

## **SLOAC Steering Committee Agenda October 6, 2008, 2-4, Room 6202**

Present: (Canada) Ray Lapuz, Rita Sabbadini, (CSM) Jeremy Ball, Sandra Comerford, Ada Delaplaine, (District) Marilyn McBride, (Skyline) Steve Aurelio, Luciana Castro, Jan Fosberg, Tom Hewitt, Rob Johnstone, Nick Kapp, Lucia Lachmayr, Sue Lorenzo, Vicki Morrow, Jude Navari, Vanson Nguyen, Maria Norris, Virginia Padron, Regina Pelayo, Felix Perez, Christine Roumbanis, Regina Stanback-Stroud, Arthur Takayama, Phyllis Taylor, Ariel Vigo, Karen Wong

- I. WEAVEonline Demonstration by Deb Leeper, Regional Director, Assessment Management, [dleeper@weaveonline.com](mailto:dleeper@weaveonline.com), Phone: 804-864-3679
  - A. Designed by Virginia Commonwealth; everyone currently working for WeaveOnline came out of higher education and were WeaveOnline administrators at their respective colleges, including Deb.
  - B. Used by universities and community colleges, including California's Antelope Valley and SDCCD Continuing Ed
  - C. Functions
    1. curriculum mapping—how course contribute to program and institutional outcomes
    2. tracking of accomplishments over time
    3. accounting for needed resources
    4. standardized formats for reporting and common language
    5. locating of incomplete information
    6. reports for accreditation and reporting
    7. access to information at any level though we can determine to what degree, and use of existing IDs to access information (but cannot download student IDs as a means to enter data)
  - D. Course level
    1. can store course outlines of record, the assessment instruments, and even audio and visual files
    2. each course level outcome is limited to program and institutional outcomes, as well as master plans
    3. can download all assessment reports for a given institutional outcome to assess its relative success
  - E. Who enters the information?
    1. Whomever you designate (individual faculty member, a chair, a work-study student...)

## F. Assessment Tools/ Measures and Findings

1. Bullet points of types of assessments that faculty/staff can simply check off
2. Functions:
  - a. Can align the assessments with the SLOs
  - b. Can set benchmarks,
  - c. Can identify whether the students met it, partially met it, or didn't meet it
  - d. Can write your own narrative analysis of the assessment results
  - e. Can connect resultant analysis with a planning worksheet (status of plan, target date, priority, who's responsible, budget requests, etc.)

## G. Action Plans

1. Notes from meetings to keep track of them
2. Reports-- Analysis questions, which we need to come up with but could come from our existing program review questions, can be used to think about what faculty and staff learned from the assessment; the report, which can be stored on the server, could be used for program review
3. Program Review
  - a. Cannot connect the existing forms to WeaveOnline such that faculty and staff can populate the existing fields
  - b. Even though the three sister colleges have their own program review processes and timelines, loading on their program reviews won't be a problem since WeaveOnline staff prefer that the database be set up according to each college's processes (though they can set it up at the District level if we prefer)

## H. Management Report—see how each department is progressing

## I. Start-Up Time

1. Recommends that each college have two “supporters” per school.
2. If they've done their homework ahead of time, they should be able to accomplish a lot in a 90 minute training session.
3. License to implementation depends on us— we can get it up and rolling in as short as two weeks
4. Labor intensive on the front end, as we load in some of our processes, train people, and get buy-in
5. WeaveOnline's intent is to facilitate whatever processes we already have, so over time we should be working more efficiently

## J. Cost (See below for the actual Skyline proposal sent by Deb after the demo; she also can generate a proposal for the other colleges if they request one.)

1. Annual subscription to host and house the data that is based on IPED enrollment
2. Estimate-- \$15,200 for Skyline, \$16,000 for CSM, \$14,400 for Canada

3. If we enroll by Dec. 31, we can get a 5% discount if two colleges enroll, 10% if all three enroll
4. Cost covers the software, server maintenance, unlimited training, support, and technical support (in addition to there being a useful “help” feature)

K. Questions we sent in advance

1. **While WeaveOnline doesn't aggregate data, is it possible to use it as a means to see the larger patterns in student performance, for instance in students achieving institutional outcomes (ie., critical thinking, effective communication, etc.) If so, how so?** There is a GE field in which we can enter our measures. We also can cluster all of the data that comes from all of the courses that map to the institutional outcome.
2. **Does everyone on the campus have access to the “Read” screens? How much restriction can you establish for users so as to ensure confidentiality?** We have total control over access levels. Her campus chose to open it up for everyone.
3. **Which functions can we customize? If we have a District site license, does it have the capacity for us to individualize for each campus' needs?** Language can't be customized, but the analysis questions and annual reporting criteria can be customized.
4. **How does WeaveOnline compare to other databases such as Curricunet or TracDat?** TracDat is their closest competitor. They fulfill similar functions, and so we should explore both. WeaveOnline was created by college researchers and the like, and so it is designed with those needs in mind. WeaveOnline seems to be the most intuitive to use. Because it mainly fulfills making connections between assessment and planning & budget, many colleges subscribe to both WeaveOnline and Curricunet.
5. **To what extent is WeaveOnline connected to the accreditation standards? Do we have to load the standards?** For the time being, yes, we need to load them, but they're working on it so that it becomes part of the package.

L. Rushed discussion points afterward

1. Like TracDat more because it can quantify data
2. Neither Curricunet or WeaveOnline can do what the other does; we need something that will help us with integrated planning
3. Concerned about the amount of time to get it going
4. Curricunet and TracDat can be customized
5. Program will only be as good as the faculty doing it; in other words, the program can't stand in for the faculty and staff who need to assess, but it can help us to capture and document what we are doing
6. Screen shots were difficult to look at since they went down to the microscopic level vs. it's a good organizer
7. E-lumen aggregates, but its reliance on rubrics feels like a straihgjacket

8. Feel constrained since we can't change templates or the language
9. If we're to use this program, we prefer that it be tucked in with program review so as to not overload faculty with tasks to complete
10. What about using ACCESS and constructing our own database? We can build our own queries and publish reports. But then someone needs to create it, as there presently is no user interface. If we're worried about entering information into WeaveOnline's infrastructure, imagine creating an infrastructure in addition to entering the information.