College of Micronesia – FSM Minutes Reporting Form

Meeting Group:	TracDat tech recommendations working subgroup

Members Present:

Titles	Name	Present	Not avail	Remarks
Chair	JP Lukusa	X		
aculty	Marlene Mangonon	X		
aculty	George Mangonon	X		
E	Francis Alex		X	
aculty	Sylvia Henry	X		
culty	Dana Lee Ling	X		
ther attendees	None			

Agenda

Review the working group report

Major Topics of Discussion

The committee reviewed the chair's summary of the findings of the working group. The chair's report represented a gathering together of recommendations produced by a member of the committee, reorganized into broad areas such as training needs, configuration needs.

The report will be recommending an office of Nuventive assistance with a prime focus on support and training for Nuventive and assessment related to the use of Nuventive (TracDat). Added back to the draft report is the recommendation that the office head should attend the annual Nuventive conference

The word "standardized" appeared in the report. This word did not have a clear meaning to some members. The decision was made to change from "standardized" to "approved" as in "approved documents" instead of "standardized documents."

The group discussed the issue of ease of data entry from the perspective of issues such as the double entry of success rates. An instructor can enter "9 of 10 students mastered this outcome" and then enter a success rate of "80%". That second field should be calculated, not entered. The female and male success rates do not need to be added - Nuventive can be integrated with SIS to bring demographic data into Nuventive. Then results can be broken out by any demographic in the SIS - gender, state.

One member of the working group recommended that the report reflect the use of the terminology used in TracDat. TracDat uses the terminology of "reporting" units and "assessment units." Offices such as that of the VPIA are assessment units. Counseling, IC, DAP, fourth year,

these are all assessment units. To enable budgetary decisions these must be assessment units for the budgets.

Each assessment unit has someone appointed to take the lead on assessment in the unit. The smallest assessment unit is the course, the course has outcomes that are set by the faculty member. The faculty member is the logical assessment lead for a course. The next assessment unit up is a program, each program is an assessment unit. This led to a long discussion as to who is the lead for a program assessment unit. Who takes the lead on assessment for a program. There are assessment units where the head is self-evident. Such as the aforementioned course level assessment unit: the logical lead is the course instructor. The office of the dean of academic programs is an assessment unit logically headed by the dean of academic affairs. The office of the vice president for instructional affairs is the lead for the instructional affairs assessment.

Programs, however, do not now have program coordinators, they have only program assessment summary writers and multi-year program assessment summary writers. Writers are not the lead for assessment in the program. They are not even necessarily instructing in the program. Program assessment summary writers are writers for hire. The generation of assessment units for programs, which exist, will demand that a lead person be responsible for assessment in that unit. A writer is not responsible for assessment within a program unit. What these lead persons are called will be left to the institution. The working group discussed at length whether the report should refer to these program assessment leads as program coordinators. The group was aware that there are no program coordinators at present with the exception of a couple of programs. The group was also aware that the issue - and the choices of language used - is a potentially sensitive issue with faculty as the program coordinator position had often been treated as "other duties as assigned" rather than as a compensated (monetarily or in terms of workload) position. The committee also discussed that although the program assessment writing positions were to be compensated, no one on the working group was aware of anyone who had been compensated.

While one member met briefly with students, the rest of the working group looked at TracDat. One member had noted the power of Data Tools. Another member logged into TracDat and discovered that they do not have access (permissions) to the Data Tools module. This is at the core of the recommendations of the working group: configuration and training needs. TracDat is not properly configured. All faculty should have access to Data Tools and, just as critically important, training in proper use of the Data Tools. This drives the recommendation that there must be an office of Nuventive that has assessment skill sets. Not just another dean or coordinator of assessment, but someone who knows Nuventive and can train faculty to use Nuventive in support of assessment in their classes.

The current Nuventive configuration at the college configures only a few reporting units and is missing some assessment units such as assessment unit for ISLET, for DAP.

At 15:10 the working group secretary had to leave the meeting to tend to personal matters. Another member had class, and the room in which the group was meeting also had a class.

Comments/Upcoming Meeting Date & Time/Etc.:

TBD

Handouts/Documents Referenced:

1. https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1mhWoengpF51X4P4nCsUEPXdCAaUmm93OI 0InboLrODY/edit?usp=sharing

College Website Link:

1. http://wiki.comfsm.fm/Committee_Minutes/Assessment_Team/TracDat_Nuventive_working_group

Prepared by: Dana Lee Ling Date Distributed: 12/04/2019

Approval of Minutes Process & Responses:

•

Summary Decisions/Recommendations/Action Steps/Motions with Timeline & Responsibilities:

•

Action by President:

Item #	Approved	Disapproved	Approved with	Comments
			conditions	