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Appendix L

FIAC Recommendation Regarding Electronic Database for Faculty Records

The Provost, in a memorandum dated April 1012, asked the Faculty Senate to recommend an electronic database system to him by April 2013. The Senate Executive Committee asked the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee to take the lead with this request.

There are two major players in this area. One of these is Sedona, which the University implemented in a limited manner during the 2011-12 academic year. It was met with mixed reviews from faculty and full implementation was put on hold while another system could be investigated. The second system is ActivityInsight, a product of Digital Measures. There have been numerous conversations with representatives from Digital Measures, and the company presented a webinar to FIAC (which was open to the entire university community) in February 2013.

As a result of the webinar and subsequent discussions at FIAC meetings, the committee is recommending that the University adopt ActivityInsight if it is planning to proceed with implementing an electronic database for faculty record keeping. Members of the committee and others who attended the webinar who had previous experience with Sedona believe that ActivityInsight is the better system for UNC Pembroke.

There are several reasons for this recommendation. ActivityInsight has a polished, user-friendly interface; its authority records provide consistency across the board; and it has numerous clear discipline-specific categories of scholarship. One of the intriguing facets of this program is that it will interface with department and individual web pages. Finally, while it is highly customizable, it is useable “right out of the box.”

There are, of course, many concerns and unresolved questions – concerns and questions that must to be addressed before implementation proceeds, even on a limited basis:

- There needs to be a clear strategy for full implementation of this, or any, system. What are the short- and long-term purposes and goals? What does Academic Affairs foresee this program being used for in the first year? In the fifth year?
- The data this program yields are only effective if faculty participate. How does Academic Affairs plan to ensure 100% faculty participation?
- FIAC is well aware that there have been numerous problems with the accuracy of Banner data; this problem became especially apparent during the limited Sedona trial. Can Academic Affairs guarantee that data imported from Banner are accurate?
- Who will be designated as the “administrator” of this system? Will the University need to hire a system administrator to guide its full implementation? If so, have the true costs of implementing any electronic system been considered?
- Can security of faculty evaluations and promotion/tenure portfolios (should the faculty opt to use electronic portfolios) be guaranteed?
- Who will have access to faculty data besides those in the faculty member’s chain of command (e.g., department chairs, deans)?

Finally, let it be clear that FIAC is not endorsing the use of an electronic database, only that if the University chooses to purchase and use such a system, FIAC firmly believes that ActivityInsight is the superior product.