

NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA
Monday, October 26, 1992 Room 146, College of Law

The Faculty Senate convened in special session at 2:30 p.m. on Monday, October 26, 1992, in Room 146 of the College of Law. Thirty-four members were present. Presiding Officer of the Faculty Senate Vivian L. Cox presided.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT: Atwater, Cox, Cusanovich, Dickinson, Elliott, Enos, Ewbank, Garcia, Hill, Horak, Impey, Inman, Jones, Konur, Larson, Law, Lewis, MacDonell, Mautner, McElroy, Mitchell, J. O'Brien, Pitt, Reiter, Roemer, Sergeant, Siciliano, Silverman, Spera, Troy, Warburton, Witte, Young, and Zwolinski. Dr. Robert Sankey served as Parliamentarian.

SENATE MEMBERS ABSENT: Badger, Barrett, Coons, Dvorak, Fajardo, Hammond, Hildebrand, Joens, Kaczynski, Najor, S. O'Brien, Pacheco, Reynolds, Songer, Sullivan, Tomizuka, Valenzuela, Williams, and Wright.

1. SHARED GOVERNANCE ISSUES ON THE CAMPUSES OF ASU AND ASU-WEST: Dr. Cox introduced representatives of the Arizona Faculties Council Dr. Dickinson McGaw, Chair of the Academic Senate at Arizona State University, and Professor Jane Carey, Chair-Elect of the Academic Senate at Arizona State University-West.

Dr. McGaw, who has been a faculty member at ASU for 25 years, noted that their faculty governance system had changed dramatically, particularly within the last two and a half years. During the 1970s, the faculty had been socialized into a passive role. They were trained to stay out of public controversy. Under President Nelson in the 1980s, involvement of faculty members in the community, both commercially and politically, was encouraged. At the same time, other changes restricted voting on such matters as departmental promotion and tenure recommendations. Something resembling a glasnost has occurred during the incumbency of President Coor. The President's Council and the Council of Deans now include members of the faculty. Faculty members serve as well on the University Planning and Budget Council and virtually every important committee. Though there was some resistance at first, the benefits of early consultation between faculty and administration are now generally recognized and mutual respect is developing. Partnership between faculty and administration in the development of policy for higher education respects the special roles of faculty in higher education practice and of administrators in many aspects of administration.

Major issues before faculty governance at ASU this year have been salaries and health insurance. Open hearings are scheduled to determine why current insurance contracts include less coverage at higher costs and why faculty concerns were not adequately reflected during contract negotiations. With respect to salaries, a data base is being established for use in examining questions of salary equity and the long-term consequences of allocation of funds according to their merit system. It has not really been possible to reward performance because the legislature has not appropriated adequate funds to do so. Dr. McGaw expressed the hope that the universities would join together to pressure for a reexamination of the whole compensation system. He expressed the belief that the current system is seriously flawed, and that something like the California step system would be preferable.

Professor Carey, who has been a faculty member at ASU-West almost from its

beginnings not much over five years ago, presented a statement on shared governance prepared jointly with Ben Forsyth, Interim Provost. The joint statement reinforces her assessment that shared governance is alive and well at ASU-West.

Primary areas of shared governance include 1) curricular issues; 2) peer-level personnel issues; and 3) limited resources allocated directly to faculty and academic professionals, such as internal grants for scholarship, research, and creative activities. Faculty and academic professionals generally do not participate in operational management, but their input may be sought in decisions related to operations to facilitate implementation.

It is understood that legal responsibility for decisions rests with the Provost through delegation from the President and, ultimately, the Board of Regents. Faculty committees make only recommendations, but their input is valued through recognition of faculty expertise and close experience with problems and opportunities being explored.

Faculty and academic professionals sit with administrative decision-making groups, and representatives of administration participate ex officio in Senate committees, thus facilitating communication in both directions. Further, the assembly votes for representatives to committees, usually at the unit level rather than campus-wide.

Ultimately the implementation of shared governance greatly depends on the willingness of an administration to share and on the willingness of an assembly to participate. As the search is conducted for replacements for interim administrators, much depends on appreciation by a new Provost of the current culture of shared governance.

1A. QUESTION AND ANSWERS CONCERNING SHARED GOVERNANCE

In response to a question from Senator Witte about provision for periodic review of administrators, Dr. McGaw noted that a Senate resolution setting up a system of evaluation was one of only three motions out of some 25 in the past year that President Coor did not approve immediately. A decision was deferred to permit referral to ASU-West, which approved the general sense but preferred more frequent evaluations until greater stability was achieved.

A question from Senator Silverman concerned the methods by which committees are established and their members selected, especially as the processes might be impacted by SB1106. In response, Dr. McGaw noted that they had supported SB-1106 because it was understood to have been so useful to other universities and could be useful at ASU in case of a change in administration. With respect to committees, a point has been made with the administration that most problems should be solved through the regular Senate structures. Ad hoc committees are actively discouraged. It is up to the Senate to stand up for its territory and jurisdiction. Professor Carey noted that practices at ASU-West have varied from Provost to Provost. Administrators have sometimes tended to appoint people without thinking about the faculty, but the faculty have protested and obtained improvements. With respect to the promotion and tenure committee in particular, Dr. McGaw noted that at ASU each dean appoints a faculty representative from the college. The Senate, recognizing the validity of the administration arguments with respect to the importance of balanced representation including minorities and women, elects only one member. Negotiations are in progress in an attempt to get more elected positions. Professor Carey noted that each unit selects by vote three tenured faculty members from among whom their directors may choose.

Senator Garcia noted that the Arizona Faculties Council was heartened to see that the President of NAU had withdrawn the reorganization scheme proposed earlier and turned the strategic planning process over to the Senate. He then asked about the structure of the review process for department heads. At both ASU and ASU-West a small group of senior faculty conducts and analyzes a survey, part of which is reported to the administration and part to all members of the unit.

In response to a question from Senator J. O'Brien about voter participation in elections, Dr. McGaw reported a turnout of around 25 percent at ASU--disappointingly low. Professor Carey noted a much higher turnout, 60-70 percent, or sometimes even 100 percent, depending on the issue.

Dr. Cox expressed the appreciation of the Senate, which was reinforced by applause.

2. REPORTS OF THE TASK FORCES OF THE PROGRAM FOR INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITIES: After expressing appreciation for the efforts of all members of task forces who participated in the formulation of the reports, many of whom were present, Dr. Cox asked Dr. Allan Beigel to join her at the podium.

Dr. Beigel then reviewed the assessment process and its five task forces. The Task Force on Mission had presented its draft report for Senate comments in September. The task forces concerned with the criteria and review processes for academic and non-academic units were presenting today their preliminary draft reports for similar direct Senate comments. The purpose of the interim assessment, intended to get underway by mid or late November, is 1) to provide a basis for the long-term strategic planning process being designed by a committee chaired by Dr. Gottfredson, and 2) to provide an information base for any short-term decisions that need to be made by the Provost or the President regarding academic or non-academic programs.

- 2A. NON-ACADEMIC CRITERIA REPORT Dr. John Wilson then provided an introduction to the review of the Non-Academic Criteria report. The two non-academic task forces had worked closely together to try to resolve problems, some of which were directly related to the review process of last year. A major problem had arisen then from a lack of consistent data. University-provided data should serve at least as a starting point in the assessment process. Another frustration had been that the time allocated to the review process was in no way proportional to the size of the financial problem of the various units. There were disputes as to whether a unit was academic or non-academic. They propose to identify as academic those units in which peer review and academic freedom are essential to effective functioning. Some comments already received complain that the process being proposed is burdensome and too negative.

The criteria being proposed should be usable for long-range planning as well as for a one-year assessment, and they should be similar to the criteria of academic program reviews as mandated by the Regents. They should include a strong customer-client orientation that includes feedback on how users perceive the services. And the review activities should be useful in and of themselves. Questions asked in the self-study should be value-added questions that encourage people to think anew about their unit.

They were looking for criteria that could be used in common across all units. The process should relate centrally to improving performance. As an example, suppose you looked at the Controller's office as a unit, then take something like

purchasing and follow the process through the warranty period. Looking at the key processes would not pick up the shadow bookkeeping problem. A tremendous amount of money is wasted on this campus in duplicate effort. What are the processes that are really central to the institution?

Under quality, three key aspects have been identified: the effectiveness of the process and activities, customer satisfaction, and efficiency.

Comments have been invited, but there has been little feedback so far. They are thinking of sitting down with a couple of units in the meantime to try out the proposed process and see how it works.

- 2B. NON-ACADEMIC PROCESS REPORT Before giving a quick summary of the steps in the review process for non-academic units, Dr. Murray DeArmond expressed thanks to members of his task force, and to Linda Dobbyn of the Office of Institutional Research for exceptional support against tight deadlines. They were looking for a process that would be do-able in a time span of roughly 100 days. So some of the things that might ordinarily be incorporated in an assessment process, such as bringing in knowledgeable peers, doing scientific customer surveys, and doing benchmarking against peers in other institutions were impracticable.

A five step process is envisioned:

1. Form a Coordinating Team of 21 members representing a cross-section of campus constituents and drawn from a pool of nominees throughout the campus, representing faculty, academic professionals, classified staff, and students, both graduate and undergraduate. Perhaps people from the community external to the university should be included.
2. Develop unit portfolios relying on preparatory data from such sources as Personnel Records and the Office of Institutional Research insofar as possible. Other aspects would include a customer survey and a self-study questionnaire. Some non-academic units have already been involved in internal or external reviews and new customer surveys. If data gathered within the past three years are available, they should be used.
3. The Coordinating Team reviews the portfolios and assigns units to Group A or B. The units assigned to Group B would undergo a secondary review to address issues of concern identified by the Coordinating Team. Since there are as many as 120 non-academic units, it is suggested that the Coordinating Team be divided into small teams to review portfolios.

Group A would consist of units that seemed to be functioning well, with adequate budgets, and requiring no institutional decision. Any suggestions for the units would be documented in the report of the Coordinating Team.

Factors that might lead to a unit being placed in Group B include inadequate resources or a difference in perceptions between the unit and its customers. Review teams of three members would do site visits, interview the unit heads and perhaps individual staff members. All reports from secondary reviews would go back to the unit heads and their immediate supervisors for correction of factual errors and for comment on the recommendations.

4. The Coordinating Team reviews the completed portfolios and results of secondary reviews and issues a set of executive recommendations for the

President and the university community.

5. The President, using advisory structures that he selects, will finalize decisions and report to the university community on the reasoning he used, particularly when decisions may be at some variance from the recommendations.

After all is done, the two Task Forces should get together to do a post mortem on the process and develop a written report as to whether the steps have been followed with integrity, whether accountability held, and whether criticisms and suggestions for improving the process had emerged.

2C. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD ON THE NON-ACADEMIC CRITERIA AND PROCESS

Senator Inman asked about nominations for members of the Coordinating Team. Dr. DeArmond replied that, though appointments would be up to the President, nominations would be invited from the University community at large--from students, faculty, staff, and academic professionals.

Senator Witte asked whether reports in step 3 would go to the unit or to the unit director. Dr. DeArmond responded that unit heads was what they intended, as well as to the immediate supervisor. Senator Witte then asked when the members of the unit would see the report, perhaps after the President had made an adverse decision? An opportunity for comment to the coordinating teams by all members of the unit, as well as the supervisor, was urged also by Senator Silverman, who further suggested that selection of members of the Coordinating Team was a good place to begin the new culture by having the Faculty Senate, Staff Advisory Council, ASUA, and perhaps some other constituencies, as well as the President, each choose some members. Senator Silverman also noted the positive effects of encouraging non-academic units to think about their clients and customers, to identify who they are, and to get input from them. Senator Garcia added his support to Senator Silverman's remarks.

Senator Elliott asked whether the intention was to get budget information from a central source. Dr. DeArmond responded that they wanted to maximize the use of central data but to let units comment because it was not yet clear how much of the necessary information was available centrally. Dr. Beigel noted that one of the benefits of what was being proposed would be to expose inadequacies in the data that are actually available. There is a great deal of variability within the University about the level and quality of the data that are available about non-academic units. Ultimately there will be recommendations about how the database for non-academic units in the University can be improved.

Senator Witte noted that an incredible load of data collection was being proposed. Are we to be diverted from essential university activities to collect data that aren't worth collecting? She asked Dr. DeArmond for his estimate of the cost in money and time that needs to be added to the budgetary line. Dr. DeArmond responded that if we are serious about this, support needs to be identified for the process itself. It is a terrific burden on the members of the Coordinating Team as well as on the units. Dr. Wilson remarked about the lack in the process last year of uniform data even on what the basic unit budgets were. Permanent budget cuts and mid-year recisions had sometimes been added together. The Office of Institutional Research should be able to provide a precise profile of what the budget has been in the units, and if they can't, they ought to be able to. That is just basic management information. Unquestionably, the units are being asked to provide some information. If the unit has never done anything of the sort before, the process will be more time

consuming than if they are experienced with the CORE process.

Senator Witte remarked further about her experience with accrediting agencies in medicine, and similar external pressures to collect data pertaining to educational outcomes. Have improved patient care or better public education been achieved as a result? Are we really looking at values? Is the process going to lead to better decisions? Or is it going to lead to endless documents that give mid-level managers, and perhaps some high-level ones, a sense of importance? Dr. DeArmond responded that though the document unquestionably has weaknesses, he believed that the process had validity. There has got to be a better way to make management decisions than what we have experienced over the past two to three years. He believes that the present proposal moves in the right direction, but the question of the time and effort needed to ensure a useful outcome is a valid one.

Senator Lewis expressed the view that it would be irresponsible not to try to solidify a direct process of evaluation for both non-academic and academic units. It is his sense that the documents define a clear process that allows an observer to assess whether a unit is performing well or not. He asked Senator Witte whether it was the document that deserved an F or is it the situation that is addressed by the review process that deserves criticism.

Dr. DeArmond added that the process being proposed was not one they invented. They have been in touch with universities in the U.S. and Canada that have assessed non-academic units and have tried to distill the essential elements to fit a very short-term process.

Senator Garcia noted that it became clear to everybody involved in the last budget process that our database for almost anything you can think of was too weak to support any decision-making at all. Improvement of the database has to occur at whatever price that comes. He thought support for reports from Institutional Research might well be increased by factors more like 10 than 1.1. In time of budget constraint, however, we must be sure that what we are doing in terms of data collection is prudent and wise. Through the decades on this campus, we have left the collection of data to the individual units, and the control of data by units has damaged our ability to make institutional decisions.

Senator McElroy remarked that difficulties perceived by customers within the university frequently derived from interactions between units rather than from functions within the unit. Will the Coordinating Team be looking into interactions involving units of the B Group and not just the B unit itself? Dr. DeArmond's response had two parts: Units will be asked to identify in the preparatory data all units that they serve as well as all units that serve them. That was intended to catch upstream-downstream connections. A critical process in which half a dozen units were involved might very well be lost in the first-year review. In a second-year review, the same team might be assigned to look at what falls among units. Dr. Wilson joined in assessing this question as raising a very good point. He believed that the CORE process would help to identify interactions that affect a unit. Activity is underway in some colleges to identify processes that affect them. This is an area in which current movement is very fast.

Senator Siciliano thought that it was important to lock a process in place and adjust it and improve it as shortcomings are identified rather than recreate the evaluation process every time we have to apply it. Further, based on his

experience with the ad hoc budget committee last May, and the Nadel committee last June, he wanted to reinforce Senator Garcia's point that the data situation on this campus is a disaster. At whatever price, we need to develop a way of having data generated under a central authority and not have to rely on data generated by the individual units. The problem lies in getting too many versions of data. Recommendations made at the level of the ad hoc committees and forwarded to the Nadel committee were eliminated because of incorrect data and then changed again--flipflops in recommendations based on numbers that no one really ever knew to be right or wrong.

Senator Witte clarified her earlier remarks with the statement that she did not mean to imply that we shouldn't have institutional data. She was concerned that data collected in a hurry would be used to make critical decisions to end people's jobs--to make straightforward but devastating decisions. She also wanted to make a point about the fair participation of faculty in development of criteria and the assessment process.

At this point, Dr. Cox asked Dr. Beigel to introduce the chairs of the Academic Criteria Task Force, Dr. Betsy Hoffman, and the Academic Process Task Force, Dr. Hermann Bleibtreu. Dr. Beigel noted that though their draft reports were in two parts, it was intended to integrate them later into a single report.

2D. ACADEMIC CRITERIA REPORT In introductory comments, Dr. Hoffman stated that her task force had tried first to identify the criteria by which a great university should be judged and then to identify the criteria by which units should be judged to highlight the full extent of their activities in a good university. They did not want to make serious omissions but had to recognize the limitations of what could be done in a hundred days. A unit should be able to address in a portfolio, through a subset of points in the draft report, how it meets its own mission and the mission of the university. A page limit should be set for the portfolio, which they envision as a short document. It should begin with a mission or vision statement that explains what the unit does, what academic programs it serves, how it contributes to the creative activities of the university, and what services or support activities it performs. It should address directly how the unit fits in with the mission of the university as defined by the mission task force. Units should not spend a hundred days collecting data, though they recognize that units have a lot of data that needs to be put into some kind of centralized database. Since the data that units have do not always agree with that in the Office of Institutional Research, some adjudication process is needed. Units should identify which data, from among those mentioned in the appendix, are relevant to the assessment of the unit and establish whether the data are available or can be obtained in a short interval of time. A brief statement would be sufficient to explain why some data might be irrelevant. Have some ways in which the unit should be assessed been overlooked? What data have been missed? How could it be collected and evaluated?

2E. ACADEMIC PROCESS REPORT Dr. Bleibtreu then gave a brief introduction to the Academic Process report, which was in a very preliminary stage of development. Material had been received from the Academic Criteria Task Force, but no joint meeting had yet been held. The first problem had been to determine what a unit is. They had defined an academic unit as an entity that offered academic programs or parts of such programs. A list had been made, but it could be seriously in error. The definition of an academic support unit was even more obscure. The list that had been made came from the telephone book: if there was a phone, there must be a budget. Administration units that support academic units present another problem. It is a very complex and diverse university, and comparability

will be very difficult to achieve. In his brief experience in administration, it seemed that all they did was write reports to somewhere, so it was likely that a lot of information existed. The process would then be to ask the unit to assemble a portfolio, to be submitted to the Office of Institutional Research. That office would then add their own information and compare it with that in the portfolios. Assessment groups involving the departments and the deans would then be created. Dr. Bleibtreu noted that the Academic Process Task Force would be meeting jointly with the Academic Criteria Task Force the next day to work out some of the problems.

2F. QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD ON THE ACADEMIC CRITERIA AND PROCESS

Senator Witte, in opening the questioning, noted the explicit statement in the Academic Process report, "The Task Force suggests that the Academic Deans be responsible for the composition of the assessment groups. They should recommend to the President who should be members of these groups, because it is the Deans that best understand the units to be assessed, as well as the individual faculty who will do the assessing. The procedure the Deans will use to compose the committees should be left to them, individually or collectively...The Assessment Groups, in conjunction with the Deans, should report to the joint Academic Criteria and Processes Task Forces..." In her view, this was clearly wrong and in violation of principles of shared governance both as presented by faculty leaders who had addressed the Senate earlier in the session and as incorporated in the new state law. There is a big difference between faculty representatives who are elected and those who might be chosen by deans and agreed to by the President.

Senator Impey said that he liked the idea of a portfolio and the goal of a holistic measure of how well a unit was working. But he had concerns about the possibility of actually obtaining comparable and consistent data and for making comparisons of portfolios when there was no basis for comparison. A set of comparable core data is needed, but that situation has improved over the past year. There is a big difference in significance among indicators on the list, though, with item 7, "proportion of tenure-track teaching faculty devoted to each education program" and item 10, "proportion of unit floor space devoted to each program" as examples that deserve very different weights.

Dr. Hoffman noted in response that there were not enough institutional data available so that all units could actually show their strengths. For example, there is no centrally collected institutional data on faculty scholarship, and that is one of the key facets of the university mission. Such data are part of the annual review of each faculty member, so part of the formation of a portfolio might be to direct the Office of Institutional Research to code all the data that has been directed to the Provost on an annual basis. Last year units had major battles with Institutional Research about data on educational programs. There are data at the central level, but units don't trust it. Part of the idea of a portfolio is to give units a chance to tell how they manage their educational programs. There needs to be an adjudication process, and that is one of the things that needs to be worked out in the process committee. There are no central data on service, either. So data on two of the three main activities of faculty are not collected centrally, and data on the third activity are suspect. Institutional Research says they can reduce the data gathering tremendously because they have all the students on a database already. So the survey might be cut to a couple of pages.

Senator Inman asked how many years back data would go for assessing faculty

scholarship and creative activity. For a unit, fifty pages of information could be reached very quickly. Dr. Hoffman agreed that the point was valid but preferred to leave the time schedule to the faculty. The three years suggested by Senator Inman seemed reasonable.

Senator Silverman remarked that the criteria part of the report seemed very complete, but he was concerned whether all the suggested data could be collected in 100 days, or would be worth collecting. He hoped that the Task Force could come back to the Senate with a streamlined list. Dr. Hoffman indicated that feedback from senators would be appreciated, but was concerned that every senator would have a different short list.

Senator Silverman commented further that he didn't see that a process had been identified for assessment of academic units. He recommended that the Academic Process Task Force look at the recommendations of the Non-Academic Process Task Force to see whether they could be adapted to the academic side. He expressed concerns related to selection of members of the assessment group, what it would do, and to whom it should report. A process needed to be identified as a replacement for ad hoc procedures that have been used so frequently in the past.

Senator Garcia thought that the list of criteria would be usefully applied to long-range planning, but did not represent a program that could be carried out in the short term. He supported Senator Impey's view that the Task Force should use its own judgment together with advice from people who operate in the short term to write a short list. Dr. Hoffman responded that she didn't want to impose on the Senate to write a short list.

Senator Garcia remarked further that the real imposition was that implied in the selection of the assessment group. It is an insult to faculty to say that they cannot understand the unit to which they belong. In a time of real trouble, we need to pull together. We don't need to create mechanisms that will separate us and cause further distrust. By all pulling together we may be able to retain the strengths that this university now has. He thought that some appointive process that provided balance to the result of an elective process was probably appropriate, but what was being proposed was totally unacceptable.

Senator Atwater thought that the list of criteria was excellent and thorough, but involved a lot of counting. She supported the comments of Senators Witte and Inman and noted further that counting alone did not reflect quality. She was horrified to read that the portfolios were to be submitted to the already inundated Institutional Research Office to be turned into numbers and tables which would have to be interpreted by different rules for different units. Were there not wise people in the assessment groups who could understand quality as well as quantity?

Dr. Hoffman responded that they had tried to find a way to assess both quality and quantity. Service on peer review committees or as a journal editor was recognition of quality by peers outside your university. They had tried hard to get away from numbers of publications and numbers of pages because they felt those were not appropriate ways of assessing people. The real question is whether you are recognized by peers in your field as a distinguished person.

Senator Inman expressed doubts that any group of people, let alone a group selected by academic deans, would be able to make a meaningful assessment of such material, and wondered about the value of the effort.

Dr. Hoffman noted that she had participated in a number of peer review activities in her profession as an economist. Members of panels had been able to assess proposals in fields with which they were only marginally familiar. While professional standards differ from department to department, we do have a shared vision of what constitutes a great faculty and a great university. She envisions the process as similar to that of a National Science Foundation review panel.

Senator Lewis thought that selection of people to manage the review process and its result would be relatively easy, but he was concerned about finding a way to downsize the list of criteria.

Senator Witte, noting that she had received several phone calls from faculty, remarked that she thought the faculty would be willing to undergo peer review, but that what was being proposed was not review by peers. There was a definite possibility of politicizing the whole process because of the procedure for selecting members of assessment groups. To think that a gigantic campus-wide P&T process could be conducted fairly in 100 days and then responsible budget decisions made at the end seemed to her to be foolhardy. She referred to a letter in the Chronicle of Higher Education several months earlier that had criticized the way students were evaluated in terms of a contrast between counting beans and considering the results of planting seeds. "Let's talk about the human capital each faculty member generates rather than how much capital a grant would generate. If we decide that seeds are important to plant, how are we going to find them in this mass of data? How are we going to cultivate faculty who know how to plant seeds rather than ones who deposit beans in their students' minds?"

Senator McElroy expressed concerns about costs. He's been fighting for years for the collection of comparable data. But now in his department funds are so short that they are forbidden to make long-distance phone calls or even copies of tests for students. They are in the midst of a program review and seem to be constantly collecting data, but it never gets to a central file because it is never comparable. The faculty is demoralized and many have sunk to just sort of making up whatever else is needed next, there are so many requests for information coming around. It would be a good investment by the university to decide which data are critical and then to maintain files on a long-term basis. But in his opinion it would be a bad investment to impose a major burden on departments that are already suffering just for collection of more bad data that will be reduced to one page.

Dr. Hoffman noted that sixty responses to a memo to units inquiring how they wished to be assessed made it clear that they did not want to be assessed by the data that are now centrally available in the university. The list of criteria was compiled out of the responses to the memo. She would rather allow units to choose among the criteria than to disenfranchise units. "Our hope is that this will be the first step toward deciding what data this university ought to be collecting."

Senator Impey remarked that there seemed to be some convergence on the idea of the criteria, but he wanted to hear more about the nature of the process. In the end, it would not be a comparison of apples and oranges, but one unit will present the graceful pear, and another the kiwi fruit, and we're going to be asked to decide between them.

Senator Garcia pointed out that for units that had not recently undergone a major program review and done the data collecting that goes with it, this exercise will

be a major undertaking. The program review takes a whole academic year and sometimes longer, depending on the size and complexity of the unit. Departments have prepared assiduously for the reviews in which he has participated, with lots of data and documentation highlighting the things they are good at. He thought that setting up the kind of extensive database that was being proposed was important in the long run. But he questioned whether it could serve in the short term that was the focus of the present discussion. Perhaps a much modified process that identified only two or three key elements that everybody does regularly should be developed.

Senator Silverman said that he was unable to identify a process in the report and suggested that the non-academic process might be adopted. Assessment groups might be configured to review units according to the organizational reporting lines of the vice-provosts. Units might be sorted into Group A and Group B, with further site reviews of units in Group B.

Senator Pitt said that the five-year departmental self-study, to which Senator McElroy referred, has an additional cost to the department of some \$5,000 for photocopying, support staff, phone calls and the like. They had asked the University administration for financial help but got no response. Will this institutional assessment program be funded by the University administration or by the individual departments?

Dr. Beigel replied that he did not know, but he thought the point was well taken. He noted that the sense of the final recommendation from the Criteria Task Force was becoming clear, along with the nature of the costs involved, both in human terms and in terms of actual budgetary costs. That has to be addressed before the actual assessment process begins. He assured Senator Pitt that costs would be considered.

Dean Sevigny, who was sitting in for Senator Sullivan, asked Dr. Beigel if there was any consideration of staggering assessments "so that we don't end up with a year of paralysis by analysis." Must every single unit be examined in a year?

Dr. Beigel remarked that the input provided by the Senate was extremely helpful and would be addressed both by the Criteria Task Force and by the joint task forces before the next document comes forward. The President's charge to the task forces was to come up with a methodology for a review, doing whatever can be done within a period of roughly 120 days, to identify those programs that need the kind of further study we've talked about. The budget for 1993-94 will not necessarily be changed, but the new Provost needs information on which to base a whole series of important resource decisions. The notion of selecting a certain portion of the programs for assessment this year, and then another third, gets back more toward academic program reviews, and does not meet the need. He thought the President's original intent was to get a sense of programs on the academic or non-academic sides that need attention now and what kind of attention they need, including more money if they are underfunded critical programs, or programs that might not warrant continuation with the kind of mission we have.

Senator Garcia said that it was clear that the Faculty Senate would not be able to take any action at the November meeting, because the task forces could not get revised drafts back in time for review. He wondered how best to proceed.

Dr. Beigel thought that the same pattern would be followed as with the Mission Task Force. As soon as the Task Force reports are completed, incorporating input from the Senate and other sources, they will be sent back to the Senate. The

1992/93-51

Senate can then make its recommendation to the President prior to the President taking action on them. Dr. Beigel noted that the reports had to be completed to go to the President by the end of the second week in November.

Dr. Garcia asked whether the December meeting would then be the appropriate one for Senate action. Depending on how fast the President worked to move forward on the basis of the reports, Dr. Beigel thought that it might be necessary to get in touch with the Presiding Officer and confer with her about whether the Senate would want to meet to review them further or to take formal action.

Dr. Cox hoped that the practice of seeking Senate input on each draft would continue but she recognized that the task forces had a schedule that could not always be influenced. She further hoped, therefore, that information, ideas, and perceptions might be shared directly with Dr. Pacheco.

Dr. William Epstein, member of the President's Task Force on Academic Criteria, and Professor of English, wondered why we must do this review now, and why only 100 days. The Task Force decided they were going to do a responsible and fair job and recommend something do-able, not in 100 days but in however long it took. It probably should be phased in very gradually and very carefully over a 3-year period. "Suddenly we are being asked to make up for many years of academic and administrative mismanagement. Suddenly we are in crisis....This is a responsible and fair criteria document...I think you can tell from looking at this document, we've worked hard at it. We've done our homework. From what we can tell, this may very well be at the leading edge of assessment documents of this sort--public, land-grant, Research I universities--in this country. This is the kind of criteria document that we ought to be adopting, and if we do adopt it, there will be many other institutions like us around the country that will be very interested in it. But we shouldn't be asked to carry out this very important process as a short-term budget cutting process when, as Senator Witte has already pointed out, it is going to result in people losing their jobs. We should do things fairly and responsibly. It doesn't have to be done in 100 days. It doesn't have to be done immediately. We can phase it in over three years and do it the right way."

Dr. Cox: "Thank you for your input."

The meeting adjourned at 4:50 p.m.

Elizabeth Roemer
Secretary of the Faculty Senate