

Student Affairs Assessment Council
Minutes
November 28, 2007

Attendance: Beth Dyer, Pat Ketcham, Rick DeBellis, Barb Cormack, Eric Hansen, Gina Shellhammer, Tina Clawson, Melissa Yamamoto, Kami Hammerschmith, Ann Robinson, Adry Clark, Bob Kerr, Susie Leslie, Jo Alexander, Michele Ribeiro, Edie Blakley, Jodi Nelson, Linda Reid, Lisa Hoogesteger, Rebecca Sanderson

Presentation of Possible Technology Solutions (Eric, Beth, Gina, Rick)

As scheduled earlier, the Council meeting was focused on reviewing 5 possible technology solutions for keeping track of assessment plans and reports and becoming more transparent in our assessment efforts. The committee used a rubric to evaluate the systems. Because of time limitations, only four were reviewed. The last one will be reviewed at the next meeting of the Council.

Technology possibilities included:

1. **Student Voice:** Rick DeBellis reviewed this software. Additionally Kim Vanderlinden, Student Voice representative, had presented information to the Council during the summer.

Student Voice has a survey feature along with the Assessment plan management software. It is basically easy to use and would provide reporting capabilities and the ability to roll goals, etc. up to Student Affairs strategic goals, etc. Has levels of security and is located on Student Voice servers so there would not be a need to host and all technical support would be done at Student Voice. It would not require new hardware and support from OSU.

Cost for full package (survey software and management system) for one year: \$18,900 which is a discount. The survey software allows as many projects as we want in student affairs and also allows us to do two projects outside of student affairs. This also includes 7 palm zires which become the property of OSU. Also, for first year Student Voice will input all our plans, etc. into the management software for us. Student Voice has sent a contract that specifies cost, conditions, etc. There is also an option for just the management software which would be about \$8,900 for the first year.

2. **Weave On Line:** Beth Dyer reviewed this software. Beth had only their web site and a CD to review. Currently Weave On Line has 80 subscribers and they are about to come out with a new update. It was difficult to tell if navigating the system would be intuitive or not since there was not a demo to use to assess this. The initial cost was \$32,000 plus \$9,600 per year—this is based upon enrollment at OSU. There is no price break on this software. There is no survey feature on this. Otherwise it is comparable to other systems. It is hosted on the Weave On Line servers.
3. **Trac Dat:** Eric Hansen reviewed this software possibility. This was software that the Council considered several years ago and decided to forego at the time. It has changed a great deal since that time.

Using Trac Dat would necessitate hosting it on a local server which also means local support for the server. It has no survey feature but is comparable to the others in terms of the management software. Typically Trac Dat licenses a university rather than one area. However, they are willing to license Student Affairs at OSU. The initial license would be \$14,000 plus annual maintenance/support of \$2,900. For the first year there is also a charge for on site services to

get it set up which is \$6,400. The total first year cost would be \$20,900 plus the cost of server and any server maintenance here at OSU.

4. **Blackboard Outcomes System:** Gina Shellhammer reviewed this software. OSU is a Blackboard school so it would fit with the other Blackboard applications. The Outcomes System is new this summer. It has many of the same features as other management systems. It can however create rubrics within the system. Right now however the cost is \$170,000 per year.

Gina also reviewed the 5th system however due to time, this will be explained to Council members at our next meeting.

In essence, the different software choices are somewhat comparable with each having some limitation. The cost is quite variable and the maintenance differs from software to software.

The next step that the committee recommended to the council was to determine if there were one or two programs that we wanted to pursue and then ask for a live or webinar demonstration so that the council could once again look at it before making a recommendation to Larry.

The next meeting is December 12 in the MU Council Room.

We will continue our discussion about the various software systems and also hear from Gina about the 5th possibility.