



Assessment & Academic Improvement Council

Wednesday, July 22, 2015 • Meeting Minutes
1:30pm • Rm. 408 / Case Study 1, Student Union

1. Introductions and Call to Order

Present were: S. Damron, K. Clinkenbeard, J. Comer, J. Nalon, L. Cota, J. Gelder, J. Swinney, S. Ownbey, G. Fox, J. Romans, P. Fry, , C. Johnson, J. Gelder, and B. Crauder (representing T. Wikle).

Absent were: S. Gordon, S. Haseley, C. Hawkins, D. Hobson, B. Masters, K. Neurohr , R. Singh C. Ippoliti, and C., Campbell, C.

Dr. Romans facilitated the meeting. The meeting was called to order at 1:30PM.

2. UAT Budget Update

a. Lisa Cota provided a brief history of the decrease in the UAT budget surplus, beginning with the University's acquisition of the ALEKS exam in 2011. Dr. Fry provided additional details. Ms. Cota also provided information on current costs facing UAT, including the latest ALEKS charges in November, as well as Scantron software for SSIs.

b. Ms. Cota stated that UAT has approximately \$100,000 to award to departments this year. Departments have requested approximately \$218,000; UAT has pared that down to just over \$100,000* by reducing requested amounts in compliance with the guidelines for the use of assessment funds

(<http://tinyurl.com/assessfundguide>). Specifically, UAT made the following reductions:

- GRA/GTAs were reduced to no more than .25 FTE for no more than one semester
- Faculty raters were capped at no more than 2 faculty raters per program
- Benefit rates were corrected to appropriate amounts
- Faculty rater stipends were corrected to appropriate amounts (\$15/paper)
- No faculty travel

*Note that this figure does not include testing and exam fees

c. Dr. Fry indicated more funds *might* become available; she suggested that AAIC use the \$100,000 as a starting point, and prioritize how additional funding (i.e., carry-over) might be spent if/when it becomes available.

3. Discussion

a. Dr. Johnson suggested one possible decision metric should be how much money is spent per student. She calculated that SSB spends \$1.50 per student enrolled in that college, as compared to COE, for example, which spends \$9.00 per student.

b. The use of professional credentialing / licensing exams as an assessment point was again discussed. Some programs use both licensing exams and nationally benchmarked exams in their assessment; the distinction was made and noted for further discussion. There was some discussion of cutting funding for tests and exams, and giving departments who had requested money for tests and exams the opportunity to re-submit their requests, but was decided against. No decisions were made at this meeting to cut funding for either licensure exams or nationally benchmarked tests; this item will be on the agenda for the September AAIC meeting.

c. A proposal was put forth that UAT average the previous two years of funding awards per program, and scale that average such that the sum-total of the awarded amount equaled \$100,000. The motion was carried with one dissenting vote.

d. Funding will not be allocated until after UAT has a clear idea of what, exactly, can be allocated.

e. It was suggested that associate deans communicate this information to the departments. Dr. Fry will meet with Dr. Gordon and Ms. Cota to draft the text of that communication.

4. General Reminders

a. Annual department assessment reports due to UAT on September 15, 2015.

Meeting adjourned at 2:24pm.