

AbOut Assessment Software
Feb. 4 (Wed) 11:00-11:50am
EE Conference Room (Main 208)

Attendees:

Jeff Braun, Professor and Department Chair (Computer Science), JBraun@mtech.edu
Mitch Deplazes, Student, MPDeplazes@mtech.edu
Bryce Hill, Professor (Electrical Engineering), BHill@mtech.edu
Josh Lee, Student, JLee1@mtech.edu
Celia Schahczenski, Manager, CSchahczenski@mtech.edu
Luke Schuler, Student, LSchuler@mtech.edu
Mack Sutherland, Student, MDSutherland@mtech.edu
Dan Trudnowski, Professor and Department Chair (Electrical Engineering),
DTrudnowski@mtech.edu

11:00 Introductions Celia Schahczenski

11:05 Requirements Engineering Process

- What are requirements?
- Ground rules

The objective of this course and these meetings is to produce a requirements document. The system will not be implemented as part of this course. It may be implemented as part of the maintenance course, ESOF 3326.

11:15 Overview of existing system

- Context

Josh Lee

- Environment

Mack Sutherland

Current AbOut system does not run on the Internet Explorer browser. Internet Explorer does not adhere to the standards making it more costly to develop for it.

- Features

Mitch Deplazes

Data Sources: EE gets their data from four sources. Course work, such as what CS faculty record in AbOut, is just one source. They also use the FE exam.

Terms: It was found that there is a very large gap between how CS faculty, and the AbOut software, use the term “assessment” and how EE faculty use the term. It appears that the AbOut’s definition of assessment translates to the EE metrics. Dan agreed to provide the ABET definition of these terms to the committee.

Performance criteria: Performance criteria are important to EE faculty members. For example, EAC a means different things to different people. To EE it means that the students passed a certain

class and did a particular lab, etc. Each of the performance criteria are measured separately.

The performance criterion for the CS department is simple “80 percent of the passing students in the program earned 70% or higher on all items which assess the outcome”.

Course weights: In EE weights are associated with courses, whereas in CS, and AbOut, each course contributes equally in determining the extent to which a student outcome is met.

11:25 Business Objectives

Celia Schahczenski

- Current objectives
 - Changes?

Upload scanned documents: Being able to upload scanned documents such as the best, average and middle sample of each assignment into the software was suggested.

Accreditors accessing AbOut: It was suggested that some accreditors might be interested in searching within the AbOut system. This could be a new type of user.

Using AbOut to track students: AbOut helps CS faculty members calculate the extent to which student outcomes are met. It does not track students. Both Dan and Bryce mentioned that they would like the software to track students.

- Features
 - Changes?

Enter scores from a spreadsheet: The capability of importing data from an Excel spreadsheet into AbOut was considered. Bryce places all of his assessment data into a spreadsheet so this would be useful. CS faculty member Keith Vertanen also places his assessment data in a spreadsheet and would like this capability.

Problems resulting from differences in number or order of student names in AbOut and the spreadsheet were mentioned. It seems likely that it is important that names can be added and removed and placed into a particular order.

Student names: It was suggested that being able to sort by student ID would be helpful. (Dan and Bryce) Being able to remove non-EE majors was also suggested. (Dan)

Course within multiple programs: The course Embedded Systems is in the CS, SE and EE curriculums. AbOut would need to be able to distinguish the students in the CS/SE program, from the students in the EE program.

Users: It was mentioned that a department chair user would be useful as faculty members cannot look directly at other faculty member's course data. (They can see the reports, but reports are typically aggregated data.)

EE faculty mentioned that they would most likely not want their faculty to have access to administrative features.

11:50 Next meeting – Feb. 18th (where?)