Professional Record Online System Steering Committee

September 12, 2011, 3 p.m., Provost's Conference Room

Members and Staff Present:

Mary Lee Hummert, Chair; Steve Warren, Diane Goddard, Ben Eggleston, Joshua Rosenbloom, Sara Rosen, Deb Teeter, Ryan Cherland, Paul Terranova, Julie Loats, Linda Mannering, Kevin Boatright

Presentation

Linda Mannering was introduced. She is on administrative leave as Director of Institutional Research at the University of Nebraska at Omaha and is assisting with the implementation of the Professional Record Online (PRO) system at KU.

Mannering said a project management approach will be used for the introduction of Digital Measures. The School of Music implementation will set the stage for the rest of the university. She talked with colleagues at the University of Iowa, where four schools are using Digital Measures. Those schools implemented the program independently and have stand-alone databases, administrative support, and web staff. Their advice to KU was "make sure it's a centralized instrument and approach" to ensure consistency for roll-up reporting. They spoke to the need for clear leadership and commitment, which KU has.

At Penn State, said Mannering, they started in a decentralized fashion and there have been challenges in doing campus reporting as a result. At UC-Irvine, a centralized approach was used (except for Music), and that is closer to what KU wants to do. UC-Irvine has been using Digital Measures for two years, but KU could accomplish the implementation more quickly.

A contract has been signed with Digital Measures and Mannering has had access to the Activity Insight[TM] set-up for KU since September 9. We can now begin working with and loading data into the system. She presented an extensive four-page progress report for August-September that outlined tasks completed, the status of the School of Music implementation, formal project communication, next steps, and other information.

Mannering also walked the committee through a draft charter for the project and a set of frequently asked questions. She invited members to contact her by e-mail during the coming month with suggested changes to either document. There will eventually be a KU-wide charter, in order to eliminate confusion going forward.

Discussion: Data Management

Members expressed surprise at the limited size of stored files in Digital Measures. Digital Measures says that file size is limited to 50KB because of the time it takes to load large files to PRO. Options were discussed, including KU ScholarWorks, as a repository, since audio and

video files are very large. Mannering said it would be OK simply to link (by giving the URL in PRO) to wherever the file exists.

It was asked who will manage user security? For now it will be Mannering, but that can be delegated. Communications will be critical, and the existing PRO system web site should migrate to the Provost's Office.

Mannering reviewed the responsibilities of KU and Digital Measures during implementation:

KU	Digital Measures
Data entry	Data base structure
Data validation	Report creation
Manage/train users	Customize screens
Data extracts	User guides
Portal environment	Security
Web page hosting	Back-ups

While Digital Measures can handle the data entry using temporary workers, e.g., Manpower, KU could enlist student hourlies. Which would cost less? Those doing the work will have to be very good, so there are pros and cons to either approach. Perhaps we could hire retired KU program assistants who have good skills and are familiar with KU? The quality of data entry is important to the faculty. Perhaps one person enters the data and another validates it? The challenge may be in interpreting each faculty member's vita.

Mannering noted that whoever enters the data we are responsible for it. Some data can be loaded into the system automatically by KU, e.g., demographics, awards and grants, courses taught, student advising, course evaluations, etc. Other data will have to be keyed in, e.g., research, scholarly, and creative work; service; biographical narrative, current and future interests, course syllabi, etc. Faculty should be updating their information once or twice a semester.

Discussion: School of Music Implementation

If any loaded data are incorrect, we need a process that corrects the data at the source. The School of Music is a good starting point because there are lots of nuances but a manageable-size number of faculty (57).

Existing emeritus faculty are excluded from the PRO system, though current faculty who move into emeritus status will remain in the system and department pages can show all faculty.

School of Music data will be loaded into the system during the fall and validated and tested with the dean and associate dean. The data will be shared with faculty when it's "95% right" and will be compared with the information submitted in the spring for promotion and tenure purposes. Dean Walzel has indicated that he wants the School of Music to have its own reporting format.

Discussion: Policy Issues

Mannering outlined three policy issues for the committee to consider:

1. Add a check-off list so faculty can indicate completion of data/reports?
2. Will it be important that faculty save their activity reports in PRO?
3. Give the faculty the option to authorize the library to review publications/citations for Open Access purposes?

The need for an electronic signature that we'll have to design was discussed. The third item is exciting because it will improve and streamline the process for the library and faculty. There is no downside to granting access and it's a great starting point for the person's entire body of work in the past. A check-off list will enable department chairs to determine who has updated their record.

Other Business

The School of Music implementation will take the 2011-12 academic year. It would be good to be able to give people a timeline for implantation across the Lawrence and Medical Center campuses.

Mannering noted the need to develop a plan and stage it. We are paying for 100 faculty records at this point but are only using about two thirds of them. Other departments have expressed interest and perhaps we should add one.

There are some decisions that need to be made to enable university wide tracking, e.g., tagging the strategic initiatives and engaged scholarship.

At the Medical Center campus, implementation among the basic science departments will be fairly uniform. Annual department evaluations are helpful for collecting data.

Eventually, departments will submit their annual reports to their dean using the PRO system. This should become routine over time. Some decisions need to me made concerning the use of course evaluations.

The next meeting of the committee will take place in November, followed by a meeting in early February. A demonstration of the system should be possible at that time.

Minutes by Kevin Boatright

#####