



THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER  
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85724

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE  
DEPARTMENT OF SURGERY

*Distributed to Faculty  
Senate members with  
2/5/79  
Agenda*

January 22, 1979

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: C. F. Zukoski, M. D.  
Chairman, Committee of Eleven

*C. F. Zukoski, M.D.*

SUBJECT: Report on Intercollegiate Athletics:  
New Motions

1. At the December fourth meeting of the Faculty Senate, the discussion re motion #3 on the restructuring of the Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics focused on the fact that the motion did not meet the policies of the Board of Regents requiring two-thirds of the members to be faculty and staff of the University of Arizona. Therefore, the Committee of Eleven presents the following motion to the Faculty Senate:

In order to encourage greater Faculty voice in discussions regarding Athletic policies and budgets that affect the entire University community, the Committee of Intercollegiate Athletics shall have in its membership three faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate upon nomination by the Committee on Committees.

2. Due to the change in Athletic Conference, the University of Arizona is no longer specifically computing a grade point average for athletes as there is no grade point average required in the P. A. C. Therefore, the Committee of Eleven withdraws its motion #6.

*Distributed to Faculty of the University  
with 2/5/79 Agenda*

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
TUCSON, ARIZONA 85721

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION  
AND ATHLETICS

David H. Strack, *Director*

TELEPHONE (602) 884-2200



*McKale Memorial Center*

January 25, 1979

Memo To: University of Arizona Faculty Senate

From: David H. Strack, Director of Physical Education and Athletics *David H. Strack*

Regarding: Intercollegiate Athletic Financial Report

Please find attached a Financial Statement of Operations for the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics for the year ending June 30, 1978.

On page one you will find listed revenues and expenses for each category that we have in our department. Even though the statement is labeled as Unaudited Statement of Operations for the Year Ending June 30, 1978, the figures do tie in with the audited Annual Report of the University of Arizona for that year.

On page two we have tried to explain some items which, perhaps, are not clearly defined on the Statement of Operations.

Page three defines salaries for the Department of Physical Education and Athletics and addresses itself to the state funds which are used to support portions of salaries of people engaged in Intercollegiate Athletics. The Committee of Eleven had asked for a pro rata share of salaries for administrators, coaches, and staff personnel and these figures should answer that question.

Page four addresses itself to the tuition waivers which are granted by the Board of Regents to the University of Arizona for athletic purposes. One-half of a waiver is used for a student-athlete who is granted one at midterm. The fifth year tuition waiver is used for the student-athlete who has completed his eligibility, who meets certain academic qualifications, and who needs one or two more semesters to earn his degree.

Page five categorizes by sport the services we received from Physical Resources and the amount of money that was paid to Physical Resources by Intercollegiate Athletics during the academic year. These direct cost dollar figures are included in the expense column of each sport which is listed on page one. Physical Resources does not define any charges for the care and maintenance which is performed on our buildings and grounds during the time when athletic events are not in progress.

The information which appears on the attached report answers the questions which were posed to us by the Committee of Eleven. If anyone wishes any additional information, it is recommended that they contact Mr. Leon Goodman, Assistant Vice President, Administrative Services. I should call to your attention that the Statement of Operations was prepared for us by Mr. Mark Harkness, Accountant, Comptrollers Office, Business Affairs.

DHS:er

Attch.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA  
 INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS  
UNAUDITED STATEMENT OF OPERATIONS FOR YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 1978

	<u>REVENUES</u>	<u>EXPENSES</u>
Football	\$1,324,701	\$1,082,430
Basketball	559,906	352,926
Baseball	51,360	102,794
Track	2,614	73,478
Tennis	90	25,411
Golf	298	13,427
Swimming	2,944	61,953
Wrestling	5,632	39,169
Gymnastics	3,179	22,663
Water Polo	7,446	17,757
Cross Country	342	5,168
Women's Sports	<u>2,724</u>	<u>218,160</u>
Total Sports	\$1,961,236	\$2,015,336
Training Room	\$ 5,273	\$ 177,492
Equipment Room		41,138
Ticket Office		86,709
Sports Information Office	18,372	63,813
Broadcasting	21,231	39,506
Intramurals	8,650	64,531
Academic Counseling		19,732
Sports Promotions		28,899
General Administration		288,929
Adult Fitness Program	33,773	26,086
Stadium Bond Debt Service		457,856
*Fees (University Revenues)	811,290	
Gifts (Wildcat Club)	341,289	
Concessions	81,305	
Transfers In	12,550	
Miscellaneous Other	<u>150,638</u>	<u>9,882</u>
Total Other	\$1,484,371	\$1,304,573
TOTAL	\$3,445,607	\$3,319,909

\*Any department on the campus which receives support through student fees lists fees as revenues. We are following normal acceptable accounting practices by placing the fees in the revenue column.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS  
 SUBSCHEDULE SELECTED REVENUE ITEMS  
1977-78

FEES:	
*Men's athletics	\$522,950
Women's athletics	203,000
Intramurals	<u>85,340</u>
	\$811,290
GIFTS:	
**For Recruiting Expense	\$ 75,983
Cash transfer from Wildcat Club	<u>265,306</u>
	\$341,289
TRANSFERS IN:	
***McKale Rental	\$ 17,550
Cheerleaders (Out)	<u>(5,000)</u>
	\$ 12,550
MISCELLANEOUS OTHER:	
Stadium Club Lunches	\$ 1,899
Conquistadores Gift	5,000
Telecast Right-KZAZ, etc.	19,731
Spouse Activity Book Proceeds	29,674
Mailing recoveries, Lockers, Hats, etc.	24,813
Fleetwood Mac & Expense recoveries	68,487
Miscellaneous	<u>1,034</u>
	\$150,638

\*The portion of the fees allotted to the men's athletic program are pledged to retire the stadium debt service; that is \$457,865 of the available \$522,950. The amount of the debt service varies from year to year and in some years we must supplement the student fees with Intercollegiate Athletic funds to meet the debt service.

\*\*The money, recruiting expense, is used to provide transportation and housing for the male student-athlete who is invited to our campus for an official visit.

\*\*\*The money which is received from the rental of the McKale Center is designated for capital improvement in the McKale complex. The rental includes \$1,000 per home basketball game paid by Intercollegiate Athletics. The total paid by ICA in 1977-78 was \$16,000.

DEPARTMENT OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ATHLETIC SALARIES

Total state funds available for Department of Physical Education and Athletic salaries:	\$1,614,104
Total available state funds used for academic portion of salaries:	1,039,921 (64%)
Total available state funds used for athletic portion of salaries:	<u>574,183 (36%)</u>
	<u>\$1,614,104</u>
Athletic Administrators:	\$125,122 (8%)
Athletic Staff:	78,168 (5%)
Coaches:	<u>370,893 (23%)</u>
	<u>\$574,183 (36%)</u>

PERSONNEL WITH RESPONSIBILITIES IN PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND ATHLETICS

SOURCES RESPONSIBILITY	FROM STATE FUNDS		ICA REVENUE	TOTAL SALARY
	ATHLETIC	ACADEMIC	LOCAL FUNDS	
ADMINISTRATORS	\$125,122	\$ 46,544	\$ 73,035	\$244,701
STAFF	78,168	44,121	111,482	233,771
COACHES	<u>373,918</u>	<u>93,346</u>	<u>114,199</u>	<u>581,463</u>
	\$577,208	\$184,011	\$298,716	\$1,059,935
	- <u>3,025*</u>			
	\$574,183			

\*Local funds used for percentage of teaching responsibility for one coach.

INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS  
TUITION WAIVERS 1977-78

WOMEN

Basketball.....	6
Cross Country.....	3½
Field Hockey.....	8½
Golf.....	6
Gymnastics.....	5
Softball.....	6
Swimming/Diving.....	8
Synchronized Swimming.....	4
Tennis.....	6½
Track & Field.....	5
Volleyball.....	6

TOTAL 64½

MEN

Baseball.....	17½
Basketball.....	12½
Football.....	89
Golf.....	7
Gymnastics.....	13
Swimming.....	12
Tennis.....	4½
Track & Field.....	16½
Water Polo.....	10
Wrestling.....	18½
Fifth Year.....	12

TOTAL 212½

WOMEN.....64½

MEN.....212½

TOTAL.....277

The Board of Regents grants the following number of tuition waivers to the three state universities for athletics:

University of Arizona.....	315
Arizona State University.....	315
Northern Arizona University.....	210

The Regents do not attach a dollar value to the waivers; therefore, no dollar value is shown.

The number of tuition waivers utilized each year varies, but we cannot exceed the total granted to our university.

ICA 1977-78  
 MAINTENANCE AND REPAIR SERVICES  
PURCHASED FROM PHYSICAL RESOURCES

FOOTBALL:

S1739	Seats Football Stadium	\$ 903.46
S1740	Seats Football Stadium	674.00
S2126	Game - San Diego State	5,000.00
S2127	Game - Texas Tech	5,000.00
S2128	Game - Utah	4,999.99
S2129	Game - Colorado State	5,000.00
S2130	Game - New Mexico	5,000.00
S2003	Fans Night	576.54
S2001	Prepare Stadium/Season	13,976.44
S2054	Spring Football	<u>3,583.50</u>
		\$44,713.93

BASKETBALL:

S1932	Resurfacing Basketball Floor	\$ 610.98
S2132	Fans Night	236.57
S2133	Game - NAU	1,370.65
S2134	Game - Houston	2,177.97
S2135	Game - Purdue	1,518.03
S2136	Game - Harvard	1,440.30
S2137	Game - Eastern Michigan	1,236.23
S2138	Game - Pepperdine	1,289.45
S2140	Game - Grand Canyon	1,281.57
S2141	Game - Athletes In Action	1,088.28
S2142	Game - UTEP	1,418.60
S2143	Game - New Mexico	1,319.89
S2139	Game - Nevada-Las Vegas	1,408.53
S2144	Game - Colorado State	1,032.23
S2145	Game - Wyoming	1,196.85
S2146	Game - Utah	1,172.03
S2147	Game - BYU	1,153.41
S2148	Game - ASU	1,450.24
S2002	Prepare McKale/Season	7,148.25
S2131	Install and Remove Floor/Season	592.98
S2155	Basketball Clinic	88.78
S2206	127F, Change Logo, Painting	504.73
S2207	Install Doors	<u>151.40</u>
		\$30,887.95

BASEBALL:

S2149	Season	\$10,195.48
-------	--------	-------------



TRACK:

S1999 Season \$ 3,784.98

TENNIS:

S2151 Season 457.14

SWIMMING:

S2027 Season 957.42

WRESTLING:

S2152 Season 256.07

GYMNASTICS:

S2150 Season 99.30

ATHLETICS GENERAL:

S1911	Grounds	3,922.30
S2064	Stadium Lights/July 4th/1 Hr.	36.00
S1998	Buildings	5,000.00
S2826	Pima County Fair Exhibit	355.00
		<u>\$ 9,313.30</u>

INTRAMURALS:

S2063 Season 840.80

WOMEN'S ATHLETICS:

Season 912.16

TOTAL EXPENSES \$102,418.53

2/5/79

*Distributed to Faculty  
Senate members with 2/5/79  
Senate Agenda*

To: All Members of the Faculty Senate

From: Cornelius Steelink, Chairman  
University Planning Committee

Re: Delphi Questionnaire

Attached you will find a Summary of the responses to the second Delphi Questionnaire, plus a copy of the questionnaire. Beside each question are two numbers: the first number (  %) is the result of the second questionnaire; the second number in parentheses (  %) is the result of the first questionnaire.

Our Committee will submit recommendations based on the results of the Delphi to the Faculty Senate at the March 1979 meeting. We also encourage each Senator to develop individual recommendations.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA FACULTY SENATE  
DELPHI ANALYSIS ON PLANNING\*

SUMMARY

The Delphi technique is frequently used to identify the probability of future events. It normally involves a few people with special knowledge of a subject expressing their views anonymously. Respondents then have a second opportunity to answer questions after seeing how others have expressed their views. Forecasts thus can be based on informed opinion, realistic considerations, and a variety of viewpoints.

This Delphi analysis was submitted to all members of the faculty senate in March 1978 in an open-end format so that the specific choices for subsequent questions would come from the senate members. The second cycle was completed in October 1978 and provided an opportunity for the senate to reevaluate early responses as well as see the selections of others to help formulate opinions. The first questionnaire was completed by 48 members of the 93-member senate (52%); the second questionnaire was completed by 60 members (65%). When the second questionnaire was submitted to the senate, an election had occurred which resulted in 33% of the members being new since the first questionnaire was completed. Of the 32 new members, 21 were college faculty representatives, 3 were ex officio, 7 were students, and 1 was faculty at large. This compares with the total faculty representation of 36 college members, 20 at large members, 28 ex officio members (administration), and 9 students.

Those responding were approximately in the same ratio as the senate membership for administration, faculty, and students. However, a majority of those indicating faculty also indicated current service as some type of administration. Most of the respondents have been at the University for over 10 years.

There was a definite sentiment either to change the name of the Senate to reflect the actual composition or to change the composition to reflect the current name. A majority favored changing the name to "university senate" (as an example) and approximately half of the membership felt the faculty senate represented a cross section of the university. Most senators felt that the term "university planning" is defined as setting priorities and determining needs as well as determining goals and policies. Most of the respondents indicated they had not been involved in a university planning capacity: half indicated they would like to be involved, and most of the remaining that they would like to be involved to a degree.

A need exists for more information on subjects such as long-range goals and budget decisions, as well as priorities of buildings and of programs. The most effective way of reporting this information is periodic written reports to the faculty and by reporting to the faculty senate. Faculty viewpoints on planning objectives can best be elicited by a periodic survey of all faculty.

---

\* Prepared by University Planning Committee, Faculty Senate, December 1978

Realizing that it would vary with each department, the respondents indicated the general focus of the university as a whole in hiring new faculty should be approximately half on teaching, a third on research and the remainder on service, where service was defined primarily as that rendered without fee to government and citizens. The groups with the most influence (other than the president) on future planning at the university were the Executive Vice President and the Vice President for Planning and Budgeting; those off-campus groups with the greatest influence were the regents followed by the legislature.

The most important factors that could have an impact on the future which could be influenced by the faculty were identified as the teaching program and the curriculum design, although most respondents felt the faculty was only influencing these factors to a degree. The major factors which the faculty cannot influence are the economy and inflation as well as budget and appropriations. In terms of planning functions by non-university groups (alumni, business associations) the primary role should be advisory and funding as well as acting as a resource in helping to identify the needs of society. The most important problem facing the university in the next twenty years relates to keeping in step with society's needs, the population and age distribution changes, and inflation.

The university programs which will increase in the next five years were identified as health-, energy-, business-, and information-related, while the programs that would decrease in the next five years in importance were the romance languages, education and social sciences, and humanities.

When evaluating new programs or reviewing old programs when there are insufficient resources to have both, the major criteria should be benefits to state and long-range needs of society, followed by potential student demand and job market. The most important factor in evaluating the optimum size of a university is the quality of available resources (student-teacher ratio, physical plant capabilities, administrative efficiency).

Approximately half of the respondents felt that research grant funding would increase in the next ten years. Regarding restrictions on seeking outside research, 43% indicated no restrictions; 37% indicated restrictions. Most of those advocating restrictions indicated they should be in line with university goals and priorities.

Almost 3/4 of the respondents felt that remedial courses in math and English should be offered by the University.

The majority of those responding felt that programs should be evaluated approximately every five years for specific programs while using a continuing procedure. The specific responses to both cycles of the Delphi questionnaire are listed on the attached results summary.

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA FACULTY SENATE  
DELPHI ANALYSIS ON PLANNING

RESULTS

The results below indicate percentage responses of the 93 member Faculty Senate. The first cycle in March had 48 responses (52%) and is identified in parentheses. The second cycle in October had 60 responses (65%) and is underscored in the results. Those questions which only have the second cycle percentages were asked as an open-end question initially; the comments provided by the Faculty Senate were then used as choices for the second cycle. All figures below are percentages of actual responses.

A. Respondent Background

1. Which category are you serving in the Senate?

	<u>Actual Senate Distribution</u>
<u>32%</u> (25%) Administration	Administration 30%
<u>66%</u> (65%) Faculty	Faculty 60%
<u>2%</u> (10%) Student	Student 10%

2. If you marked faculty in question A (above), do you also currently serve as an administrator (e.g. department head)? (Note responses are percent of faculty responding).

25% (39%) Yes  
75% (48%) No

3. How long have you been at the University of Arizona?

13% (15%) Less than 5 years  
22% (27%) 5-10 years  
63% (48%) Over 10 years

4. Do you feel the members of the Faculty Senate represent a cross-section of the University?

52% (44%) Yes,                      38% (33%) No,                      10% (15%) Not sure

5. What does the term "University Planning" mean to you (Check two)?

17% Having some control over the future, not just reacting to conditions imposed on us.  
38% Setting priorities and determining needs.  
11% Allocating limited resources.  
25% Determining goals and policies.  
0% Other (specify)

6. Have you ever served in a University Planning Capacity?

38% (31%) Yes,                      60% (52%) No

7. Would you like to be involved in University Planning?

50% (42%) Yes,                      15% (13%) No,                      35% (27%) To a degree

B. Current Situation

1. Do you feel the University Administration keeps the faculty informed on significant decisions and activities related to planning?

13% (17%) Yes, 30% (29%) No, 55% (40%) Sometimes

I feel the need for more information on (Check two).

<u>15%</u>	Athletic expenditures	<u>2%</u>	Land acquisition
<u>28%</u>	Building priorities	<u>28%</u>	Priorities of programs
<u>30%</u>	Budget decisions	<u>10%</u>	New programs
<u>35%</u>	Long range goals	<u>5%</u>	Other (Specify)
<u>48%</u>	Curriculum development	<u>5%</u>	None

2. What are the most effective ways to keep the faculty informed of administrative decisions? (Check two). (First questionnaire allowed three choices; figures are percent of possible response for each item).

70% (100%) Reporting to Faculty Senate  
67% ( 90%) Periodic written reports to faculty  
35% ( 83%) Faculty/Staff Newsletter (Que' Pasa)  
5% ( 52%) Periodic oral report to faculty at general faculty meetings  
2% ( 0%) The faculty doesn't need to be kept informed on purely administrative decisions  
5% ( 23%) Other (Specify)  
 (Advisory Committees through Deans)

3. What are the best ways of getting faculty viewpoints of planning objectives in a manner which can be compared year to year (Check two)? (First questionnaire allowed three choices; figures are percent of possible response for each item).

90% (73%) Periodic survey to all faculty  
33% (56%) Periodic survey to Faculty Senate  
35% (58%) Discussion at Faculty Senate  
7% ( 8%) Memorandum from Administration  
0% ( 8%) Rumors  
18% (25%) Others (Specify) Faculty Planning Committee, Departmental Meetings, Deans Council.

4. Do you feel the faculty rewards structure (incentives) of the University fits the stated goals? The goals of the University are:

"...to provide the opportunity for the acquisition of comprehensive education and usable skill, to serve as a resource for the expansion of knowledge through research; and to extend the opportunity to improve the quality of life by making available the services and resources of the University, its faculty and staff, to the students of the University and citizens of the State."

27% (17%) Yes, 65% (50%) No, 8% (23%) Don't Know

5. Realizing that it will vary with each department, the general focus of the University as a whole in hiring new faculty should be-- (distribute 100 points). (Response #2 represents weighted average, ranges were same as response #1).

51% (30-80) Teaching  
31% (10-50) Research  
18% ( 0-40) Service

6. How did you define "service" in your answer in question B5 (above)? (Check one).

42% Services rendered without a fee to government, citizens.  
17% Services student aid, University committees.  
15% Services specific citizen oriented activities such as the Cooperative Extension Service.  
16% Other (Specify).  
10% Combination of above  
6% Service

7. Should the University offer remedial courses (e.g. Math and English)?

72% (50% Yes, 27% (40% No

8. Other than the President, what persons (or titles or groups) have the greatest influence on planning/building at the University?

a. On Campus (Check two)

32% Executive Vice President  
43% V. P. Planning and Budgeting  
13% V. P. Research  
20% Director of Physical Resources  
18% Deans as a group  
20% Vice Presidents as a group  
3% Faculty  
15% Director of Athletics  
3% Other (Specify)

b. Off Campus (Check one)

55% Regents  
23% Legislative  
12% Special interest groups by discipline  
2% Alumni  
0% Other (Specify)

C. Future Opinions

1. What are the most important factors that can have a major impact on the future of the University and that the faculty can influence? (Check two)

- 33% Curriculum design
- 22% Promotion and tenure
- 47% Teaching, evaluation and advising
- 25% Involvement of faculty in planning
- 27% Academic programs evaluation
- 30% Incentives for superior faculty performance
- 17% Quality of students

2. Do you feel the faculty are currently influencing that factor you identified in question C1 above?

23% (19%) Yes,     13% (21%) No,     58% (50%) To a degree

3. What are the most important factors that can have a major impact on the future of the University but that the faculty cannot influence? (Check two).

- |                                      |  |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| <u>50%</u> Budget and appropriations | <u>50%</u> Economic conditions         |
| <u>15%</u> Enrollment                | <u>0%</u> Quality of entering students |
| <u>40%</u> Inflation                 | <u>3%</u> Athletics                    |
| <u>27%</u> Population changes        | <u>2%</u> Unannounced policies         |
| <u>5%</u> Unemployment               | <u>2%</u> Other (Specify)              |

4. What should be the role of "non-university" groups in general in University planning (e.g. alumni, business associations, elected officials)? (Check two).

- |                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <u>60%</u> Advisory         | <u>37%</u> As a resource                  |
| <u>22%</u> Public relations | <u>38%</u> Help identify needs of society |
| <u>30%</u> Funding          | <u>0%</u> Other (Specify)                 |

5. Which of the following will have the most important impact on future University operations? (Check one).

- a. 3% (2%) Energy/resource changes
- b. 52% (40%) Population age shifts/enrollment
  - .Needs of retraining older population
  - .Enrollment stability/decline
- c. 22% (17%) Inflation/unemployment
  - .Affordability of college
  - .Availability of funds
- d. 3% (13%) Government regulations
  - .Funding controls both teaching and research
  - .Stifle creativity
- e. 0% ( 0%) Computer/information changes
- f. 2% ( 6%) Other (Specify)
  - .Attitude of public/legislature
  - .Low salaries



6. What is the single most important problem facing the University in the next 20 years? (Check one).

- 22% Population and age distribution changes
- 10% Accountability (Full Time Equivalents)
- 33% Keeping in step with society's needs
- 5% Dependence on federal funds
- 0% Public relations
- 7% Individual concerns overriding institutional needs
- 15% Funding
- 2% Other (Athletics, institutional concerns overriding individual concerns)

7. Which university (or college) programs do you feel will increase in importance in the next 5 years? (Check two).

- |                           |   |
|---------------------------|---|
| <u>15%</u> Agriculture    | <u>25%</u> Information storage/processing |
| <u>23%</u> Business       | <u>40%</u> Health related                 |
| <u>12%</u> Engineering    | <u>45%</u> Energy related                 |
| <u>17%</u> Human Behavior | <u>8%</u> Athletics                       |
| <u>3%</u> Other (Specify) | <u>8%</u> English language skills         |

8. Which university (or college) programs do you feel will decline in importance in the next 5 years? (Check two).

- |   |                         |
|---|-------------------------|
| <u>53%</u> Romance Language             | <u>2%</u> Business      |
| <u>40%</u> Education                    | <u>10%</u> Agriculture  |
| <u>25%</u> Social Sciences & Humanities | <u>13%</u> Athletics    |
| <u>22%</u> Fine Arts                    | <u>0%</u> Medicine      |
| <u>17%</u> Law                          | <u>8%</u> Pure Sciences |

9. What are the primary factors in evaluating new and old programs when there are insufficient resources to have both? (Check two).

- 43% Does the program meet a specific need?
- 3% Availability of faculty
- 47% Potential student demand/job market
- 78% Benefit to state and long range needs of society
- 23% Duplication of programs
- 0% Other (Specify)

10. What are the most important factors in evaluating the optimum size of the University? (Check two).

- 35% Student-teacher ratio
- 22% Student faculty interaction
- 32% Physical plant capabilities
- 20% Academic support services
- 22% Administrative efficiency
- 55% Quality of overall work within available resources
- 2% Other (Specify)

D. Questions added after Cycle One

1. How do you see overall research grant funding in the next 10 years?

- 48% Increasing
- 25% Decreasing
- 27% Remain about same

2. Should there be any restrictions on seeking research funding?

- 43% Yes
- 37% No
- 18% Don't Know

3. How should programs funded by temporary research funds be evaluated (e.g. continued or terminated) when funding ends?

Criteria

- Service to clientele group and state importance
- Objectives met and need exists
- Relationship to university goals
- Professional demand and academically sound
- Hard headed evaluation and termination if no need
- Evaluated same as other program evaluation
- Cost-benefit analysis and availability of support

Mechanism

- Selected committee including faculty in and not in program area
- Visiting committee (peer review)
- University wide committee
- College wide committee

4. How often should there be a review of all university programs (teaching, research, service)?

- 18% 1-2 yrs.
- 12% 3 yrs.
- 48% 5 yrs.
- 7% 8-10 yrs.
- 2% continual
- 2% Not fixed period

5. The name of the Faculty Senate should be changed to:

- 18% No change
- 68% University Senate
- 3% Campus Senate
- 2% Other (Presidents Senate)

Comments: Change name or composition since the two are not currently compatible.