

## Case Western Reserve University

### Faculty Lifecycle Initiative

November, 2012

---

#### Background:

*The structure of the American research university is rapidly changing, and the composition of the academy's most valuable asset—the faculty—and the essential nature of their work are being transformed ... The research university model has evolved to function within a more globalized, knowledge-based economy with powerful privatization and market forces, and advanced technologies ... At the heart of this transformation has been a restructuring of the faculty lifecycle; academic appointments, academic work, and academic careers (Jack H. Schuster and Martin J. Finkelstein. *THE AMERICAN FACULTY: The Restructuring of Academic Work and Careers*. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006).*

The amount of data about faculty required or requested by government agencies, accreditors, non-profit organizations, and university administration has increased dramatically over the years, with an expanded interest in all aspects of the faculty lifecycle: teaching and learning trends, salary equity, demographics, workload, and research and scholarship. There are also third-party services such as Academic Analytics and Thomson Reuters, who both provide and collect information about faculty for university administrators and industry.

The method of tracking faculty lifecycle activity at CWRU is not a centralized process and is impeded by the following challenges:

- Decentralized business intelligence collection processes
- Standalone database and data collection systems maintained at the school/department/administrative levels (e.g., School of Medicine, Sponsored Projects Administration, and the University Registrar)\*
- Duplicated manual input processes
- Data gaps – inconsistent and missing information

\* The Provost's Faculty Database is maintained by the Office of Planning and Institutional Research. This is a standalone database not linked to any university system that retains information on all Board-appointed faculty (i.e., at the rank of instructor and above): their salary, demographics, promotion and tenure, and academic and administrative posts. Approximately 1,700 of the faculty with Board-approved appointments are paid through affiliated hospitals and are not university employees.

A two-fold need exists to successfully track faculty lifecycle activities:

- 1) Establish a faculty database which captures information relevant for required reporting activities, as well as those broader areas of research, scholarly achievements, and creative endeavors.

- 2) Identify a technology solution which bridges the gap between university data systems and provides a platform for generating more actionable metrics about faculty that aid in strategic planning.

Implementation of the above solutions would position the university to pursue additional opportunities in the following areas:

- Establish an institution-wide faculty activity reporting system that can be customized to meet the needs of the individual schools
- Create a warehouse of business intelligence for use in planning and collaboration
- Develop a portal for external partnerships and enhanced collaborations in teaching and research
- Strengthen the university's ability to provide actionable data for internal assessment of policy and program effectiveness and benchmarking analysis
- Incorporate Faculty Handbook policy filters throughout the system that ensure adherence to university policies
- Create a community of scholars

We propose that a committee be formed and charged to review and develop a faculty lifecycle process and system that would better address the university's current needs and future goals. The initiative will proceed on parallel tracks. To begin, a committee of administrators will focus on aspects of the lifecycle related to faculty appointment, promotion, tenure, and related actions. Separately, two existing faculty committees – the University Budget Committee and the Council of Alliances – will serve as consultants on development of a faculty activity report.

## **Executive Sponsors**

William A. "Bud" Baeslack III, Provost and Executive Vice President

Lynn T. Singer, Deputy Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

Christine A. Ash, Vice President for University Planning and Institutional Research

Lev S. Gonick, Vice President for Information Technology Services and Chief Information Officer

## **Key Themes: Data, Processes, and Technology**

**Information Architecture:** Standardize the information architecture of the faculty lifecycle by establishing a reporting system which tracks and accumulates institutionally relevant milestones in the faculty lifecycle from initial appointment through reviews, leaves, promotions and tenure, and retirement, and that also records faculty academic activity – teaching, advising, research and scholarly activity, committee assignments, awards, and service to the profession.

**Business Architecture:** Examine current business processes related to the faculty lifecycle to identify opportunities to improve the flow of information, confirm the adherence to policies and procedures adopted for members of the faculty, and ensure a common understanding of the university's strategic objectives for this group.

Technology Architecture: Identify the appropriate technology architecture that joins information from databases and systems around campus (e.g., HCM, ERA, SIS, Financials, school shadow systems, and third party systems such as PubMed) into a faculty-centric architecture that provides the capability of accessing data to meet the planning and reporting needs of the university.

### **Proposed Administrators Committee Membership**

Daniel E. Anker, Associate Dean for Faculty Affairs and Human Resources, SOM  
Marcia Beasley, Assistant Vice President, Human Resources  
Rimas Biliunas, Director of Information Technology, CSE  
Melissa Burrows, Faculty Diversity Officer, OIDEO  
Denise Donahey, Director of Administration, College of Arts and Sciences  
Jean Gubbins, Director of Institutional Research  
Amy Hammett, University Registrar and Director of Student Information Services  
Lois Langell, Special Assistant to the Provost  
Colleen Nagy, Senior Director of Strategic Initiatives, Policy and Portfolio Management, ITS  
Nassif Nassif, Applications Developer, Program Management Office, ITS  
Suzanne Rivera, Associate Vice President for Research  
Molly Watkins, Director for International Affairs  
Lynice Willis, Program Manager, Planning and Institutional Research

### **Proposed Faculty Consultant Groups**

#### University Budget Committee

- Christopher Cullis, College of Arts and Sciences (Chair)
- Jerold Goldberg, School of Dental Medicine (Dean Rep.)
- Eric Jensen, School of Law
- Kenneth Ledford, College of Arts and Sciences
- Alan Levine, School of Medicine
- Kenneth Loparo, Case School of Engineering
- Elizabeth Madigan, Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing
- Ermin Melle, CFO's Office
- Karen Powers, Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences (Bus. Ofcr. Rep.)
- Mark Taylor, Weatherhead School of Management

#### Council of Alliances

- Robert Miller, School of Medicine (Chair)
- Iwan Alexander, Case School of Engineering
- Shannon French, Inamori Center for Ethics and Excellence
- Alan Levine, School of Medicine
- John Lewandowski, Case School of Engineering
- John Orloch, College of Arts and Sciences
- Stuart Rowan, Case School of Engineering
- John Ruhl, Case School of Engineering
- Robert Salata, School of Medicine
- Kenneth Singer, College of Arts and Sciences
- Rhonda Williams, College of Arts and Sciences
- GQ Zhang, Case School of Engineering

## **Proposed Committee Tasks**

- 1) Create business requirements for the system through analysis of current business activities and processes as follows:
  - a) Review current silo processes to identify data being collected and issues related to merging the information into one system
  - b) Identify key business stakeholders
  - c) Establish success factors for a future/target state
- 2) Explore trends in education, research and the faculty lifecycle, and identify “best practices”
- 3) Validate the Faculty Services Lifecycle core diagram for inclusiveness
- 4) Make recommendations to the executive sponsors for the Faculty Lifecycle initiative based on the established business requirements, to include system features and benefits

## **Proposed Priorities for Implementation**

- Institutionalize and secure the existing Provost’s Faculty Database
- Create a roadmap and timeline for the initiative
- Design the architecture for faculty services to include the business, information, and technology aspects of the lifecycle.
- Secure buy-in from schools
- Create a business plan that encompasses costs, staffing, roadmap and timing