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

Attendees:
Jeff Braun, Mitch Deplazes, Bryce Hill, Josh Lee, Celia Schahczenski, Luke Schuler, Mack Sutherland, Dan Trudnowski

11:00   Recap last meeting   Mack Sutherland
- User roles
    - Admin, Observer, and Faculty
      These will be the roles with faculty split into inactive and active faculty. Most likely the observer role would be evaluators or department heads. Observers would only be able to view information associated with courses within a program.

- Adding Performance Criteria
  Performance criteria will be added to outcomes. Fields include auto name generation, description, and active dates.

- Reports
    - Remove Overview Outcome report?

      The Overview Outcome report should not be removed. The Outcome Report, for a single outcome, is not useful and could be removed, but leave it in for now.

      The reports should be renamed, as the current names and vague and don't do a good job of indicating what the report shows.

11:05   Actors and roles (permissions)   Mitch Deplazes
- EE objectives and actors
  For this system, actors can be seen as a set of permissions.

- Capabilities of actors
  A feature tree was presented that showed the new capabilities of the actors based on expanding AbOut to the EE department.

- Characteristic of actors
    - Association with department

      It was noted that when student papers are shown to accreditors, the names need to be blacked out. Thus, to comply with FERPA, when the system is used in read-only mode, the names should not appear within the course

offerings. This is also appropriate if faculty members are given read-only permission to see information in offerings taught by other faculty members. Faculty will need their own view that will allow them to see the student names in their own courses.

In cases of dual courses like Embedded Systems, both departments will be able to view the course.

11:35   Activity Diagram   Luke Schuler
- Describe how classes are loaded
- How metrics are created
- Generating reports

The words outcome and performance criterion can simply be used together. Also, rather than stating a precise 2 years for updating outcomes/performance criteria, these are changed "as needed".

Currently outcomes are associated with courses on a course edit page. There are two ways outcomes are no longer associated with a course:
- On the course page the outcome is "unchecked".
- The outcome is expired

EE indicated that this process will work for them. Instead of outcomes, performance criteria are associated with courses. These performance criteria can be expired in the same way as outcomes are expired. This is the page where weights can be given. Rather than simply checking if this course measures this performance criterion, a weight is given.

11:45   Reporting metrics   Josh Lee

EE would not include courses for which only the grade is used within AbOut. AbOut would be for EE courses for which EE faculty are teaching. For the courses which are in AbOut, something like the following should be generated:

Outcome	Performance Criteria	Classes	Number of Students	Weight	Student Weight	Average GPA	Score	(Student Weight)* Score	Comment
a	Apply chem knowledge	CHMY 143	5	3.0	15.0	2.80	83.0	1245.0	
a	Apply non-EE General Engineering Knowledge:				0.0				
	Statics	EGEN 201	5	1.5	7.5	3.00	85.0	637.5	
	Dynamics	EGEN 202	5	1.5	7.5	3.60	91.0	682.5	
	Fluid Mechanics	EGEN 335	2	1.5	3.0	3.00	85.0	255.0	
	Thermodynamics	EGEN 324	4	1.5	6.0	3.33	88.3	529.8	

EE wants more information that just a percentage. Similar to the raw data EE would like to see 3 numbers:
- The number of students
- The weight of the course for its performance criterion
- The percentage.

Commas should separate these values. The current method of selecting raw data is ok.

The weight should be an enterable value that represents that the course's association with that performance criteria. No value entered can indicate that the course does not measure the performance criteria. The matrix report should be changed to show weights instead of the current system that displays X's.

Note that reported percentages for CS is the percentage of students who passed the metric with 70% or better; while the percentage for EE is a regular percent.

It was suggested that the focus of the user interface should be on a faculty member, not on an accreditor.

EE likes the current interface for choosing which courses will measure an outcome/performance criterion. EE department were comfortable with having to expire performance criteria when the criteria are changed or no longer exist.

11:50   Next meeting – April 1   Mack Sutherland