A number of us were confused about the presence of multiple surveys and so only completed one (thinking that we were providing all requested feedback). The survey interface was quite confusing. I see in the data that, for many questions, a large percentage of the surveys indicated “no response.” If this percentage includes people who responded to one, but not all, of the surveys, this large percentage of “no responses” should not be interpreted as suggesting that people do not have an opinion about those questions. I suspect that, if the “no response” answers are disregarded, the percentage of “unacceptable” responses will increase substantially.

1. Bravo! It is so good to see this process in action.

2. I see no problem with “double counting”. If a grant wouldn’t come to UI (either department) without both participating, why not recognize the synergy? If a grant comes to an Institute (such as IBEST) or Center, which includes faculty from multiple departments, then participation in that unit’s success should be reflect in the departments of the participants. This is how BCB degrees work (a graduate “counts” in the department of the major professor AND for BCB).

   This restriction still assumes that the contributions of each department are disjoint, which is contrary to the nature of interdisciplinary work. Double counting encourages teamwork, avoiding it encourages isolation.

3. BLS categories are always behind the times—for example they still don’t include Bioinformatics. Universities should be creating future types of jobs, not just filling the want ads. We need to leave it up to the units to evaluate their market responsiveness without telling them how to do it (which is what we currently do in all UCC proposals, by the way).

4. I oppose penalizing units for using TAs. One of the best teachers I ever worked with was a TA. I couldn’t even nominate him for University recognition, and he eventually left UI. Also, TA experiences are an important part of many graduate degrees. Let’s focus on how well departments are delivering education, not on how they are doing it.

5. Yes, we need to recognize different distributions of ROJD assignments, which also reflect different unit missions. To do that, we need an online ROJD system, so that summary statistics can recognize human resource allocations. This is something we could do NOW, and then tell the SBOE that we not only have a plan—but that we have begun implementing it.

6. Morale. The trick is to use rankings to spur competition, rather than as a reflection of how much a unit is valued. I’m not sure how to do that. Perhaps add special prizes or budget items to low-ranked units that most effectively move up in the quintiles?