

Committee on Institutional Assessment  
Tuesday, October 18, 2011  
BA-240

Present: Rhonda Bonnstetter, Jay Brown, Christine Olson, Lori Baker, Wije Wijesiri, Jan Loft and guest Betsy Desy.

Absent: Nadine Schmidt and Tony Amato due to teaching schedules.

1. Jan explained she will start the process of editing and updating the CIA charge and description. Jan will base the editing on the current description found on the SmSUFA website.
  
2. Rhonda demonstrated LiveText:
  - It was noted that SMSU has never lost data via LiveText.
  - Rhonda showed the types of information that can be collected and how items can be “drilled down” to find specific levels of information.
  - The Education Department, for example, does not tie data to specific courses but it can be done that way.
  - If we had the overall LEP approach, Eng 151, for example, could also be added? Yes.
  - Down the line for people rating effectiveness how do they do it? Submit the whole portfolio to be scored by an individual professor for overall comments at the top of the page or within the text and then send back to the assessment system and the comments, although the comments are not on the original. Or, do it just by course only; you do not have to have to go portfolio route.
  - Bookend assessments collections with FYS and IDST 400? If they don’t submit they don’t get a final grade?
  - How would we regulate what they deposit in-between FYS and 400?
  - Would a group or team do various evaluations? The student’s permission is needed for others to access the information/data. It must be submitted by the student for review.
  - There could be several logistical nightmares, depending on how we use it as a tool.
  - If each student has an account, they can upload into their accounts...and then we could do random samples for assessment?
  - If it is course based would we need permission or student submission to access the information? Rhonda will check.
  - Lori suggested that if we can have access, a team or group could do the random evaluations and assessments using the rubrics designed for that particular assessment year...advancing through the years with the rubrics, moving through a five year cycle.
  - \$130.00 per student for a five year license (e.g. Education); for a larger number of students it would be less expensive, about \$86.00, if the University would apply for licenses.
  - Students can have more than one portfolio on the same account/license.
  - There is no limit what the students can save on LiveText, the saving space is huge.
  - This can be seen as a very long term project, with stumbling blocks. What happened in the past: Faculty buy-in was hard, faculty learning to be adept at this was hard with many questions; Rhonda developed workshops because if you do not use it all the time you forget

how to use it effectively which is why Rhonda visits classes for refreshers and updates and answers questions.

- This would likely be a half time position if this was to be coordinated across the whole University.

What does this look like otherwise? If we don't use something like this, what would be a university wide perspective on assessment? How would we collect and assess data? Answer: a lot of manual entering into Excel for storage but the assessment eventually is done from the stored data. Compiling and aggregating is time consuming, trying to make sense of everything. Paper...storage...but still entering data for eventual assessment.

- Coordinating LiveText with D2L, having them "talk" to each other is a possibility someday, to be hoped for.

Next meeting: November 1<sup>st</sup> at 4:30. Jan will reserve a room (update: BA-524). Our aim will be to discuss the North Dakota model; not enough time at this meeting to discuss more than LiveText.

Respectfully submitted:  
Jan Loft