1.0 Overview

The 2015-16 academic year marks the first year the PRO system has been fully implemented: complete CV data for faculty in all schools, departments, and research units are entered, and all faculty/equivalent researchers including new hires have been trained.

Since PRO has been used by all units for at least one year, we now understand more about how faculty across campus are using the system, including how often they access PRO, how their participation varies across the academic year, and what kinds of reports faculty are drawing down from the system. Sections 1.1 and 1.2 describe faculty participation in 2015-16 and highlight key indicators that describe how faculty seem to be using PRO.

Sections 2.0 and 3.0 describe a number of new system and operational developments, including vendor developments and PRO team initiatives. Section 4.0 suggests challenges and future goals for the PRO project.

1.1 Faculty Participation and Use of PRO

Faculty participation. This academic year, approximately 120 new faculty/equivalent researcher CVs were keyed and proofed, and trainings for new faculty members were completed. As part of an ongoing process, new faculty CVs will be keyed into the system each summer, and new faculty trainings will occur each fall and spring based on faculty arrivals.

As the result of a substantial effort made to communicate with department chairs and faculty in spring 2016, nearly 100% participation in updating 2014/2015 information has been achieved across the academic units. Direct assistance with CV updates was offered to some faculty members who had not responded by March 1, 2016. Ongoing assistance with CV updates was also offered to distinguished professors.

Faculty use of PRO. In addition to annually entering new data into the system, it is important for faculty to run reports from PRO, not only to check the accuracy of their data entry but to use PRO to its full capacity as a tool to create university documentation such as annual reports and P&T/PTTR candidate CVs.
Since PRO has been fully implemented for one year, we now know more about how faculty are using the system. At a high level, we know that:

- **Most faculty enter data into PRO on their own.** Only about 10% of faculty users have established a staff proxy or rely on the PRO team (as in the case of distinguished professors) to manage/update their data. Most faculty are using the system directly and independently.

- **Most faculty are running PRO reports.** Approximately 86% of faculty users have run at least one report from PRO this academic year (e.g., CVs). This figure excludes any reports run during PRO training sessions.

- **Faculty tend to run three kinds of reports.** Figure 1 indicates that of the roughly 8,800 report iterations faculty ran in 2015-16, most were annual reports, CV reports, and P&T/PTTR reports:

  ![Figure 1. Types of PRO Reports Run by Faculty, 2015-16 (N = 8,844)](image)

  NSF and NIH Biographical Sketch reports are programmed into PRO for faculty to use in submitting funding applications. In 2015-16, 241 unique biosketch reports were run by faculty, indicating that a portion of faculty are using PRO as a tool for biosketch creation purposes.
• **Investment in PRO reports varies across units.** Figure 2 compares the percentage of total reports run in 2015-16 to the percentage of faculty users in PRO by college division/school. Every CLAS division and school has access to 3-10 custom reports specifically designed each division/school, and 30 of 53 of individual departments (57%) have access to 1-3 custom reports specifically designed for their departments. Assumably, each unit’s share of total reports run and their share of total campus users would be roughly equal, if faculty members across units were running PRO reports in similar quantities. In many units, this is the case. However, some units such as Engineering, Social Welfare, the Social and Behavioral Sciences, Law, and Architecture, Design and Planning seem to be using PRO reports in relative frequencies that exceed their portions of total campus users. Units where the percentage of reports run is less than the percentage of total campus users may indicate that custom PRO reports designed for those units need modifications to be more useful or attractive to faculty and administrators.

![Figure 2, Distribution of Report Usage per College Division/School, 2015-16](image)

• **Many faculty access PRO as a tool to prepare P&T/PTTR candidate CVs.** Faculty ran roughly 1,000 iterations of the *Promotion & Tenure CV* and the *Progress Towards Tenure CV* from PRO this academic year. At the time of this progress report, PTTR and PTR candidate CVs are under review, so it is not known the extent to which PTTR and PTR candidates used PRO to prepare their candidate CVs. However, of the 71 candidates who went up for P&T, 76% used PRO as a resource to generate at least one P&T CV. Most
candidates produced multiple iterations of PRO P&T CVs as they neared their submission deadlines.

Importantly, assistant professors who will go up for PTTR/P&T in 2016-17 were heavy users of the P&T/PTTR CVs this academic year, assumedly to examine the candidate CV templates in PRO in preparation for their submissions next year.

**PRO team follow-up.** The data on how faculty use PRO help inform the PRO team’s work in encouraging campus integration and use of the system. Based on these data, in the 2016-17 academic year, the PRO team plans to:

- Continue to track faculty usage across units;
- Follow up with faculty users who are not running reports to provide further training, assistance, or education on the uses of PRO where appropriate;
- Seek feedback from units whose percentage of total campus users exceeds the percentage of reports run, because it may be that reports need to be modified to be more usable or attractive for faculty and administrators; and to
- Encourage PRO among faculty going up for PTTR/P&T and PTR next year and gather feedback about how well the PRO candidate CVs match with what candidates actually submit.

**1.2 Faculty Web Page Developments**

**Current status.** An ongoing goal is for faculty members to use PRO to publish content to their KU faculty web profile pages. Faculty appreciate having direct, close-to-real-time control over the dynamic content on their web pages, and connecting PRO to web pages also considerably reduces faculty and staff time in managing content. An additional benefit is that when faculty members mark “Display on web page” on publications and creative works, it positively impacts their profiles on the new Engage KU portal for public use.

The number of faculty using PRO to publish content to their web pages has increased significantly in the last six months, in part due to a dedicated communication effort on behalf of the PRO team: 831 individual faculty members (about 75% of the academic faculty) now have their web pages connected to PRO. At the last steering committee, about 450 faculty (about 49% of the academic faculty) had web pages connected to PRO.

Notably, 831 faculty members are now using PRO to publish content to 1,302 individual web pages, leaving about 366 faculty who are publishing from PRO to more than one website. Faculty publishing to multiple webpages from one PRO account average 2-4 webpages per person, and these are often lab, program, or department websites in which faculty are jointly appointed or affiliated. The PRO team will continue to encourage faculty, department chairs, web admins, and deans to connect PRO accounts to faculty web pages.
New developments. IT and the PRO team collaborated to complete four new web page developments that were discussed at the November 2015 steering committee meeting. All new features are live and they include:

- Linking selected awards and honors to web pages via a “Display on web page” option in PRO;
- Displaying faculty education/degrees earned;
- Toggling from “Show Selected Publications” to “Show All Publications”;
- Making MLA and Bluebook optional citation styles in addition to APA formatting.

IT and PRO will continue to collaborate on the final citation style options on the web, Chicago A and Chicago B, which are targeted for completion by fall 2016.

2.0 Digital Measures Development & Performance

Digital Measures has completed a number of planned upgrades this year including:

- New user interface;
- Type-ahead search functionality on drop-down lists, reducing lengthy faculty scrolling;
- Improved data center/server capacity, creating faster processing for users;
- Reducing work request turnaround time from 10 business days to a median of 7 business days;
- Offering opportunities to rate and providing feedback on DM’s performance in completing work requests.

3.0 Initiatives Completed by the PRO team

- **Artistic works.** In winter 2016, the artistic works data for the School of Music was completely transformed, resulting in much improved screens and dropdown values for Music faculty.
- **Grants data loading from PeopleSoft.** The pilot project incorporating PeopleSoft data into PRO for new grant proposals and awards was completed in January 2016. The outcome was successful: faculty in various departments provided positive feedback about their reduced time doing data entry on grants. The PRO team still manually inputs this data, but ideally, this data will be uploaded automatically into PRO. To enable this to happen, Digital Measures needs to complete developments on its end, namely, the ability to upload data to records containing dynamic sub-answers.
- **New website and user documentation.** The PRO team has launched a comprehensive website that offers detailed and easy-to-use information about PRO. The PRO team is in the midst of updating the remaining user documentation, including department-specific documents, and posting them to the web for faculty use.
• **KUMC consultation.** The PRO team consulted with KUMC as it finalized its contract with Digital Measures to bring its own Activity Insight instrument. The result of this consultation is that Lawrence and KUMC will use the same base instrument, which may save KUMC considerable time and effort on system development.

### 4.0 Challenges and Future Goals

The PRO team is working with Digital Measures to implement key system developments, including:

• **Lifting the record limitation on unit-wide, multi-year reports.** DM currently limits the number of records that can be accessed and reported in various reports. The current limit bars access to key summary reports, especially when reports are run across multiple years or large schools/departments. The PRO team will continue to monitor Digital Measures’ progress in lifting this limit and stress to Digital Measures the urgency and importance of being able to run unit-wide/multi-year reports.

• **Finalizing the NLM citation style.** The development of the National Library of Medicine (Vancouver) citation style is nearly complete, and it is the final style specified in the agreement between KU and Digital Measures.

• **Improving other key user and back-end functionality.** The PubMed/BibTX imports and usage statistics need further development.

The PRO team is working with KU deans, department chairs, and faculty to:

• Follow up on faculty usage and reporting needs suggested by the data described in Section 1.1 of this report to further improve PRO as a tool for campus users;

• Make screen adjustments based on faculty feedback, such as moving “Guest course lectures” to appear in the “Teaching” section (currently in “Service”);

• Work with research centers to improve their engagement with PRO;

• Establish broad and routine campus-wide communication/reminders;

• Encourage faculty to use PRO and let them know it continues to improve;

• Review and modify screens to improve faculty data entry experience given changes in screen readability due to the new interface;

• Interface with internal and external systems and web sites (e.g., KU Faculty Expertise Portal); and

• Continue training of faculty, department chairs and departmental staff.

### 5.0 Formal Project Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Originator</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Status and Schedule</td>
<td>Kulp</td>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>Report on project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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