

## Senate Discussion on IPAD

1 21 22

- Data are important but should not be sole indicator of quality. Quality goes beyond finances
- Rollout should have had Senate approval
- IPAD implemented without “advice and consent,” essential for shared governance.
- Academic policy...approved by provost and senate...should be driving IPAD
- Faculty are not questioning the need for data but need a deeper discussion of criteria beyond the financial. Suggest we pause implementation until thorough discussion/development of academic policy related to IPAD
- Data driven is good but some concerns e.g. research output. Should be looking at total dept output rather than percentage of faculty publishing. What about non tenure track faculty? They should not count in the faculty number.
- Concern with data used to determine profitability.
- Concerns with the role of enrollments in the process
- We need more collaboration.
- IPAD not wrong per se, although there is concern about data errors.
- Faculty want a conversation about these things
- The process seems top down.
- Program Review is a faculty responsibility.
- The Senate needs to approve the process/criteria.
- Suggest discussion/negotiation related to criteria.
- Senate needs to approve academic policy. IPAD falls under academic policy.
- This seems like “automatizing” a process that should be individualized. There should be a “bottom up” discussion related to criteria....chairs, program directors, and deans need to be part of that decision making.
- The speed with which this happened was also problematic. It seemed rushed.
- Qualitative data important.
- Previously administration used data but it was “behind a black curtain.” The good thing is that although IPAD might have flaws it is more transparent.
- Look again at criteria. The devil is in the details.
- Programs are quite different...they need input into the criteria. We agree in principle, but faculty at program level need to look at criteria and give input
- A great deal of agreement on the previous couple of points
- Some concern with implications of pausing, but there continue to be many questions/concerns
- Call for a pause and a good faith analysis at the faculty (program) level. We need academic policy related to this that is approved by the Senate
- Let’s sit at table and move forward
- Seems like an erosion of consultation. Pause seems reasonable to give input and then vote support
- Decisions on the “trigger” should be made closer to the ground.
- Goal should be to engage in discussion, engage stakeholders (faculty at program/dept level)
- Think of this as experimental data and continue to work on, refine

- Several senators suggested that the IPAD committee would be open to pointed critiques of everything and that the point about faculty at program/dept level providing input is essential.
- This is academic policy. A pause, input, vote by Senate essential
- There should be a more accurate way to capture faculty productivity. Quality is also not being considered in this process.
- The problems we see are symptomatic of a lack of sustained engagement with faculty over the criteria
- This kind of initiative demoralizes the academic vision of a liberal arts institution—where faculty, in relationship with administration, share our perspective about what's important
- Just a few faculty were at the table and it needs more input than that—we're losing control of the academic enterprise
- The qualitative data is now overshadowed by the quantitative data
- If a program is struggling, is the way to help them to give them more work to do and placing a dark cloud over it?
- IPAD trying to provide a consistent set of numbers that we get each time.
- In some ways it actually helps the liberal arts and small programs
- The data has not been shared uniformly
- Departments were never consulted
- We seem to have no say when it comes to admissions, but then we're held responsible for our numbers
- A pause would be an opportunity to look at the whole thing
- Maybe form an ad hoc committee to do the work of reworking the process
- Bigger issue: the erosion of real consultation and shared governance
- IPAD feeds into Senate program review—they want to use us to do this and we're not ok with that
- Need time to consider the data, the implementation, etc.
- Are there parallel IPAD processes for admin? Athletics?
- There are 2 things going on: collection/sharing of data and the process of triggering—they should be uncoupled and there should be a different process for triggering and it should be made much closer to ground, with the dean/chair/faculty
- Why does this have to happen every year?
- Deans should be involved in the process
- Need structures within the colleges to consider all of this too