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Purpose of Presentation

- To demonstrate how to develop a successful plan for an online web application
- We will describe, using our own applications, how to plan and administer an online web application, and review how we’ve done
What We’ll Cover Today

Three online applications:

- Course Evaluations (CourseEvalUM)
- Faculty Activity Reports (FAR)
- Instructional Workload (IWS)
Missions of Applications

- **CourseEvalUM** – A campus-wide collection of standardized evaluations, results to be used for APT decisions and reporting to students
- **FAR** – Collect faculty information for tenure/merit review, comply with the Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment University policy, and to report to the state on non-instructional faculty workload
- **IWS** – Report department workload activity and exceptions to the state
Key Common Features

- Accessibility and Usability
- Efficiency and Accuracy
- Pre-population
- Data capture and storage (in Oracle database)
- Reporting
Audiences – Each has…

- Survey-takers
- Local report-users
- Global report-users
CourseEvalUM Audiences

- Students take surveys
- Chairs, Deans and other administrators use local results for APT, merit, course assignments
- Deans, Provost and other administrators use summary results
- Students see selected results
FAR Audiences

- Faculty complete surveys
- Chairs, Deans and other administrators use local results for APT and merit review
- University administrators review Outside Professional Activities
- State receives workload report
- Other report audiences include federal gov’t., accreditation reviewers, and general public
IWS Audiences

- Chairs and Deans review reports and add exceptions for individual faculty
- State receives final report
Development and Implementation

- Team approach
- Develop time-line
- Collection and reporting
- Maintenance and support
Team Approach

- Core policy and technical development team
- Advisory groups and liaisons
- Testers
- Bring administrators and faculty along
Time-line

- Develop a schedule and task list for the development and administration of the application
- Include priorities and designate who will complete each task
- Leave ample time for testing and unavoidable delays
Collection and Reporting

CourseEvalUM – deploys and reports each semester

FAR – deploys and reports once a year, at some point survey open all year

IWS – deploys and reports once a year
Collection and Reporting

Common security functions:

- Security and Access – tiered access using a campus-wide standardized security system
- Access to the website is restricted to two groups: People who enter data, and people who review data
- Selected reports are available in real time for departments, chairs and administrators
IWS Collection and Reporting

Security and Access

- Chairs are given access to view information for the faculty in their departments or colleges.
- Deans are allowed to view and change information for faculty within their colleges.
- Deans must approve and lock the data before it can be reported for the IWS.
IWS Collection and Reporting

Produces pre-populated reports for review in the Spring

Exceptions are added by administrators in mid-July

The final report is compiled in August
## IWS Exceptions Report

### Workload Faculty Information: Sample Department

26 records found.

### Workload Category: Tenure/TenureTr

#### Fiscal Year: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Leave</th>
<th>Sabbatical</th>
<th>Expected course units</th>
<th>Actual Units Taught</th>
<th>Exception needed?</th>
<th>Current Exception</th>
<th>Exception Code from Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Locked</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>SB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Locked</td>
<td>DR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td>IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IWS Summary Report

### Fiscal Year: 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>T/Tk Faculty FTE</th>
<th>Avg Crs Units per T/Tk Faculty FTE</th>
<th>% Meeting Standard Load</th>
<th>% Meeting Adjusted Load</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Summary</td>
<td>2200.2</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department A</strong></td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department B</strong></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department C</strong></td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department D</strong></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department E</strong></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department F</strong></td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Department G</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division Summary</strong></td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CourseEvalUM Collection and Reporting

- Courses to be evaluated are identified
- Department schedulers review and add additional instructors
- Liaisons confirm college-level items
- Publicity blitz to notify students
- Evaluations are deployed for 2 weeks before study day, prior to finals and grades
CourseEvalUM Collection and Reporting

- Results and grades are pulled into reporting application
- Results are tested in IRPA
- Results are released to administrators, faculty, and students
- All past semesters are available, for students searchable by instructor or course name
Sample Course-Section Report

**ADMINISTRATOR UNIVERSITY-WIDE INSTRUCTOR ITEMS:**
Questions for use by faculty/instructors and for administrative purposes
N/A responses have been excluded from the following calculations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor: Professor A</th>
<th>FAKE100</th>
<th>0101</th>
<th>COLLEGE COMPARISON*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
<td>% Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>% Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor treated students with respect.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The instructor was well-prepared for class.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average rating for all similarly leveled course sections (e.g., all 200-level course sections) in this college.

**AVERAGE OF FIVE ADMINISTRATOR AGREE/DISAGREE QUESTIONS: 3.58 / 4.00**
Scaled 0-4: Strongly Disagree=0; Strongly Agree=4. N/A is not in the average.

The standards the instructor set for students were ... (Number of Responses 65)

0% Too Low
94% Appropriate
6% Too High
# Sample Summary Report

## College-level Results by Department and by Course Level

Fake College Department-Level Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Score*</th>
<th>The instructor treated students with respect</th>
<th>The instructor was well-prepared for class</th>
<th>The course was intellectually challenging</th>
<th>I learned a lot from this course</th>
<th>Overall, this instructor was an effective teacher</th>
<th>Number of Course Section Units Included in Calculations</th>
<th>Total Number of Evaluations Submitted</th>
<th>Total Number Enrolled</th>
<th>Overall Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept A</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept B</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept C</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept D</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Average of Instructor Scores from course-section units across all course sections in department.

Instructor Scores are scaled 0-4: Strongly Disagree=0; Strongly Agree=4. N/A is not in the average.
FAR Collection and Reporting

- Currently FAR posts reports for review and editing in January.
- The reports are available anytime until March 15 for faculty to add publications, grants, awards, service and other activities.
- After the deadline, dynamic reports are available online for multiple years.
Sample FAR Report

Introduction

Welcome to your Faculty Activity Report for the Calendar Year 2007!

FAR replaces your responsibility to complete:

- IRPA's Non-Instructional Report
- Annual Report of Outside Professional Activities
  (also known as 'Conflict of Interest/Conflict of Commitment')
- UM Experts Database

Instructions for entering, saving, and submitting data.

Please remember to save the page you are working on at least every 40 minutes or so to avoid having your session timeout!

For help with any part of this report, please contact:

A. Verify Your Personal Information

Name:
Academic rank: (Date of appointment to current T/TT rank*)
Primary appointment:
Sabbatical:
Faculty Activity Reports: Summary Sheet of Submitted 2007 Reports for the College of

This page is best printed in landscape mode

NOTE: Submitted Reports may not be final until a few days after the deadline. Faculty are allowed to submit their reports any number of times.

This Summary sheet was assembled to give the Dean an overall idea of the output of faculty as whole in the college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Name</th>
<th>Course, # Stds (# Evals), Grade</th>
<th># of Grad students supported</th>
<th># of Doctoral students who completed</th>
<th># of Doctoral Grads in last 6 years placed in Tenure/Tenure-Track Positions</th>
<th># of Journal Papers Accepted</th>
<th># of Refereed Conf. Papers Accepted</th>
<th># of Contracts</th>
<th>2007 $ Value of Contracts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robin Hood</td>
<td>HITASA101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maid Marion</td>
<td>HTW101</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Maintenance and Support

All applications include the following:

- Online administration
- Online definitions and explanations

FAR and IWS have:

- User manuals to educate and train users
Maintenance and Support

- Maintain a log of problems, issues, questions and answers.
- Develop a college contact to disperse information and be the top level contact for college issues.
- Be ready when immediate (and sometimes delayed) repairs and updates to the software occur during the collection and reporting.
Sometimes we need to honestly assess the situation.
Assessment

- Streamlines data collection and reporting
- Answered University need to have data managed efficiently and uniformly
- Reliance on a core programming staff sometimes poses problems
- Although these are confidential data, many requests
- Buy-in still a factor
Challenges to Overcome

- On-going development in production
- When time runs short, time set aside for testing suffers, and problems ensue
- IRPA will be able to easily and quickly build new reports or modify existing reports to meet new demands
- Scope creep – Demand for new items on surveys, reports and expanded access
Scope Creep

HOW DID THAT THING GET SO BIG?

FAR and CE
Questions or comments?
Sharon at slavoy@umd.edu
Donna at dwillia2@umd.edu