommendations related to a College of Arts and Sciences and for a Performing Arts Center. Both

appear to elicit strong reactions, mixed (both positive and negative) regarding the former and mostly positive regarding the latter.

Culture and Tradition. TAMU identity and traditions are important to the community. Mentions of the institution’s history, tradition, culture, and unique character appear in many responses. Specific identification with (e.g.) the Corps of Cadets and land grant/agricultural connections reflects the ways that the TAMU community expresses its identity and also the ways the responses reflect tensions and variation within that shared identity.

DEI. “Diversity, equity, and inclusion” is a topical category in Exhibit 3 that incorporates a variety of words and ideas expressed by respondents. Not surprisingly, given heightened national political focus on critical race theory and the widespread attention to various dimensions of equity and inclusion in higher education institutions, responses reflected strong opinions and a wide array of perspectives within the TAMU community. Responses reflected ideological differences, concern about TAMU’s position in the wider higher education “marketplace,” and different aspects of belonging or engagement on campus (for students, faculty, and staff). Because of the complexity of the issues and the breadth of identities contained within this topic, the topical group for the purpose of this analysis included variations on diversity, equity, and inclusion, references to racial, ethnic, gender, and sexual identity, and discussions of critical race theory.



Related to both this area and reorganization recommendations, many comments focused specifically on potential changes to the Office of Diversity.

Leadership and Mission. Collectively, responses included thousands of mentions of leader, leadership, mission, vision, president, provost, and other senior roles at the university. The respondents recognize this report as potentially signalling a strategic path forward. The request for feedback came directly from the president, and many of the responses addressed President Banks directly. Responses about leadership, mission, and vision were often interwoven with references to the institution's traditions and culture.

Efficiency and Operations. Although neither of these words appear directly in the most common topics, they capture themes expressed through other topics and details appearing in numerous responses. For example, discussions of facilities, finances, administration, and various report recommendations related to centralization/consolidation and reorganization/realignment contain references to efficiency, both positive and negative. Comments often expressed a balance between operational efficiency and effective delivery of education and services.



## Methodological Notes

**Population:** As mentioned above, the stakeholders who were contacted to provide feedback included all students, faculty, and staff as well as all former students for whom the university had email addresses. The request for input came in the form of an email from President Banks, and it provided a link to the online survey as well as an email address for those not wishing to or able to access the survey. An example of the email to the community (this one to the former students) is in [Appendix 1](#), and a copy of the survey instrument is in [Appendix 2](#). Survey responses were limited to one per person, and email responses were checked to ensure only one email per person was included in the body of text input as well. In addition, recipients of the president's email request had the ability to pass it on to other potential respondents, and the "Other" category of respondents includes such recipients (e.g., parents of students, local businesses, etc.).

**Data Used:** Survey data exported from Qualtrics included only those data elements that may have value in the analysis. Name and Universal Identification Number (or UIN) are retained within the Qualtrics platform but are not stored with the analytical datasets used in this analysis. Each survey response has a unique identifier with no connection to personally identifiable information, and the survey data used in this analysis also include the respondent type (faculty, staff, student, former student, other), the text responses provided grouped within the 10 report

sections plus those submitted in the General comments category, and the date the survey was completed (for internal quality checking purposes). For the emailed responses that were appended as part of the analytical dataset, analysts manually scanned each email and identified the respondent type, and the responses were all categorized as General (i.e., not specific to any one of the report sections). Note that a handful of the emails appear to be collective input from groups of faculty or staff. For the purposes of this analysis, those were treated as if they were from individuals. Also, some of the emailed responses were sent with attachments, such as spreadsheets and diagrams. Those attachments were reviewed individually by university leadership but were not included in this text analysis.

**Data Preparation:** In some cases, survey responses required some degree of "cleaning" to be more suitable for analysis.

- Manually coded emails - Analysts read through the 157 emailed responses and identified (in most cases) the respondent type, or otherwise indicated "Other" when the respondent type was unknown. All emailed responses were assigned to the General feedback item.
- Omitted empty surveys - The survey software created records when an individual entered the survey, even if none of the 11 feedback items contained data. Those survey records were excluded from the counts due to lack of usable data.



- Omitted non-substantive responses - There were numerous survey items in which respondents entered non-substantive feedback, such as “huh,” “na,” “no comment,” and other similar text. These were omitted from the analysis data.
- Consolidated identical/repeated text within surveys - There were some surveys in which respondents entered the identical response in each cell - i.e., all 11 survey items contained the same sentence(s). In such cases, the response was assigned to the General feedback cell, and the other identical responses were omitted.

Entity Analysis: In addition to the descriptive summaries of the data (i.e., counts of responses by respondent type and response category), DataWorks Partners used the Google Natural Language API as an entity analysis tool. Ultimately, the entity analysis was an iterative process that started with the Google API and included additional steps. The Google API identified over 8,500 key words and phrases (nouns) from the 1.1 million-word dataset in the initial run of the process. Following are some significant parts of the analysis.

- The API excludes common, non-substantive words (prepositions, pronouns, etc.).
- Analysts reviewed and made subjective judgments concerning other non-substantive or relatively

- uninformative words and phrases (e.g., sometime, anybody, state).
- Analysts combined similar/related terms into entity groups (i.e., topics). For example, the entity group “TAMU” combines all the various ways that respondents referred to the university by name. These combinations were based on knowledge of language and context. For example, analysts combined “faculty,” “professor,” “professors,” “instructor,” “instructors,” and various phrases using those words (e.g., “engineering faculty” or “adjunct professors”) into a single “faculty” topic. Some of these were the result of more subjective decisions that were made after review of the report content and initial groupings and after internal discussions. One example is the combination of variations on the word “unit” with variations on the word “department” in the overall “departments” topic.
- In some cases, words or phrases may be double-counted in multiple topics (e.g., “aggie engineering students” as a key phrase identified by the natural language processing would be counted with “Aggies,” “engineering,” and “students”).

Data presented in the report (Exhibit 3 and [Appendix 3](#)) include 46 resulting topics that were considered substantive, relevant to the report content, and for which there were over 300 mentions in the collective responses.





## Appendix 1: Email from President Banks to Former Students

Texas A&M University Former Students:

During my first weeks as president, I held listening sessions with the leadership of our colleges and schools, faculty, staff, students, former students and other key stakeholders, to hear their challenges, opportunities and ideas.

In addition to listening sessions, I also focused on learning. I reviewed many strategic plans that were developed throughout various units, university-wide.

Over the past four months, one of the premier consultancies in higher education has reviewed our administrative functions and structure.

The report of the findings and recommendations has been provided to Texas A&M. The next step in our process is critically important: receiving reaction and feedback by the entire university community regarding the recommendations in the report.

**The report has been posted online at [feedback.tamu.edu](https://feedback.tamu.edu)** . I invite you to review the report and provide your thoughts on the website form.

Input will be accepted on this website over the next two weeks. We are utilizing an external firm to collect and analyze the input to ensure a thorough and unbiased evaluation. This will allow me and our leadership team to review all the information in an efficient manner.

I want to underscore the importance of sharing your feedback. All perspectives are important and will be considered. The survey asks for name and connection to the university. This information will not be provided to the university in the analysis; it is intended to provide the firm with a sense of respondent representation.

After thorough review of the input, I anticipate announcing in early December which recommendations will be accepted, rejected, modified or require further study.

Next steps will include the formation of implementation committees and working groups. Forums will be held to discuss implementation.

I look forward to your participation as we move forward.

M. Katherine Banks

President



## Appendix 2: Survey Instrument

*This report draws on data from the following survey, developed and administered by the TAMU Office of Marketing and Communications.*

\*\*\*\*\*

Howdy and thank you for taking the time to provide your feedback related to the MGT report. Questions marked with an asterisk (\*) are required.

If you have any issues submitting your feedback, please email your responses to [mgtreport@tamu.edu](mailto:mgtreport@tamu.edu). Thank you.

Q1: Your Name (\* Required)

Q2: If you know your UIN, please provide it:

Q3: Please choose your primary role: (\* Required)

- Faculty
- Staff
- Student
- Former Student
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

*You will have the opportunity to provide feedback in response fields related to each section of the report. A comment section is also provided at the end of this form for general feedback.*

Q4: Provost Office. Please provide your comments related to the Provost Office:

Q5: Faculty Affairs. Please provide your comments related to Faculty Affairs:





Q6: Academic and Strategic Collaborations. Please provide your comments related to Academic and Strategic Collaborations:

Q7: Academic Realignment. Please provide your comments related to Academic Realignment:

Q8: Student Affairs. Please provide your comments related to Student Affairs:

Q9: Facilities. Please provide your comments related to Facilities:

Q10: Finance and Business Administration. Please provide your comments related to Finance and Business Administration:

Q11: Human Resources and Organizational Effectiveness. Please provide your comments related to Human Resources and Organizational Effectiveness:



Q12: Information Technology. Please provide your comments related to Information Technology:

Q13: Marketing and Communications. Please provide your comments related to Marketing and Communications:

Q14: General Feedback. Please provide your comments related to general feedback, process, or other sections not listed above:



Appendix 3: Additional Detailed Data from the Entity Analysis

Exhibit 4: Most Common Topics Mentioned, by Respondent Type (total mentions)

Topic ("Entity")	Faculty	Staff	Students	Former Students	Others
Students	2,310	2,599	563	3,018	2,220
Colleges/Schools	3,245	2,263	579	1,663	2,610
Departments	2,895	1,121	369	2,261	1,041
Programs	2,178	970	306	1,168	1,197
Sciences	1,904	941	291	573	1,353
TAMU	1,123	1,696	280	1,162	702
Faculty	2,604	738	236	864	509
Arts	1,199	716	187	509	946
University	1,197	923	266	740	400
Money/Finances	780	646	126	1,060	452
Recommendation	959	829	99	797	200
Staff	609	304	112	1,707	143
Campus	500	400	125	829	249
Research	1,108	188	107	425	179
Construction Science	244	820	170	91	664
Engineering	387	647	176	198	553
Change	646	386	80	533	233
Library	833	137	203	527	60
Degrees	507	407	102	258	429
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	455	667	89	264	141
Facilities	414	390	102	553	151
Marketing/Communication	336	323	75	792	67



Topic (“Entity”)	Faculty	Staff	Students	Former Students	Others
Education	587	331	134	300	168
Architecture	251	660	197	123	279
Advising	481	140	72	463	312
Health/Healthcare	735	116	57	262	109
Human Resources	195	82	36	852	27
Centralization/Consolidation	445	171	36	415	46
Geosciences	268	110	47	105	566
Leadership	309	291	70	263	108
Provost	439	161	45	329	40
Bush School	445	151	41	85	257
Values	197	390	56	183	146
Community	278	177	65	325	101
Reorganization/Realignment	309	206	69	205	110
Mission/Vision	390	145	46	244	62
Administration	286	131	44	189	103
Aggie	60	412	49	118	106
Journalism	216	279	34	115	76
Kinesiology	578	12	14	56	51
Culture	111	283	26	83	62
President	248	143	30	103	38
Corps of Cadets/Military	23	394	21	76	37
Student Affairs	68	91	15	327	31
College of Arts and Sciences	211	64	27	74	102



Tradition	28	198	13	51	37
-----------	----	-----	----	----	----

**Exhibit 5: Most Common Topics Mentioned, by Respondent Type (Per 100 Respondents)**

Topic ("Entity")	Faculty	Staff	Students	Former Students	Others
Students	411	441	84	329	1,194
Colleges/Schools	577	384	87	181	1,403
Departments	515	190	55	247	560
Programs	388	164	46	127	644
Sciences	339	159	44	62	727
TAMU	200	287	42	127	377
Faculty	463	125	35	94	274
Arts	213	121	28	56	509
University	213	156	40	81	215
Money/Finances	139	109	19	116	243
Recommendation	171	141	15	87	108
Staff	108	52	17	186	77
Campus	89	68	19	90	134
Research	197	32	16	46	96
Construction Science	43	139	25	10	357
Engineering	69	110	26	22	297
Change	115	65	12	58	125
Library	148	23	30	57	32
Degrees	90	69	15	28	231
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion	81	113	13	29	76
Facilities	74	66	15	60	81
Marketing/Communication	60	55	11	86	36



Education	104	56	20	33	90
<b>Topic ("Entity")</b>	<b>Faculty</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Students</b>	<b>Former Students</b>	<b>Others</b>
Architecture	45	112	30	13	150
Advising	86	24	11	50	168
Health/Healthcare	131	20	9	29	59
Human Resources	35	14	5	93	15
Centralization/Consolidation	79	29	5	45	25
Geosciences	48	19	7	11	304
Leadership	55	49	10	29	58
Provost	78	27	7	36	22
Bush School	79	26	6	9	138
Values	35	66	8	20	78
Community	49	30	10	35	54
Reorganization/Realignment	55	35	10	22	59
Mission/Vision	69	25	7	27	33
Administration	51	22	7	21	55
Aggie	11	70	7	13	57
Journalism	38	47	5	13	41
Kinesiology	103	2	2	6	27
Culture	20	48	4	9	33
President	44	24	4	11	20
Corps of Cadets/Military	4	67	3	8	20
Student Affairs	12	15	2	36	17
College of Arts and Sciences	38	11	4	8	55
Tradition	5	34	2	6	20

