

ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE: Analysis and Reporting Group

**January 23, 2003, 2:30pm
SUB 308**

Those Present: Carol Hoferkamp, Sue Pieper, Erika Woehlke, John Ishiyama, Sally Cook, and guest Garry Gordon.

- I. Time is an issue.
- II. Garry spoke about the budget.
 - A. Right now, we are waiting to see how things go with the tobacco money. If there are bonds, we probably won't get another withholding.
 - B. There is a possibility now that elementary and secondary education will be grouped with higher. This situation would be very beneficial to us; however, the elementary and secondary people might resent it.
 - C. We have done a self-imposed withholding of 7-½% on operations and equipment, which was equal to about one million dollars.
 - D. The worst-case scenario for this fiscal year and next would be another 10% withholding across the board: over \$2,000,000.
 - E. Academic Affairs withholdings could equal \$625,000. About half would be cut from support services, which means the other half will come from the divisions. This would be very harmful.
 1. \$75,000 existed for the faculty research/scholarship and curriculum development grants. We had to decide whether to keep the grants or to move the money to the divisions. This question was brought to the Faculty Senate, who voted unanimously to split the \$75,000 among the divisions.
 2. Now we have assessment grants with a total budget of \$25,000. The same question could be asked of this money. However, if the applicants can do some real analysis with real results,—ideas that will help with retention and recruitment—it would profit us immensely in many ways.
- III. Discussion of grants
 - A. Assessment *is* scholarship. When faculty realize this, they will be grateful for these grants.
 - B. [Prior to this meeting, ARG members e-mailed each other with 2 strategies for awarding the grants: 1) Use a contract model: no open competition, recruit specific people to do specific jobs so that we can prepare for North Central, and 2) have an open competition like with any other grant.]
 1. Strategy 1 has its advantages: it is very efficient, serves the purpose of using the data we have in order to get a specific job finished, and it does not anger people who, if there were an open process, would have applied and been denied. Its major disadvantage is

that it does not provide incentives for faculty to become involved in the assessment process as a scholarly pursuit. It might be perceived as a “backroom” deal that further demonstrates the lack of concern for scholarship.

2. Strategy 2 is advantageous because it brings in more faculty into the assessment process and will promote the scholarship of assessment. However, it may lead to several different projects, not all of which will be directly applicable to preparing for North Central.
 3. The Committee will opt for Strategy 2.
- C. We need to communicate that we are doing this assessment grant process as research and scholarship. Investing in our success is important.
 - D. The findings should be published. We need to consider withholding some of the money for publishing purposes.
 - E. The \$25,000 exists until June 30, 2003. The VPAA will try to have available money for the next fiscal year.
 - F. Accountability? Print project ideas and then publish the results. Present at Faculty Development Luncheons or the January Conference.
 - G. When to the applicants get paid? Whenever the request to be paid. It depends on equipment or software needs, travel needs, etc.
 - H. We should modify the grant guidelines that already exist for other University grants.
 - I. What about groups or pairs of applicants? Sure, groups may apply. We need to set a dollar limit—each person in the group cannot get \$1000 if there are more than three people, for example.
 - J. It would be a good idea to bring in Judy Mullins and/or Judy Lundberg when we reach the guideline writing stage.
 - K. We must be careful not to make the application process so specific that applicants cannot tell you what they plan to do because they might not have their specifics worked out.
 - L. We need to draft the purpose, the budget restrictions, and the guidelines. Make sure the purpose is distinctive from curriculum development grants.
 - M. Timeline: maybe set a deadline in the third week of March.
 - N. Invite Debra Kerby to speak about HLC criteria at one of the ARG upcoming meetings.

Meeting adjourned.

ew