I. Assessment Data Management System: Criteria

Required capabilities for Assessment Data Management System:

1. **User-friendly.** It will provide easy data input by faculty and staff, including those with low computer skills. Displays will be clean and uncluttered. In no more than five (5) “clicks,” users will move from UH log-in to data-input screens.

2. **Integrated.** It will allow regular data updates throughout the life of the vendor contract, including information from KSCM (e.g., map of Student Learning Outcomes [SLOs], Program Learning Outcomes [PLOs], Institutional Learning Outcomes [ILOs]) and Banner (e.g., students’ data), via API or other standard delivery protocol. It will also interface with Sakai (and possible later substitute as Canvas), so that instructors will grade a student’s assignment in Sakai and then assess the SLO for that student through that assignment (e.g., via a rubric). In this way, assignment grading, SLO assessment, and evidence are interconnected and retrievable at any points.

3. **Three folded.** Input and output screens will be configurable to work with HonCC’s three-level assessment process—course/unit, program, and institution levels.

4. **Comprehensive.** It will allow alignment of outcomes at the three levels—SLO-PLO(s)-ILO(s) and SAO-ILO(s)—through initial database setup and ongoing updates. It will quickly allow data entry of outcomes in qualitative and quantitative forms at each level, with or without a variety of customized rubrics. It will allow uploads to multiple types of files, including Word, Excel, pdf, ppt, jpeg, bitmap.

5. **Analytical.** It will provide comprehensive data analysis functions, such as analytics, aggregations, longitudinal reviews, both pre-set and customized queries. It will display mapped curriculum, data visualization, and assessment results at the three levels in text and tables/graphs in Word, Excel, and pdf formats.

6. **Utilization-focused.** It will quickly generate easy-to-read reports that can be used for improvement at the three levels, including course/unit and program reviews, accreditation requirements, strategic planning, and budgeting processes. It will also allow the random export of students’ artifacts (e.g., one best and one worst per class).

7. **Supportive.** It will offer on-going live technical support to faculty and staff as part of the support package at no additional cost. The technical and training support will be accessible to users who do not speak the software jargon through multiple means, including email, phone, online chat, and scheduled trainings and webinars.

8. **Secure.** It will have secure off-campus cloud-based or vendor-server-based data storage. It will allow HonCC to download its data to its own server if/when contract service and/or cloud/vendor-server storage is discontinued.

9. **Confidential.** It will allow multiple levels of personnel access, including for faculty, staff, and administrators. It will allow for restricted input and read-only functions at the three levels based on UH-login. An individual’s access status can vary over time (e.g., special projects will require temporary change in access).

10. **Interactive.** It will allow digital notifications of faculty/staff inputs, for example to be sent to the Institutional Assessment Specialist and other appropriate administrators. It will allow selected reviewers with appropriate permission status to input comments and questions on faculty/staff reports.

11. **Software as a Service.** It will be offered in a “Software as a Service” product format, not a license-fee-based product format.
## II. Assessment Data Management System: Review sheet

**Reviewer's name:**

**Product name:**

**Review date:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Rating*</th>
<th>Comments/questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. User-friendly</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Integrated</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Three folded</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Comprehensive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Analytical</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Utilization-focused</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Supportive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Secure</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Confidential</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Interactive</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Software as a Service</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*R=1=strongly disagree      2=Somewhat disagree      3=Neither agree nor disagree      4=Somewhat agree      5=Strongly agree
III. Assessment Data Management System: Committee

- John Delay, University College, delay@hawaii.edu
- Chiara Logli, Institutional Assessment, logli@hawaii.edu
- Zane Nedbalek, Information Technology Services, zane.nedbalek@hawaii.edu
- Robert Perkins, Transportation and Trades Programs (Tech I), rperkins@hawaii.edu
- Steven Shigemoto, Policy Planning Institutional Research, sshigemo@hawaii.edu
- Vern Takebayashi, Communication and Services Programs (Tech II), takebaya@hawaii.edu

IV. Assessment Data Management System: Possible vendors

- Campus Labs Outcomes
- eLumen
- Portfolium

V. Timeline for each product

Demo
- Committee and developer meet for a 90 minute-demo
- Committee debrief for 30 minutes
- Committee members fill out review sheet
- [Developer provides sandbox/demo site]

Sandbox
- Committee members interact hands-on with demo site on their own time, individually
- Committee members talk to colleagues to bounce ideas
- Committee members adjust their review sheet accordingly
- Committee members send questions for developer to Chiara
- Chiara compiles questions and send them to developer

Follow-up demo
- Committee and developer meet for a 90 minute-demo to address questions
- Committee debrief for 30 minutes
- Committee members adjust their review sheet accordingly
- Developer leads demonstration(s) for any other identified parties on campus (e.g., ITS).

Campus-wide demo of top 1-2 vendors
- Attendees fill out review sheet (simpler version)
- Committee members finalize their review sheet accordingly and make decision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Demo (2-214)</th>
<th>Sandbox</th>
<th>Follow-up demo (2-214)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Campus Labs Outcomes</td>
<td>W, 1/24, 2-4pm</td>
<td>Between demo 1 and 2,</td>
<td>M, 2/5, 2-4pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>on your own time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLumen</td>
<td>W, 2/7, 2-4pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>F, 2/23, 12-2pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolium</td>
<td>M, 2/26, 2-4pm</td>
<td></td>
<td>W, 3/7, 2-4pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Campus-wide demo: W, 4/4, 2-3pm and F, 4/6, 12-1pm (2-201)