

DRAFT

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Ed Kormondy
FROM: Walker Allen, Computer Services Director Screening DTF
DATE: January 16, 1976

The DTF has conducted the screening process as requested and offer what follows as our report.

One matter of considerable concern is the proposed reorganization. The desire is for the momentum of academic computing move ahead quite vigorously. The proposed reorganization does not seem to reinforce that. It may be desirable to recognize that affiliation by granting the Director "Member of the Faculty" status (assuming proper procedures).

Somewhat related is the larger issue of potential budget cutting. Essentially the questions: Are there alternatives to a Director paid (in whole or in part) out of Computer Services budget, or do we absolutely require a Director?

In all of our discussion we saw the balance between academic and administrative services to be 50/50% (we really feel its more like 60/60%). That was the context in which we operated during the entire screening and interview process.

Prior to inviting these people for the interview, we contacted references and students of theirs. The responses left no doubt that all are competent. Our chore is to decide if any fit into our melieu of needs and that's not easy.

You requested a statement of the strengths and weaknesses of each candidate. These follow in the same sequence as the interviews.

John Aikin has a strong commitment to higher education and CAI. He seems to understand interdisciplinary studies and Evergreen. Our sense is that he could provide a broad range of academic services from the most basic to quite complex, and because he is very articulate could "sell" uses of the computer to the faculty. His knowledge of networking would be useful to our institutional future. That coupled with his articulateness would make him a good representative for TESC to state-wide bodies and for dealing with state agencies (i.e. DPA)

Perhaps the most serious concern was if he might overcommit the resources and then be between a rock and a hard place on delivery. Since he has not managed a total system we do have some reservations, given the needs of the staff and the really unique characteristics of managing at TESC compared with Cornell. That is somewhat offset by his personal sensitivities to all people and his obvious intellectual capabilities. We feel he could be a fine manager, it just might take some additional time compared to the others. His commitment to PLATO coupled with a lack of knowledge about TICCIT (another prominent, but recent CAI program) is also a concern. We were also aware that he does not fill the need for a computer science faculty (neither do the other candidates), but duplicates existing capabilities.

His position and past action on Affirmative Action was considerably stronger than both Ford and Lehman.

Ruben Marti is the strongest candidate in terms of actions for Affirmative Action. His responses reflect a down-to-earth view of administration. If selected he would bring a wide variety of experience in different areas which would be useful in many different ways. He is an expert in Spanish culture (art and literature), and has had world-wide experience in curriculum planning. Ruben lives in Olympia and is well known (an advantage in relating to local Chicano and governmental agencies). He remembers his students by name over a long period of time reflecting his interest in those with whom he has contact. He is also readily available.

The other side is that he doesn't seem to be current on networking and has had no experience with CAI. The students did not have the feeling that he was open-minded (which does not seem to be related to his language skill). Of most serious concern is his preference to be a Faculty Member rather than Director. That desire would probably display itself somehow. If not selected, his vitae should go to Rudy for consideration as a faculty candidate.

John Ford has had cross-curriculum experience at EWSC and would bring Business curriculum with him (a natural advantage if we move in that direction). Academically he could support work over a broad range of computer sciences. He is a hard working, down-to-earth person who could deliver what he promised. His knowledge of the state system and of the people plus an ability to communicate with them are in his favor.

On the other hand, he didn't seem to understand TESC as well as the other candidates. He seemed nervous and unlikely to inspire use of the computer by the faculty. His Affirmative Action position was not strong, and in particular we were concerned about his relationships with women.

Richard Lehman has tremendous experience in computer simulation in the social sciences and has written two books on the subject. The students felt an ease in communicating with him which is probably a reflection of his experience in a small college and interest in TESC. He is cognizant of budget realities and has an awareness of how to offer some computer instruction without hardware. Unfortunately he seems somewhat inflexible (we changed the interview schedule for him, he would demand faculty status, and couldn't come until July). His overall knowledge of computer science may be limited. Management experience has been limited and apparently ended prematurely (which may not have had anything to do with his ability). We weren't sure he would be satisfied with the position over the long haul - our reasons aren't certain, but it might be a desire to prove he could do that kind of job. Overall his position on Affirmative Action was weak.

We hope these comments are helpful to you in making a decision. It isn't an easy one. Also attached are the written comments from others. Truthfully we're looking forward to being a "disappeared" task force.

WA/jh
enc.