

Faculty Activity Reporting System

Stakeholder Committee Meeting #1

November 2, 2010

Apollo Room, Nichols Hall

Agenda

- Background
- Role of the Planning and Stakeholder Committees
- Potential applications of a faculty activity reporting system
- Principles that may govern such a system
- Q & A

Planning Committee Members

- Steve Warren
- Ben Eggleston
- Paul Terranova
- Josh Rosenbloom
- Deb Teeter
- Kevin Boatright
- Diane Goddard
- Mary Lee Hummert
- Ryan Cherland
- Julie Loats
- Barbara Romzek

Role of the Planning Committee

- Generate goals and specifications for a faculty activity reporting system
- Identify and evaluate potential vendors and their proposed solutions
- Provide all relevant information to the Stakeholder Committees and feed this back into the implementation of the system
- After all reviews are complete – recommend next steps to the Chancellor

Stakeholder Committee Members

- All deans or their representative
- All major center and institute directors or their representative
- All department chairs or their representative
- Leadership of the University and Faculty Senates

Role of the Stakeholder Committees

- Serve as representatives of faculty and academic staff
- Communicate with other faculty and staff
- Provide feedback to the Planning Committee on all aspects of the creation of a faculty activity reporting system

Background

- Chancellor's Task Force on Research Engagement recommended a comprehensive university-wide system to measure research engagement
- Feedback to Task Force last spring – “don't ask us to do yet another report” !!!!!!!
- Solution - create a system to measure faculty activity broadly that **replaces** other “paper systems” for various required activities

Background (cont.)

- Last summer the Chancellor appointed the Planning Committee and charged it to plan a faculty activity reporting system, in consultation with the administration and faculty of the university
- The Planning Committee held its first meeting in May, 2010

Progress to Date

- Concluded early on that it would be a serious mistake to build our own system
- Began reviewing systems already available or in the process of being developed and launched

What Do These Systems Do?

- Serve as a secure electronic depository and database for various records of faculty activity, including teaching, research, and service
- Generate annual reports for individual faculty and for departments, schools, and centers
- House and manage promotion and tenure materials
- Generate CV's
- Provide a reliable source of required information for grant applications
- Eliminate data silos, data reentry, etc.

Principles to Guide a FARS

- The database should be self-explanatory
- A faculty member's entire "file" should be accessible to the faculty member and entirely exportable to a format outside the database (e.g., a PDF file)
- A faculty member should be able to enter information about any and all aspects of their activity in a straightforward, open-ended manner

Principles (cont.)

- A faculty member should be able to edit or delete later on anything they enter into the database
- A faculty member should have the ability to upload PDF or Word files of publications, syllabi, etc., and have them linked to specific items entered in the database
- A faculty member should have the ability to upload a CV

Principles (cont.)

- If a faculty member's records contain information entered by others, it should be visible to the faculty member
- Appropriate policies should be developed to govern who can and can't add information to anyone else's record
- If the system includes teaching evaluation data from a particular form, this should not lead to pressure on faculty member to use that form

Principles (cont.)

- If the system is used as part of the annual merit evaluation process and/or the P&T process, a faculty member should have the ability to see and assemble the relevant materials in a format (such as a PDF file) that can be both “submitted” electronically within the system and exported so that the faculty member has a separate record of what was submitted

Next Steps

- The Planning Committee will continue to review potential systems
- When the committee identifies one or more systems that appear to meet the university's needs, meetings with the Stakeholder Committees will be convened to review the candidate system
- Our goal is to identify a candidate system by early in the second semester

Your Turn

- Questions?
- Comments?
- Concerns?
- Feedback?