# Faculty Senate Research Committee (FSRC) FY15 Final Report

The FY15 FSRC had the following charges:

Standing Charges:

1. Monitor the administration of the General Research Fund (GRF) and make recommendations, as needed, to ensure its effectiveness and appropriate utilization. Report to FacEx concerning actions taken with respect to this charge by 03/05/15. (FY2016 3 year GRP Review).
2. Monitor the execution of the University’s Restricted Research Policy (Faculty Senate Rules and Regulations, Article IX) in handling requests for exceptions.
3. Serve as the body to hear faculty appeals of research rejected by the restricted research committee or by the Vice Provost for Research, as specified in the Restricted Research Policy.
4. Monitor the implementation of policies and procedures for determining which proposals will go forward in cases where the number of grant applications that may be submitted from the University is limited.  Identify problems or concerns, and report issues and recommendations to FacEx.
5. Continue working with the ACEC (Academic Computing and Electronic Communications) Committee to process needs for and issues with computing and telecommunications for research, including recommendations for sustainable policies and procedures and monitoring ongoing and new developments in IT. Report issues and recommendations to FacEx as needed.

Specific charges:

1. Continue to consider issues related to the use of current systems for external evaluations of the University and internal research evaluations for departments, programs, and faculty. Explore how these metrics are impacting faculty research, research opportunities and the understanding of faculty research profiles.

2. Consider the usefulness, challenges, and other issues relevant to:

a. how the Provost’s Office uses Academic Analytics (AA) to compare units across campus (e.g., in relation to budgets);

 b. how deans use AA to compare to peers and across campus;

 c. how AA may be used as part of review processes, in particular post-tenure

 review;

 d. how AA is used for funding opportunities; and

 e. how useful AA is for research centers (e.g., for cross-disciplinary work).

3. Review standing charges and recommend modifications. Report to FacEx by

 February 1, 2015

## Standing Charge 1

The committee reviewed past GRF review procedures and has submitted recommendations for two changes to the guidelines for review and reallocation of funds among units.

The FY15 FSRC recommends two changes to the procedures for the FY16 GRF review

1) Change the restrictions on redistribution of funds to only capping the percentage of a decrease in a unit's funding to 10%. Increases would not be constrained, except by the amount of funds generated from decreases. This would allow for larger percentage increases to units with very small historical allocations. The problem is highlighted by the current allocation to Journalism of approximately $4000. With a percentage cap on increases to this small allocation, it is not possible to adjust to the School's shift to much more research in recent years.

2) Allow the FSRC to recommend a special adjustment in the case of administrative reorganization of units. In cases where many faculty are moved from one unit to another, there may be justification for reallocating GRF funds between the units involved.

The committee has looked at the reallocation of GRF funds that resulted from the reorganization of Fine Arts. The committee has requested the minutes for FY10 be made available for the FY16 committee. This should allow a consideration of the rationale for the FY10 Fine Arts reallocations as a part of the FY16 review.

## Standing Charge 2

FSRC chair Hoyle participated in the Restricted Research Committee's deliberations in the mandated non-voting ex-officio capacity. He reported back to the FSRC committee on the year's activities. There were six proposals reviewed during the Fall and Spring semesters of FY15. No problem issues were raised.

## Standing Charge 3

There were no appeals from the decisions of the Restricted Research Committee

## Standing Charge 4

The committee had no activity on policies and procedures for determining which proposals will go forward in cases where the number of grant applications that may be submitted from the University is limited.

## Standing Charge 5

No activity to report for this charge.

## Specific Charges 1 and 2

The committee held discussions which tended to merge these two charges. We decided to survey deans, directors, and department chairs as well as the Provost's office on the use of Academic Analytics. Survey results appear at the end of this report.

Of the chairs and directors who responded to the survey, 18 indicated that they were not using AA and 8 indicated that they were.

One clear thread running through the responses is that many chairs would like more training. Individualized training or consulting service model focused on how AA might be used by a specific department would be helpful. (Linda Mannering's training for PRO was cited as an exemplar). Clear examples of how AA could be used a department would be helpful.

Survey responses included several categories of criticisms of AA or its use.

* AA needs more or better data. (e.g. books, Web sites, appropriate conferences, grants from non-federal sources, films, works related to the arts)
* AA metrics need improvement (e.g. weighting methods)
* Departments know their competition – their strengths and weaknesses

Among those using AA, uses included:

* comparison to peers, identifying program relative strengths and weaknesses
* evaluating research productivity in comparison to peer programs
* looking for ways to improve research productivity and or rankings of productivity
* preparation for self review
* searching for potential research funding opportunities
* building a case for hires

The small sample of respondents reporting that they used AA makes drawing conclusions about overall usage on campus difficult.

Committee members felt that it would be helpful for departments being evaluated by deans to get reports on the specific AA data used. Would it be possible to have some sort of automated report that could be given to chairs?

## Specific Charge 3

There was some sentiment expressed for including something like this year's specific charge 1, relating to the impact of evaluation metrics on faculty research. There was not agreement, however, on the need for making this a standing charge.

No other recommendations for revisions to the committee’s standing charges were proposed. It was also noted that next year will be a year for a GRF review. This substantial task will take a majority of the committee’s time.

## Other Issues

The committee discussed whether to recommend any new specific charges for FY16. A suggestion for recommending a FY16 charge regarding policies relating to open access and preservation of research data was considered and, after discussion, rejected. The feeling was, though, that this is an issue needing interest from upper-level administration.

## Survey of Deans, Directors, and Chairs on Academic Analytics

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Department** | **Using** | **4. How are you currently using the AA database? Please consider the following as they are applicable to you: identification of strengths and weaknesses relative to peer institutions, individual performance reviews including post tenure review, identifying funding opportunities, accreditation, and resource allocations.** |
| ELPS | n | Not. |
| Anthropology/IDRH | n | Not yet using it, but I would like to use it in the future for IDRH. Our core work involves supporting faculty to apply for DH-inflected research grants, and AA would help us identify the kinds of grants/fellowships that humanities faculty already receive, as well as identifying where opportunities may lie to suggest other funding mechanisms to particular disciplines or departments.  |
| Anthropology | n | I am not using it. I've been unsuccessful in gaining faculty cooperation in identifying peer institutions and ranked criteria from which our data will be generated.  |
| Environmental Studies Program | n | Not appropriate for an interdisciplinary program like ours that doesn't have a doctoral program |
| Molecular Biosciences | n | I have requested training in the use of AA, but have not yet received it, thus I have not been using it.  |
| Applied Behavioral Science | n | I am not. |
| Center for East Asian Studies | n | I do not use it. / / In theory, I suppose it contains very general data that could be useful when I apply for institutional grants on behalf of CEAS, however, since the grants I apply for are almost all exclusively about East Asian Studies, and since our faculty are all housed in departments that are defined by discipline rather than region (except, in the case of the faculty in EALC, which does not appear in AA because it does not grant a PhD), there is no way for me to capture data that is specifically about CEAS faculty. /  |
| Visual Art | n | Not using the database at all because the visual arts are not included--- when art or visual art is listed it refers to faculty research that is text-based not image/exhibition based. This may be because a visual art department includes faculty who write and publish- like art education or art history- but this generally gives an incorrect view of the whole department's productivity. Some faculty publish text AND exhibit creative work, some do text based research only, some do artwork/exhibitions only. The resulting data does not represent anything important in our field. |
| Dance | n | At this time, the database does not include data about the arts, so we fall outside its scope.  |
| Special Education | n | I don't use it. |
| Urban Planning | n | To be very honest, I have not yet done much with the AA database. I would like to use it, but have not yet found the time. As a result, rating its usefulness is difficult. |
| Chemistry | n | I have not yet used it.  |
| Mechanical Engineering | n | It's of minimal value to me, as a department chair. I know my discipline, and the strengths of weaknesses of my competitors. I know what's important to improve in rankings. Figuratively, AA probably becomes more valuable to those furthest removed from the front lines. |
| Jewish Studies | n | no |
| Pharmacy Practice | n | I am not. Most of my faculty do not have accurate CV's on PRO. I would like to be able to compare my annual reports to AA to see if it is at all accurate. I suspect it will not pick up a fair amount of Practice literature, but I haven't had time to make comparisons to see.  |
| Film and Media Studies | n | Unfortunately, I am not using it to its fullest potential I am sure |
| Theatre | n | No. I had training on it last summer but I fear I'll need training again to use it.  |
| EECS | n | No, just requested access. |
| Psychology and Research in Education | y | We used it examine the research productivity of similar programs at other schools in relation to programs in our department. Not all of our programs are represented in the data base. |
| Geography | y | I have used it to see how we compare to other departments in the country and to identify what we can do to make ourselves more competitive. As a result of this analysis (2.5 years ago) our productivity as measured by AA has gone up about 30%. |
| Political Science | y | identification of strengths and weaknesses relative to peer institutions |
| French & Italian | y | Comparing ourselves to our aspirational peers, AAU peers, and ranked departments is our primary concern and AA's value, flawed as it is. This cross-comparison nationally is much more valuable than comparing ourselves chalk-and-cheese fashion to other KU campus units, and shows us what and how our most important peers are doing. AA can tell stories that speak to individual performance, though I have not used it as much for that as yet, but it is most useful as a collective reflection of what we do. I wish the University would use AA as more than a way to indicate underperformance: for example, our unit was told that we scored low in an early test-run of AA, but I was able to show how many publications had not been harvested and made part of the data - and, furthermore, when I crunched our department's numbers against a full data set of AAU members and our best peers nationally, it showed us we were much more competitive nationally according to a variety of benchmarks (10th, 12th, 20th - depending on the area- up there with ranked departments larger than ourselves, and all our AAU competitors) but when I wrote about this, there was no response at all. Using this data to find positives is as important as identifying areas for improvement and enhancement - AA can also show us the success rate of other institutions relative to our own, and can tell great stories of how well we are doing (but we don't seem to look). Also, the difference between the no. 1 department and those ranked 25-30 or so, can be, in terms of publication, one book or one article - a lot, or surprisingly little, can separate units, much less than one would think sometimes ... AA can show a lot, and can also skew a lot of data, so care is needed to see what is actually being said. I think we have to learn to use it in a diagnostic way that is truly useful, and contextualized - in a nuanced way, more so than we do now. We also have to help AA evolve to where it is most useful. Clearly it is here to stay. |
| School of Languages, Literatures & Cultures | y | The AA is an imperfect and rough guide to where strengths and weaknesses lie in a department as compared to peer departments.  |
| Psychology | y | As a chair I do use this database. I have used it to make decisions about AOE. I have used these data to prepare for faculty retreats as we talk about our research efforts. Also, I will use it quite a bit as we preparing our self study for external review.  |
| Span/Port | y | To build cases for hires. |
| CEAE | y | To compare our department with other Civil, Environmental & Architectural Engineering Departments and to develop strategies for improvement. Because data on individual faculty members are apparently not included in the KU license, it cannot be used for individual reviews, such as PTR. Having been only recently trained in the use of Academic Analytics, I had not been aware that it could provide information on funding sources. |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Number not using | 18 |  |
| Number using | 8 |  |

5. How useful is AA to you on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 is most useful)?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Answer |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | Response | % |
| 1 | 1 Least |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 11 | 41% |
| 2 | 2 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 2 | 7% |
| 3 | 3 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 8 | 30% |
| 4 | 4 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 6 | 22% |
| 5 | 5 Most |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 0 | 0% |
|  | Total |  | 27 | 100% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Statistic | Value |
| Min Value | 1 |
| Max Value | 4 |
| Mean | 2.33 |
| Variance | 1.54 |
| Standard Deviation | 1.24 |
| Total Responses | 27 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Department** | **More Training** | **6. Do you feel that additional information/training would be beneficial?** |
| Center for East Asian Studies | n | No. |
| French & Italian | n | I don't believe that more training is useful, though sharing tips and advanced ways of crunching data could be very useful - no harm in a short refresher, or information-sharing session. Also, a discussion about how Strong Hall is using this data, alongside/versus how departments are using it - developing a fruitful dialogue about strengths and weaknesses. |
| Visual Art | n | No, because Academic Analytics does not accurately reflect the work we do in the arts.  |
| Psychology | n | No really, it is a pretty easy system to use. |
| Mechanical Engineering | n | Please, no more training! |
| Jewish Studies | n | no |
| Span/Port | n | I've been to three training sessions. It seems enough are offered for those who are interested. The problem is not with the training but with the ever-improving but limited interface. |
| Psychology and Research in Education | y | Yes, it probbaly would be useful. |
| ELPS | y | I suppose the data would be helpful but I have not found it to be so to date. |
| Anthropology/IDRH | y | Yes, I was out of town the last two times there was training. |
| Anthropology | y | Perhaps information for the faculty to understand the significance of AA as it is used to assess faculty performance. |
| Environmental Studies Program | y | Yes, especially if there are ways to compare our work with peers in interdisciplinary programs |
| Molecular Biosciences | y | yes |
| Geography | y | For me this is a natural way to analyze information (I am used to working with large and diverse data); however I suspect that others with less statistical and data analysis background might find it less intuitive. I also believe that you have to be very careful in interpreting the data - some departments listed are not really competitors and have odd statistics (especially those with very few faculty), and some of the statistics/weightings can have some issues too. It is not clear to me how well comparisons between different time periods work, and whether these are "real" or artifacts due to changes in data collection etc. |
| School of Languages, Literatures & Cultures | y | Yes. AA is very idiosyncratic and the results can be interpreted in radically different ways depending on the level of one's understanding of it and can also affect modes of dissemination. In one recent example, a department chair failed to understand that publications outside of discipline are counted towards the individual and department's stats. Consequently, he advised his faculty member (unjustly) to limit his/her publishing activity to in-field journals. This is deleterious to the program of interdisciplinarity, which, one presumes, we as an institution strive to achieve. |
| Dance | y | If there were a way to link faculty production with a database, certainly.  |
| Pharmacy Practice | y | I am sure more training would be helpful; other than an orientation in a meeting, I haven't had any training at all.  |
| Film and Media Studies | y | Yes, I think that I was on leave the semester that it was introduced and then I never got up to speed. It is not talked about very much. I think I have seen one handout about our department relative to others, but to be quite honest, it wasn't really that helpful at the time. But I am happy to explore though workshops, discussion groups. |
| Theatre | y | Yes. But more than technical we need guidance from someone... our Deans?... about the data most useful to departments and administration. At  |
| CEAE | y | Yes. I recently obtained access to Academic Analytics. The information available online to departments is, however, limited. For example, data on individual faculty members are apparently not included in the KU license, and lists of the conferences, journal, awards, etc. appear to be available only via OIRP. If nothing else, there needs to be a much better exchange of information at KU. |
| Applied Behavioral Science |   |   |
| Political Science |   | not sure |
| Special Education |   | Maybe. I've seen it. I don't know how it would be helpful to me. |
| Urban Planning |   | Possibly. Too early to say. |
| Chemistry |   | Perhaps |
| EECS |   |   |
|  |  |  |
| No more training | 7 |  |
| More training | 13 |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Department** | **Appropriate Metrics** | **7. Are the metrics utilized in AA appropriate for your discipline? Please indicate metrics not captured by AA that diminish usefulness of the database. Are other quantitative metrics available (such as the PRO/Digital Measures system) that could supplement AA?** |
| Psychology and Research in Education | u | It's been so long since I have used it I'm not sure. I can't remember my userid and password for the site. |
| ELPS | u | It's hard to tell.  |
| Anthropology | u | unknown |
| Center for East Asian Studies | u | Since my unit is interdisciplinary across the entire university, I can't answer this. But, as I mentioned above, my unit is also not represented (as a unit) in AA. |
| French & Italian | u | Humanities are not sciences/social sciences - AA is most flawed when it comes to us. For foreign languages, for example, AA hitherto has not harvested Festschriften consistently/at all, or foreign publications, or collective volumes, venues in which a lot of good peer-reviewed publishing goes on in our fields. It leaves out productivity, and also prestigious venues. It makes departments appear less productive than they are. Of course, this disadvantages similar departments in universities nationally in a similar way, so the cross-university comparison is still relatively valuable - but AA has not reached the point yet where the data is completely reliable and representative of what we actually do. We should continue to push, as Marc Greenberg has done, towards OA and ensuring that we get our collective data in areas where it can be harvested, and where our citation counts can increase. Google Scholar, ORC, academia ... all these things should be on all our radars. We have to find ways of representing ourselves, increasing our digital footprint. |
| School of Languages, Literatures & Cultures | u | Yes and no. It impact and productivity by citation, for example. Productivity says nothing about quality. Citation is only one of a range of means of demonstrating impact and in some disciplines not the best one. In humanities, book and anthology publication citations are rarely, if ever, captured, which can make significant differences from scholar to scholar. The system forces publication into peer-reviewed "top tier" journals, which is a structure that fits with natural sciences but not humanities. |
| Dance | u | We hope that there will be a supplement to AA or an arts database that could be implemented via AA to make visible our faculty contributions to the institution and the field.  |
| Urban Planning | u | Unsure |
| Chemistry | u | don't know |
| Pharmacy Practice | u | I haven't had time to compare CV's to AA, so I do not know. |
| Film and Media Studies | u | So I was alluding to this. Our discipline, Film and Media studies has at least two components--creative research, film/video/animation, etc. as practice, and then scholarly work in Film Studies which for some also encompasses Communication studies and area studies.  |
| Anthropology/IDRH | n | Not yet applicable for Digital Humanities; and for Anthropology, I am not aware if (and so, how) they are being used. |
| Environmental Studies Program | n | No. Marcia Powers told me there might be some progress in making it appropriate and useful |
| Applied Behavioral Science | n | At KU, Applied Behavioral Science has no peer departments by that name. It has peer departments by other names and as program embedded in other departments (e.g., Psychology). None of these have been developed by AA, though, for comparisions. |
| Visual Art | n | No, absolutely not. And, it's a problem because it seems that it will impact our funding and status if we are not appropriately included. In addition, no other arts program in the country is represented accurately for any sort of reasonable comparison. There is a wide variety of ways departments are organized across the US. Some departments might have many text based faculty (like faculty teaching in Art History for example), while other departments may not include ANY text based faculty. / / There is no national database from which to gather general information. There are tens of thousands of good venues for the arts nationally/internationally. Even if venues could be compiled in a database, a rating system would be impossible.  |
| Mechanical Engineering | n |  / Academic Analytics is flawed. As a specific example, the last time I looked, the only conferences for which Mechanical Engineers receive credit for publishing in are Electrical Engineering conferences. |
| Jewish Studies | n | no |
| EECS | n | Metrics are not appropriate for EECS, e.g., IEEE and ACM Fellows are not counted and citations for only past five years are included. |
| Geography | y | Most do well, proceeedings need to be taken with a grain of salt |
| Political Science | y | yes |
| Psychology | y | The metrics are generally useful for our discipline. I'm not sure that it captures every funding source that my faculty have been working with. But it seems to look at the right journals and other places that we most commonly publish. |
| Span/Port | y | Yes, they are appropriate.  |
| Theatre | y | The little I looked at it, I was worried about accuracy but short of picking every bit of data apart, I have to accept it. Like many theatre departments we have faculty (typically with an MFA) whose scholarship is the creation of artistic works. Those aren't counted--I get that. Since haven't included them as research faculty (PhD) then they aren't measured in the "publication productivity per faculty member" quotient anyway. Okay. But what about scholar-artists, whose work covers both traditional academic research and creative works? Or, one of my most productive book publishing faculty members is an artist, doesn't have an PhD, I don't believe he's included at all.  |
| CEAE | y | No. AA misses many appropriate conferences, misses some important journals, and gives no credit for some important personal honors, such as Fellow of engineering societies. In addition, AA gives no credit for non-federal sources of research funding, such as research support from foundations and industry. This non-Federal is important in my field, and KU seems to be pleased to accept the funding. Limiting citations to papers that have been published within the past five years is not appropriate in most engineering disciplines simply because it often takes several years to get the first citation. There is not enough money thrown at some fields of research to generate citations at the same rate as in some of the sciences. At the same time, citations may continue for decades after an important paper is published, but these are not counted. While it is true that we are being compared to others in the same field, this mode of operation ends up with little comparison at all. Early citations are largely a function of how much research funding is available in a given field. The five-year window for counting citations is fine, but it should include papers published at any time to provide a true measure of the impact of an individual on the field. |
| Molecular Biosciences |   |   |
| Special Education |   |   |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Not appropriate | 7 |  |
| Appropriate | 6 |  |
| Unsure | 11 |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Department** | **Has Concern** | **8. Do you have any concerns regarding the use of AA? If so, how could these be mitigated?** |
| Anthropology/IDRH | n | No serious concerns. I do hope they will be used in annual faculty evaluation. |
| Psychology | n | If AA continues to be used as it has been (as a source of potentially useful data) then I do not have any concerns. |
| Urban Planning | n | Because I have not yet found time to use it, I do not have informed concerns. But, as the chair of a very small department, my initial concern would be that AA metrics might embed bias towards larger units.  |
| Jewish Studies | n | no |
| Film and Media Studies | n | I don't have concerns, and actually we do have quite a bit of faculty productivity so we don't look terrible'; it is just that it isn't taken as a measure across our discipline so it is not really a "gold standard" the way that it might be for other departments. But if we could parlay it to mean potentially something more (that we look good relative to comparable departments) I am open to it. |
| ELPS | y | Sure. It is hard to know whether the metrics accurately capture the work in my department because w have a weirdly configured department. Second, the SOE does well relative to the rest of KU but that does not seem to have paid off in any concrete way. It's not clear AA is being used for decision making or whether it should be.  |
| Anthropology | y | Of course, since faculty have not updated their CVs on the PRO system nor provided information needed to set up AA appropriately. |
| Environmental Studies Program | y | I am not informed on how the administration uses aa info |
| Center for East Asian Studies | y | I had many concerns about it when KU first signed on to use it, and those concerns may still be valid. Chairs and directors don't get a lot of insight into how AA is actually being used in Strong Hall, so it's difficult to know whether it is being used well or not. / / I think that at the unit level, AA has the potential to be useful for chairs who wish to advocate for their departments to get more resources or for departments that wish to advocate for themselves in the broader marketplace for graduate students, for example. In other words, if the comparison group looks worse than the department in question, or if the comparison group makes it clear that the department in question has a hole that needs to be filled in order for the department to be competitive, then that data might be effectively used by a chair. / / I continue to be concerned about whether Strong Hall uses the data to compare apples to oranges - do humanities departments at KU get compared to science departments at KU, for example? - in ways that might lead to unfair evaluation or distribution of resources, but since there isn't a lot of transparency about who is using AA or how they are using it, I don't know if this concern is valid or not. / / At the outset, there was a great deal of concern about whether AA used metrics that did a good job of capturing research output in the humanities, but since all history departments are being compared to other history departments using the same metrics, in the end, that shouldn't matter (as long as Strong Hall is not actually mixing and matching across disciplines as I mentioned above). / / I remain concerned that there are departments that simply don't show up in AA because they don't have PhD programs. If the Provost's Office is using AA metrics to distribute resources, then where does that leave those units? Even if AA is not used to distribute resources, those units still simply don't exist in AA and their faculty research output, which might be considerable, is overlooked. |
| Geography | y | I don't think it should be used as a sole metric for performance by a department or especially individuals. Many people do not report everything they do and sometimes even reported items are missed by AA. I think it is a reasonable tool for comparing aggregate metrics but at the individual level it gets more problematic |
| Political Science | y | All journal publications are treated the same regardless of the ranking or impact of the journal |
| French & Italian | y | I think that making efforts to help AA increase its reach and effectiveness in collecting relevant data can only help. We should help with that. On campus, we should look at how we interpret data too. Really use it against data sets of peer universities. If I can show that my department performs as well as the department at Duke or Stanford, or that we publish as much as Indiana or Harvard, why not see this as a positive for my unit? Of course, every unit can do more, but how much is needed for excellence? How do we benchmark good performance and recognize it? We have to be careful not to use AA to produce a perpetual failing model for the humanities. |
| School of Languages, Literatures & Cultures | y | There is little transparency either about how the data is collected and, crucially, how it is or will be used. While it certainly is important to demonstrate whether faculty are doing their work, the enterprise of measuring productivity and impact as done by AA, in the scheme of things, only creates an "arms race" to demonstrate productivity and quantifiable impact, which is a very different goal than to create meaningful and useful advances in one's field.  |
| Visual Art | y | Yes, big concerns because whole disciplines are excluded from consideration. AA does not report/provide data on films, online works related to the arts, performing arts (dance, acting, directing). The arts are being left out almost entirely. If budgeting, faculty positions, and support for faculty and students is based on AA, the Arts will suffer from lack of any representation. / / There is no national database from which to gather general information. There are tens of thousands of good venues for the arts nationally/internationally. Even if venues could be compiled in a database, a rating system would be impossible. |
| Mechanical Engineering | y | AA's data base appears to be flawed. The following is quoted verbatim from the AA (FSPI) wiki page (so I guess others argue AA has major flaws). Mitigations are also implied. / / "Unfortunately, like many academic productivity algorithms, the FSPI is not without major flaws. It fails to adequately differentiate among and apply appropriate measures to evaluating the very distinct academic fields represented in most colleges and universities. Furthermore, a number of specific objections have been raised about how the FSPI measures scholarly productivity. Among them are: 1) inadequate—or inconsistent—weighting of quality of journals in which publications appear; 2) failure to differentiate labor involved in producing different types of publications (publications based on secondary sources and those based on tedious and deep research are not differentiated—hence departments with many faculty members who write much but research little are better rated; 3) failure to differentiate between scholarly concentrations of departments. Departments with faculty who are more involved in obscure, non-mainstream research are less cited than those involved in fashionable, mainstream areas of research and scholarship; 4) citation indexes, extensively used in scholarly productivity indexes, do not measure citations in books; 5) citation indexes are more appropriate for hard science disciplines and less appropriate for humanities disciplines; 6) non-conventional publications, which are increasing in number (e.g. - Web sites and on-line publications, audio and media productions) are ignored; 7) use of such indexes promotes "researching and publishing to the index" in order to preserve and enlarge university, government, and private grant support—and indirectly promote conservative, safe, mainstream research and publications." |
| Pharmacy Practice | y | I don't believe I will trust it until I can compare it to CV's and annual reports. I suspect there will be problems with comparing us to other institutions due to the varying nature of Practice departments.  |
| Span/Port | y | AA gives us a really good picture of about 12% of what we need to know to make informed decisions. It is getting better by the year but will never tell us how valuable someone is to the university. If AA is used more extensively over the years there is the possibility that it will impact the quality of work (a three-page article counts the same as a 25-page article, for example).  |
| Theatre | y | Transparency. |
| CEAE | y | Yes. Per my comments above, AA needs to add appropriate conferences; make sure that all quality journals are included; give credit for honors, such as Fellow for election to professional societies other than the small number currently used; give credit for non-federal sources of research funding, such as research support from foundations and industry; and lengthen the publication window for papers cited within the past five years. The process would be improved if departments had an easier route to access the data and the ability to request changes in the approach used by AA. |
| EECS | y | Since it fails to include some appropriate metrics it does not capture a full picture of unit performance.  |
| Psychology and Research in Education |   |   |
| Molecular Biosciences |   |   |
| Applied Behavioral Science |   |   |
| Dance |   | Yes, I'm concerned that the arts don't "count." How can we advocate for the importance of the arts in the institution or beyond if the tools that measure and prioritize projects for funding initiatives, hires, etc. don't include us? If decisions are made based on AA, the arts are not at the table to shape the discussion.  |
| Special Education |   |   |
| Chemistry |   | Do not have enough experience with it to know.  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| No concerns | 5 |  |
| Some concerns | 15 |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Department** | **9. (for Deans and Directors only) How are you engaging in conversations with department chairs on the use of AA?** |
| Visual Art | I am a department Chair. We have discussed this with the past Associate Dean, but have not yet discussed with the new Associate Dean of SOTA. |
| Center for East Asian Studies | I'm not. About once a year (maybe) for the past 2-3 years, College Chairs and Directors have gotten some sort of presentation using AA that aims to show us what data is in there and how we might use it, and I suppose that a chair of a department that is actually represented in AA might then go on and do some training or talk with other chairs about how to use the data, but since my unit is interdisciplinary, houses no faculty, and is not represented in AA, I tend to look at AA only with my home department in mind. / / In my home department (of which I am not chair), it might be useful for us to look at the data as an entire unit and to think about whether it reveals anything that we ought to be concerned about, leads us to come up with any new ideas about future directions, or shows us anything important that we should highlight in conversations with Strong Hall administrators, but that has not happened. /  |
| School of Languages, Literatures & Cultures | In addition to talking to chairs about a holistic program of research visibility and measuring impact, I have given workshops (more than a dozen in the last few years in collaboration with Libraries colleague, Ada Emmett) to faculty and graduate students on how to take control of research visibility as a means of effective scholarly communication. In this context, AA should be seen as only one of many factors that should be considered. More here: https://openaccess.drupal.ku.edu/sites/openaccess.ku.edu/files/docs/Taking\_control\_of\_your\_research\_visibility.pdf |
| Jewish Studies | not at all |
| Anthropology/IDRH | Regarding IDRH's possible use of AA, I would want to see first what meaningful generalizations (about humanities funding at KU) I could draw, and then I would first talk with the Hall Center for their advice, and then discuss the matter with humanities department chairs. |
| Psychology and Research in Education | We are rarely if ever engaging in conversation about it. |
| ELPS |   |
| Anthropology |   |
| Environmental Studies Program |   |
| Molecular Biosciences |   |
| Applied Behavioral Science |   |
| Geography |   |
| Political Science |   |
| French & Italian |   |
| Dance |   |
| Special Education |   |
| Psychology |   |
| Urban Planning |   |
| Chemistry |   |
| Mechanical Engineering |   |
| Pharmacy Practice |   |
| Film and Media Studies |   |
| Span/Port |   |
| Theatre |   |
| CEAE |   |
| EECS |   |

## Response from Provost's Office

3. How are you currently using the AA database? Please consider the following as they are applicable to you: identification of strengths and weaknesses relative to peer institutions, individual performance reviews including post tenure review, identifying funding opportunities, accreditation, and resource allocations.

|  |
| --- |
| Text Response |
| Kansas Board of Regents Program Review Part of the all-funds funding model for the academic schools. Use of AA to determine where new faculty hires could position schools and departments |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Statistic | Value |
| Total Responses | 1 |

4. How useful is AA to you on a scale of 1 to 5 (5 is most useful)?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Answer |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | Response | % |
| 1 | 1 Least |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 0 | 0% |
| 2 | 2 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 0 | 0% |
| 3 | 3 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 0 | 0% |
| 4 | 4 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 1 | 100% |
| 5 | 5 Most |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |

 | 0 | 0% |
|  | Total |  | 1 | 100% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Statistic | Value |
| Min Value | 4 |
| Max Value | 4 |
| Mean | 4.00 |
| Variance | 0.00 |
| Standard Deviation | 0.00 |
| Total Responses | 1 |

5. Do you feel that additional information/training would be beneficial?

|  |
| --- |
| Text Response |
| Yes. All deans and department chairs should be trained on uses of AA, along with specific VPs. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Statistic | Value |
| Total Responses | 1 |

6. Are the metrics utilized in AA appropriate for your discipline?  Please indicate metrics not captured by AA that diminish usefulness of the database.  Are other quantitative metrics available (such as the PRO/Digital Measures system) that could supplement AA?

|  |
| --- |
| Text Response |
| Yes. Capturing book chapters would be helpful |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Statistic | Value |
| Total Responses | 1 |

7. Do you have any concerns regarding the use of AA?  If so, how could these be mitigated?

|  |
| --- |
| Text Response |
| No. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Statistic | Value |
| Total Responses | 1 |

8. How are you engaging in conversations with deans on the use of AA?

|  |
| --- |
| Text Response |
| Discussions on AA data with respect to funding and faculty hires with the deans. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Statistic | Value |
| Total Responses | 1 |