Faculty Achievement Data Initiative:
Interim Report

John Bertot
Mark Arnold
Office of Faculty Affairs

Joseph Drasin
Chris Kernan
Division of Information Technology

September 15, 2016
Introduction

The University of Maryland College Park (University) relaunched its Faculty Achievement Data Initiative in May 2016. Designed to provide comprehensive information on faculty members’ scholarly achievements, the University seeks to design and implement a system with the following goals and objectives:

- Reduce the burden on faculty for meeting productivity reporting requirements;
- Facilitate faculty reuse of reported activity data for research, instruction, and service purposes (e.g., faculty web pages, teaching portfolios, grant submission CVs);
- Facilitate the capture, presentation, retrieval, and reuse of faculty activity data for a range of University and unit processes;
- Improve the quality (e.g., timeliness, comprehensiveness, consistency, and relevance) of information about faculty activity available to administrators and committees charged with faculty hiring, evaluation, and promotion;
- Increase the visibility of UMD faculty activity, particularly as they contribute to the mission and reputation of the University;
- Reduce administrative burden, cost, and time to completion for faculty review and promotion processes;
- Improve the quality of the information about faculty activity available on university websites, social media, and other references; and,
- Increase the amount of interdisciplinary/cross-unit collaboration within UMD by simplifying the process of identifying relevant colleagues and potential collaborators.

To achieve these goals and objectives, the Office of Faculty Affairs (OFA) has partnered with the Division of Information Technology (DIT) to jointly develop and implement a Faculty Achievement Data system. Through this partnership, OFA and DIT:

- Developed a Memorandum of Understanding between the Office of the Senior Vice President and Provost and the Division of Information Technology that establishes a framework for collaboration and development;
- Formed an initial and advisory working group comprised of Chairs, Associate Deans, and key constituents across campus (e.g., IRPA, the Library, the Graduate School) to inform initial activities;
- Initiated the procurement process to enable the University to solicit and receive bids for the development and implementation of a Faculty Achievement Data system;
- Provided updates to the campus community to keep them informed regarding our process as part of a larger communication strategy;
- Reached out to a number of campuses, particularly Big 10 Academic Alliance campuses, to better understand their implementation approaches for collecting and reporting faculty achievements;
- Conducted a survey of faculty designed to 1) solicit their input into key desired system features, and 2) offer faculty the opportunity to self-identify for inclusion in various aspects of product design, vetting, and implementation;
- Conducted an initial process assessment with Chairs and Associate Deans to better understand College and Departmental processes that leverage faculty achievement (and other, when identified) data for local assessment purposes.

This interim report provides an update on the last three items listed above: 1) Lessons learned to date
from our interviews with other campuses and their faculty achievement data efforts; 2) Results from the faculty survey conducted in July-August 2016; and 3) Results from the initial process assessment.

**Selected Summary of Data Collection Efforts**
Following this summary, the report presents more detailed analysis of the interviews with other campuses regarding their faculty achievement data efforts, the faculty survey results, and the process assessment. In addition, the interim report provides an updated timeline for our Faculty Achievement Data Initiative.

**Campus Interviews Summary**
To date, the Faculty Achievement Data Initiative project team has interviewed individuals on five campuses regarding their faculty achievement data system implementations. The goals of the interviews were, in part, to: explore the overall approach to the design and implementation of faculty achievement data initiatives; discuss the process by which the campus selected the particular faculty achievement data vendor and tool; discuss the factors and features that led to the selection of a particular faculty achievement data vendor and tool; and explore vendor and tool limitations, areas of excellence, and areas of challenge. Key findings from the interviews include:

- Any vendor and/or tool that we select will have both highly desirable and challenged features;
- The more an implementation strays from a “standard”/”out of the box” implementation, the more likely there will be design and implementation challenges;
- Understanding the intended uses (faculty, department, College, institutional) from the onset is best, with an acknowledgment that needs and uses will evolve over time -- and thus there is a need for continual needs assessment activities;
- The variance in disciplinarity, and how to represent accomplishments across disciplines, is a challenge;
- There is a need to ensure that the “hooks” to other data sources (in or out) -- and access mechanisms (i.e., APIs) --- are well defined, clearly established, and tested;
- There is a need to have adequate and appropriate support for the faculty achievement data initiative across key constituencies;
- Implementation is only the beginning; and
- A phased approach that ensures a solid implementation of core functionality before adding "bells and whistles" is critical.

These findings are discussed in more depth in the Campus Faculty Achievement Data Interview Findings section.

**Faculty Survey Summary**
The survey to faculty contained three main sections: 1) Faculty rating of importance of different features; 2) Open-ended response field for any comments faculty wanted to provide; and 3) Option for faculty to volunteer to participate in the Initiative. The survey received 692 responses.

Faculty were asked to rate the importance of the following possible system features:

1. Having updates to my departmental web page occur anytime I enter an achievement in the system
2. Establishing a public-facing, institutional web profile of all faculty's achievements.
3. Being able to create NIH/NSF bio-sketches.
4. Flagging individual contributions to be inaccessible outside of the policy-required sections of the annual report.
5. Creating multi-year activity reports (as opposed to single-year annual reports).
6. Customizing reports for specific purposes (e.g., an award application).
7. Incorporating ORCIDs: mine, my collaborators', and my mentees'.
8. Importing data from indexing services or other bibliographic/citation services.
9. Other [with textbox for user to explain]

Items 5, 6, and 8 were ranked as either Very Important or Somewhat Important by 68% of respondents. Items 3 and 7 were deemed the least important, with 34% and 32% of respondents indicating that those features were Not Important, respectively. The “other” suggestions included frequent mentions of “ease of use,” and automatic imports of data from other campus systems.

A preliminary review of comments provided via the open-ended question identified five relatively prominent concerns/interests: “Ease of use;” the need for adequate categories for capturing the diversity of faculty achievements and activities; the ability to import data from other sources; concern or question about the purpose a faculty achievement data system was intended to serve and the process by which such systems are selected and vetted; and the need for a new system to be tested and stable.

Additionally, 143 faculty indicated their willingness to participate in focus groups and/or other activities designed to provide more detailed feedback on these options and/or other concerns.

The Faculty Achievement Data Survey Findings section expands on the survey findings.

**Process Mapping Summary**

The Division of Information Technology met with a small group of chairs to gain an initial understanding of faculty data processes within units on campus. The initial findings indicate that:

1. Process needs and structure vary widely among units;
2. There are concerns about data quality in various campus systems, not just what a faculty achievement data system might provide;
3. There is a strong desire for automation that facilitates access to and use of data; and
4. The urgency for the need of a faculty achievement data system is not shared equally across campus units.

These initial findings offer insights regarding how to move forward that include: develop a clear multi-phase implementation plan which not only lists features, but which concerns will be addressed by them; deploy any system that is selected in phases – not just across campus but also within Colleges; and ensure data quality.

These findings are further elaborated in the Process Mapping Study Findings.
Revised Timeline

Given the findings from these efforts to date, and the need to consider other factors, we have modified our Faculty Achievement Data Initiative timeline (see Table 1). Based on the revised timeline we anticipate releasing the RFP in early November 2016, with responses due early December 2016. The goal is to award a contract by the end of March 2017, with a variety of steps and checks between April and a live product (projected) by mid-November 2017. This is certainly an ambitious schedule, with many decision points along the way. It is important to note that this is a high level timeline with a range of other implementation decisions (i.e., what might a phased roll-out look like?) that have yet to be considered.

Sharing Information with Faculty: Communications

We have initiated periodic updates to faculty to keep them informed. We envision using this approach on an as-needed basis, but also to provide general updates to keep faculty informed. We have also created a webpage (https://faculty.umd.edu/data/) that we will update regularly with various initiative-related documents (for example, a more general/summarized version of this report, with names of interviewees removed).

Our goal is also to update faculty regarding opportunities to participate in the tool/product selection and development process to the extent possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Target Dates</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Review &amp; Revise SOW</td>
<td>8/29 – 10/15</td>
<td>Holiday 9/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Release RFP</td>
<td>11/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Proposals Due</td>
<td>12/2</td>
<td>Holiday 11/24-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Review Proposals</td>
<td>12/5 – 12/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Clarification Process (if applicable)</td>
<td>12/16 – 1/9</td>
<td>Holiday 12/24 - 1/2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Product Demonstrations</td>
<td>1/9 – 1/20</td>
<td>Holiday 1/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Write up technical evaluations</td>
<td>1/23 – 27 (technical evaluation initial draft)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/30 – 2/3 (procurement review and feedback)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2/3 – 2/13 (final technical evaluation completed and signed by dept.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Review pricing</td>
<td>2/14 – 2/15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Write up final determination from evaluations</td>
<td>2/16 – 2/21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Procurement completed – internal contract award actions and issue notice of intent to award</td>
<td>2/24 – 2/28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Debriefing Period</td>
<td>3/1 – 3/8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Protest Period (if applicable)</td>
<td>3/9 – 3/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Award contract</td>
<td>3/27</td>
<td>Holiday 3/19 - 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Stand up selected tool in DEV</td>
<td>Starts 3/28, completes by 5/5</td>
<td>Includes configuration, but not integration with other systems – Phase II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Go/No Go Decision</td>
<td>5/10</td>
<td>Move forward or invoke fallback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Import data</td>
<td>Starts 5/19, completes by 6/15. This may depend on data mapping.</td>
<td>People &amp; user data only. Other data (research, courses, course eval and CVs) to be imported as needed in later phases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Go/No Go Decision</td>
<td>6/16</td>
<td>Move forward or invoke fallback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Configuration Testing</td>
<td>Starts 6/19, completes by 7/7</td>
<td>Holiday 7/3 - 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Standup selected tool in QA</td>
<td>Starts 7/10, completes by 7/28</td>
<td>Includes automating deployment tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. UAT (User Acceptance Testing)</td>
<td>Starts 8/1, completes by 9/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Remediation/Retest (if required)</td>
<td>Starts 9/5, completes by 9/29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Standup selected tool in Prod</td>
<td>Starts 10/1, completes by 10/27</td>
<td>Includes automation of Integration tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Training Sessions Offered in QA</td>
<td>Starts 11/1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Production Go Live</td>
<td>11/15/17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Draft Timeline for Vetting, Procurement & Implementation for a System to Manage Faculty Achievement Data (Phase 1) – REV 8/15/16
Campus Faculty Achievement Data Interview Findings

The Office of Faculty Affairs and the Division of Information Technology have interviewed faculty achievement data teams at other campuses to discuss their implementations of faculty achievement data initiatives. Big 10 Academic Alliance campuses in particular were targeted as peers, but the interviews included other campuses. To date, we have connected with five campuses (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Big 10 Academic Alliance University 1</td>
<td>Digital Measures/Activity Insight</td>
<td>Centralized; implementation for all campuses in system</td>
<td>Associate Vice President of University Academic Affairs</td>
<td>• Central: Academic Affairs, Enterprise Business Systems (DIT equivalent) • Units: Hybrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big 10 Academic Alliance University 2</td>
<td>Digital Measures/Activity Insight</td>
<td>Campus implementation</td>
<td>Academic Affairs/Provost</td>
<td>• Central: Academic Affairs/IT Services • Unit: Evolving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big 10 Academic Alliance University 3</td>
<td>Digital Measures/Activity Insight</td>
<td>Centralized; implementation for all campuses in system Voluntary participation by units and campuses</td>
<td>Assistant Vice Provost Faculty and Academic Affairs/Office of the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost</td>
<td>• Central: Faculty and Academic Affairs • Unit: Assigned/designated by unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USM University 1</td>
<td>Digital Measures/Activity Insight</td>
<td>Campus implementation</td>
<td>Institutional Research, Analysis, and Decision Support/Division of Information Technology</td>
<td>• Central: Institutional Research and DIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional University</td>
<td>Faculty 180/Data 180</td>
<td>Campus implementation</td>
<td>Institutional Research and Effectiveness</td>
<td>• Central: Institutional Research and Effectiveness • Unit: Assigned person in admin office focused on implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Faculty Achievement Data Campus Interview Summary.
The goals of these interviews were to:

- Discuss the context of faculty achievement, performance, and institutional processes (i.e., APT) reporting/data use efforts on the campus (or system if a system-wide approach was taken) and how that context impacted the goals for faculty achievement systems;
- Explore the overall approach to the design and implementation of faculty achievement data initiatives;
- Discuss the process by which the campus selected the particular faculty achievement data vendor and tool;
- Discuss the factors and features that led to the selection of a particular faculty achievement data vendor and tool;
- Explore vendor and tool limitations, areas of excellence, and areas of challenge;
- Explore the specific implementation approach -- and the impact the approach is having on the ability to successfully implement a faculty achievement data system;
- Explore staffing and support structures and requirements;
- Explore technical aspects of the tool(s) and how those impact the design and implementation options; and
- Explore governance, management, and other institutional considerations regarding faculty achievement data.

Depending on where campuses were in their implementation processes(es) some of the above topics were of varying degrees of relevance, and the interviews remained fluid to accommodate that variance.

**Key Findings from the Interviews**

The interviews identified a number of instructive lessons, considerations, and details from which the University of Maryland can learn as we refocus our own faculty achievement data initiative. These are presented below (order of appearance does not reflect any form of importance ranking):

- Any vendor and/or tool that we select will have both highly desirable and challenged features. No one system has all the features -- or implementation of features -- that we might prefer. One has to balance, prioritize, and identify “must have” functionality versus those that are desirable but not necessarily essential.
  - In addition, one has to factor in the level of customer support that is both needed and expected for different product features and ensure that the vendor is able to provide that level of customer support, and that UMD is able to provide the necessary level of institutional support necessary for deploying different features.
- The more an implementation strays from a “standard”/“out of the box” implementation, the more likely there will be design and implementation challenges. This is not to say that certain levels of customization aren’t possible, but rather that there is a point beyond which customization leads to significant problems.
  - This issue should not be viewed to mean that no customization is possible, but rather that customization resides on a continuum -- and the more a campus’ procedures deviate from the tool’s base design, and the more a campus seeks to have the tool conform to its
existing procedures (rather than the institution changing some of its procedures to match what the product offers), the more likely a campus will encounter problems.

- Further, each tool has a range of modules that will address different processes (e.g. APT, annual reporting, or harvesting data from a bibliographic database). These modules are malleable to a certain extent, but also there appeared to be issues of module interactivity based on customization; that is, sometimes issues surfaced in one module when changes were made in another.

- Understanding the intended uses (faculty, department, College, institutional) from the onset is best, with an acknowledgment that needs and uses will evolve over time -- and thus there is a need for continual needs assessment activities.

- The variance in disciplinarity, and how to represent accomplishments across disciplines, is a challenge. Most challenging are portfolio- and performance-based disciplines as well as those for whom scholarly output is not well represented in harvestable sources such as Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar.

- There is a need to ensure that the “hooks” to other data sources (in or out) -- and access mechanisms (i.e., APIs) --- are well defined, clearly established, and tested.

- There is a need to have adequate and appropriate support for the faculty achievement data initiative across key constituencies: initiative owner (at least a full-time initiative manager and a data analytics/analysis person); units (a designated individual who can facilitate implementation and use); and data/systems integration (data definitions, data warehouse development and management, integration across appropriate systems for data import and export).

- Campuses varied in their approach to staffing and supporting the initiative. All, however, indicated a need to adequately resource the effort, with the definition of “adequate” depending highly on how the campus pulled together its implementation team (e.g., in partnerships with IT, collaboration with the Library, involvement and support from Institutional Research/Assessment) - and the resources those individual institutional team members brought to the initiative (or didn’t).

- Implementation is only the beginning. Support and development is ongoing and requires careful consideration, thought, and operationalization - to include advisory groups that can inform continued tool and feature development, faculty data governance issues, and working groups that bring together representatives involved with various systems from which the faculty data achievement tool draws data and into which it feeds data.

- A phased approach that ensures a solid implementation of core functionality before adding “bells and whistles” is critical. This builds trust and also demonstrates a baseline of functionality on which to build additional enhancements.

- There is a need to be realistic as well. There may be some features that a particular stakeholder finds highly desirable that may ultimately not be feasible to implement for any number of reasons. Expectation management that is engaged in an open way is essential.

- A phased roll-out may also include the Unit level. A number of the campuses were taking a College-by-College (or 2-3 at a time) approach.
These serve as the key findings from the interviews to date.

**Concluding Comments**

These findings offer a number of important insights into how we recast and redirect our faculty achievement data initiative. In the end, no one campus indicated that they have perfected their implementation or tool – and that faculty achievement data efforts are in a continual state of design, development, and roll-out. It is also important to note that none of the campuses interviewed have what we might consider a fully-implemented system, as all were in some state of implementation. As such some follow-up with participants as they are further along with their implementations would be useful.
Faculty Achievement Data Survey Findings
The survey contained three main sections:

1. faculty rating of importance of different system features;
2. open ended response field; and
3. option for faculty to volunteer to participate in focus groups, etc.

On July 12, 2016, the Provost’s office used Megamail to invite faculty to complete the survey. A reminder was sent July 25, 2016. In all, 692 surveys were completed.

Section 1 - Faculty Rating of Importance of Different System Features
Faculty were asked to rate the importance of the following possible system features:

1. Having updates to my departmental web page occur anytime I enter an achievement in the system
2. Establishing a public-facing, institutional web profile of all faculty's achievements.
3. Being able to create NIH/NSF bio-sketches.
4. Flagging individual contributions to be inaccessible outside of the policy-required sections of the annual report.
5. Creating multi-year activity reports (as opposed to single-year annual reports).
6. Customizing reports for specific purposes (e.g., an award application).
7. Incorporating ORCID's: mine, my collaborators', and my mentees'.*
8. Importing data from indexing services or other bibliographic/citation services.
9. Other [with textbox for user to explain]

Of the 8 specified features, items 5, 6, and 8 were far and away deemed the most important --- those three prompts were the only ones with more than 36% of faculty reporting the feature as Very Important. Including the Somewhat Important rating as well, over 68% of respondents indicated that items 5, 6, and 8, were either Very Important or Somewhat Important.

Of the 8 specified features, items 3 and 7 were far and away deemed the least important, with 34% and 32% of respondents indicating that those features were Not Important, respectively.

Some respondents commented that item 4 was unclear, so the low importance ratings for that item should perhaps not be taken as a sound reflection of the importance of the feature.

For item 9 (i.e. “Other”), in which faculty could add their own feature to the list, an extremely common theme was “Ease of use.” Automatic imports of data from other campus systems was also cited frequently.

Table 3 provides a more detailed analysis of the feature-importance ratings. Appendix A provides the full set of “Other” responses.
Open Ended Response Field
281 comments were offered in Section 2 of the survey. A preliminary review of these comments identified five relatively prominent concerns/interests (review methodology discussed below).

1. “Ease of use” was easily the highest concern, with 71 of the 281 responses containing some version of the phrase “ease of use”.
2. The need for adequate categories for capturing the diversity of faculty achievements and activities was second, with 53 respondents noting this need in some way or another. Several of these comments noted the difference between STEM fields and non-journal based disciplines, while others noted the special needs of Librarians, Extension Agents, and/or Professional Track Faculty.
3. The ability to import data from other sources was cited in 42 responses, often coupled with the need for such functionality to be easy to use.
4. 23 responses indicated some manner of concern or question about the purpose such a system was intended to serve and/or the process by which such systems are selected and vetted.
5. 22 responses cited the need for a new system to be tested and stable.

Other recurring themes included:

- The need for an “enter once, use many times” model of a data system;
- The ability for faculty to be able to export data in different data formats and/or for their own purposes; and
- faculty needs should be considered more fully than administrator needs.

Some comments cited more than one concern; each comment was included in the tabulation of however many of the concerns it cited.

In addition, some of the 281 responses provided no substantive comment (e.g. “No”). Some of the 281 responses provided comments that were not counted in the tabulations as it was unclear exactly how the comment related to the prompt “Are there broader considerations you think should be considered in prioritizing the features and functions in a new system?”

Option for Faculty to Volunteer to Participate in Focus Groups, Etc.
143 faculty indicated a willingness to participate in focus groups and/or other activities designed to provide more detailed feedback on these options and/or other concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Helpful but not important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having updates to my departmental web page occur anytime I enter an achieve...</td>
<td>23.37%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>25.30%</td>
<td>26.33%</td>
<td>676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing a public-facing, institutional web profile of all faculty's ac...</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
<td>31.30%</td>
<td>23.25%</td>
<td>22.06%</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to create NIH/NSF bio-sketches.</td>
<td>20.30%</td>
<td>22.41%</td>
<td>23.61%</td>
<td>33.68%</td>
<td>665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagging individual contributions to be inaccessible outside of the policy...</td>
<td>20.54%</td>
<td>23.85%</td>
<td>27.17%</td>
<td>28.44%</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating multi-year activity reports (as opposed to single-year annual repo...)</td>
<td>36.77%</td>
<td>32.44%</td>
<td>16.44%</td>
<td>14.35%</td>
<td>669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customizing reports for specific purposes (e.g., an award application).</td>
<td>36.98%</td>
<td>29.64%</td>
<td>17.22%</td>
<td>16.17%</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating ORCIDs: mine, my collaborators’, and my mentees*.</td>
<td>16.22%</td>
<td>27.46%</td>
<td>24.02%</td>
<td>32.29%</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importing data from indexing services or other bibliographic/citation servi...</td>
<td>37.71%</td>
<td>27.45%</td>
<td>20.06%</td>
<td>14.78%</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. System Feature Importance Ratings.
Process Mapping Study Findings

Below is a preliminary analysis of the faculty data process landscape based on five interviews conducted with Chairs and Associate Deans representing a range of disciplines as well as some additional research. Along with this analysis is a sketch (see Figure 1) that represents the current state of the system (process, people, tools, data).

Based on the work done, four key findings were surfaced which need consideration when determining tool features, deployment strategy, project objectives, data governance, and data readiness.

1) Process needs and structure vary widely among units – Based on the five individuals we spoke with, there are significant differences in the processes which use faculty data both in terms of maturity of processes as well as formality. In some departments there is a very regimented, data-focused process for review, while in others, there is a more informal approach to the use and interpretation of data. In addition, the data, sources of data, and consumers of data underlying these processes vary widely. This raises concerns about how well a single tool could adapt to these disparate needs. There appeared to be 3 basic meta-types of the process: Highly structured research departments; practice-based departments; and departments with external outreach components. Of course many colleges and departments had aspects of more than one of these. It is suspected that additional conversations with more departments would surface more differences.

2) There are well-founded concerns about data quality – While several of the Chairs’ and Deans’ offices expressed an interest in using data for various analyses, they also raised concerns about the quality of data in the existing systems. This was not only from the areas of FAR (e.g., how well will data come in from Lyterati), but in ancillary systems (e.g. PHR and SIS). The end result is that much of the desired analysis is not possible and may not be possible even after this effort, unless others systems are addressed. There were also concerns raised related to what UMD considers important versus what we are asked to report on. Much of this underlying data concern is of significant scope and would require a substantial investment of time to analyze, define, and remediate.

3) Strong desire for automation – The departments, especially those who were heavily research focused, had a strong desire to bring in as much data as possible from Google Scholar, PHR, KFS, etc., as current systems do not include all the data they need. Especially for research, the current model does not bring in KFS account data. Overall, there was a consistent theme of being able to enter data one time and then leverage for multiple uses.

4) Urgency is not equally felt – For some departments, a successful faculty data system was seen as highly desirable allowing them to do in-depth analysis. For other groups it was not clear why any of this was something where significant effort should be spent. This was highly correlated to the structure, formality, and external requirements of productivity data. However, all groups did recognize that there were external and internal needs for data.
Considerations

1) Develop a clear roadmap for addressing pain– The interest level and focus of faculty achievement data is so diverse, that gathering a list of requirements may be overwhelming. This increases the importance of developing a clear multi-phase implementation plan which not only lists features, but also which concerns will be addressed by those features. This should be done several phases out so that users known when their individual pain will be felt.

2) Deploy in phases (feature) – It is clear that every concern cannot be addressed immediately. The analysis done supports the need to focus on getting a few key features right rather than a scattershot of marginally working features. Along with consideration #1, this suggests the need for a narrow, but rich, focus and a public roadmap of when other pains will be addressed. There were different views from the individuals interviewed regarding what the system was/was-not and what it could, would, and wouldn’t do.

3) Deploy in phases (college/departmental) – Given the disparate processes, sense of urgency, and needs, the group should consider deploying in geographic phases starting with the more formal and structured groups first. Trying to do a campus-wide rollout with such disparity of processes will be difficult. However, if a beach-head can be achieved with key groups, it may allow for easier expansion to other departments over time. This approach will mitigate risk while still allowing for the most value to be realized in a shorter amount of time.

4) Data quality – Two key data elements were raised as problematic, and further analysis would likely uncover more. SIS course data and PHR faculty data were both identified as causing challenges to desired analysis. Addressing this would require a holistic review of the concepts and data structures surrounding these areas and a major technical effort to modify them.
Appendix A. Full Text of “Other” Responses to System Feature Responses.

Journal editorial functions
Automatically import previous data and current data such as grants and teaching 
Capacity Statement for each school 
customizable to provide data specific to department level merit and productivity reviews 
ability to export to latex and word formats 
multiple upload formats 
????

Allow adjuncts to demonstrate "in the field" qualifications as opposed to just research.
Ease of use
Ease of use
Easy data entry
Minimizing Faculty work involved
Provide formatted CVs
simplify reporting
Accept DOI as reference for papers (at entry time)
The 4th statement doesn't make sense
Being user-friendly
effects on h-index
contacts
Being able to copy and paste a list of citations
Ability to utilize annual report directly for promotion/ tenure dossiers
Making the system intuitive and as simple to learn as possible
automatically populating most fields from existing UMD databases on contracts, awards, etc.
Easy to enter data
Teaching achievements
Ease of use
Measures of success are very discipline-specific. These seem very STEM oriented. In ARHU we update our c.v.s, which works fine.
Importing the CV in MS Word standard formatting
Did not understand Q4
Being able to import/export from/to an open-source, machine/human-readable format, rather than some proprietary database system
ResearchGate
Ability to output a high quality CV based on the data entered.
Creating packages that are specific to the requirements for promotion
mscullen2007@gmail.com
BibTex, Endnotes
compatibility with papers, mendeley, endnote bibliography systems (xml?)
Many, many types of scholarly and professional activities do not fit into the narrow confines used in Lyterati. The categories and subheadings should be customizable to fit the nature of faculty achievements in different fields.
Being able to parse a CV for data entry.
Allowing data entry in LaTeX
Ease of data entry
louiqa@umiacs.umd.edu
Having no pretensions to being a CV.
Access to faculty data outside rigid department and college structures, e.g., interdisciplinary programs or centers
If we're doing this that this is what is needed for anything that UMD requires and that it formats it in the way UMD wants it - so much wasted time putting things in to slightly different formats for different units across campus
Design a non stem centric system
Ability to upload CV and not have to enter information anew
Integration with SciENcv
include emeriti in database
being attuned to conventions in the humanities
Exporting data as a LaTeX file, so that I can avoid maintaining an academic CV in parallel
Minimizing time faculty have to spend on collecting information; the metrics should align with the same metrics on a biosketch
to be inclusive and user friendly
LaTeX template
what are orcid?
Allow for co-advising of graduate students to be reported
What is an ORCID?
Give it a rest.
importing phd/ms thesis committee memberships
Exporting to a format required for departmental reporting
Incorporating Extension Major Programs and associated outcomes
easy interface
Selective updating to Researchgate.com and Academia.edu
Allowing for faculty members of different types (e.g., Libraries faculty) to have a form that is customized to our needs.
Importing papers from Google Scholar or Research Gate
Allowing for flexible categories
Automatic population of grant data from COEUS.
be adaptable to each form of faculty (instructional, research, extension, library, etc.)
Interacting with DRUM (Digital Repository at the University of Maryland); either depositing research or retrieving research and incorporating in new system
Being able to generate human-friendly PDF and HTML versions without a massive amount of effort.
Allowing file uploads, so we do not have to re-enter CV data
ability to get the data out in machine readable format when this system gets replaced by the next one.
ease of entry and use - fast
Tracking article submission/acceptance/publication across years
Accommodating the needs of library faculty
EASE OF USE
including professional work outside of university
Ability to handle non-standard academic work without horrible kludges - i.e., creative work/performances and K-12 teacher professional development
Less time to use and short learning curve
not wasting the effort that went into the Lyterati project
does not require lots of time to add data
Ability to produce different CV formats for different purposes
import from previous activity reports
make it simple to fill out.
You are simply wasting time and money by buying a system that we don’t need and no-one looks at.
Being very simple to use
Clear interface and easy to use!
tracking how our data are used
Convenient means to migrate
Just collect CVs
importing bibtex
Having an administration that cares about research rather than football