I. Call to Order
President Jim Roznowski called the meeting to order at 4:08 PM.

II. Welcome and Introductions
President Roznowski welcomed the delegates and announced that Tim Wynn was appointed as Parliamentarian and Timekeeper. President Roznowski also introduced the members of the 2012-2013 Executive Board.

Nancy Sattler - President Elect
Rob Farinelli – Past President
Margie Hobbs – Treasurer
Mary Beth Orrange – Secretary
Jane Tanner – Northeast VP
Chris Allgyer – Mid-Atlantic VP
Annette Cook – Southeast VP
Jim Ham – Midwest VP
Nicole Lang – Central VP
Kate Kozak – Southwest VP
Stefan Baratto – Northwest VP
Bruce Yoshiwara – West VP

III. Announcement of Quorum
Secretary Mary Beth Orrange announced a delegate count of 175 out of 194 and stated that there was a quorum for the meeting. The breakdown of the delegate count is as follows:

There were: 23 from Northeast Region, 20 from Mid-Atlantic Region, 25 from Southeast Region, 28 from Midwest Region, 34 from Central Region, 17 from Southwest Region, 9 from Northwest Region, and 19 from West Region.

Without objection, the Credential report was accepted.

IV. Approval of the Rules of Conduct
Motion to approve the rules of conduct.

Without objection, the rules of conduct were adopted.

V. Approval of the Agenda
Motion to approve the agenda.

Without objection, the Agenda was adopted
VI. Minutes Review Committee
Motion to approve the Minutes Review Committee for the 2012 Delegate Assembly. The committee consists of Stefan Baratto, Northwest Regional Vice President (chair); Judy Ackerman, Past President; Carol Tracy, Kansas State Delegate; Nancy Rivers, NC State Delegate; and Troy Seffrood, Hawaii Affiliate President. Mary Beth Orrange, 2012-2013 AMATYC Board Secretary, is an ex officio member of the committee.

Without objection, the President appointed the Minutes Review Committee.

VII. Minutes Review Committee Report
President Roznowski reported that the minutes from the 2011 Delegate Assembly were reviewed, revised, and approved by the 2011 Delegate Assembly Minutes Review Committee, chaired by Stefan Baratto, Northwest Vice President.

The report was received.

VIII. Reports
A. President’s Report: Jim Roznowski

The membership report was presented; there was a drop in membership in seven out of eight regions. President Roznowski reviewed the responsibilities of AMATYC Delegates with the assembly, as they pertained to membership.

B. Treasurer’s Report: Treasurer Margie Hobbs reviewed the 2011 financial reports included in the Delegate Packet. Total income for 2011 was $689,186.37. The treasurer reported that as of December 31, 2011, the change in net assets was $63,353.40. Total AMATYC assets are $2,033,981.28

C. AMATYC Foundation: Rob Farinelli
At the 2012 annual conference, $19,045 was raised. The Southeast region raised the most for the Foundation and the region with the highest percentage of participating individuals was the Northwest region with 54%. Past President, Rob Farinelli, thanked everyone who contributed

D. Strategic Planning: President-Elect Nancy Sattler provided details for the Strategic Planning report. Individuals who participated in the activities supporting the Strategic Plan were recognized.

E. AMATYC Grant Activity Reports – Quantway/Statway: Jack Rotman
Jack Rotman and Julie Phelps are AMATYC’s two liaisons to the Carnegie Foundation’s Pathways project. The official work of the AMATYC/Carnegie liaisons has been completed but the initiative continues.

F. Report on AMATYC Project ACCCESS: Laura Watkins
The 9th Cohort has 25 fellows. The AMATYC Foundation provides funding to support the program. Application forms will be posted on the AMATYC website for Cohort 10. There was a slight change in format of funding this year: the AMATYC Foundation is responsible for the lodging and the fellow’s college is responsible for the remaining expenses, including transportation.
IX. New Business

A. Motion to approve the Position Statement on Proctored Testing

Motion: that the attached AMATYC Position Statement on Proctored Testing be adopted. (Attachment A)

Made by: Fred Feldon

Motion Carried Unanimously

X. Items for Discussion - Open Microphone

Issues raised included:

- The function and scheduling of the Delegate Assembly: some spoke for moving it to a different time in the conference while others spoke for keeping the format and time the same.
- Ways to keep AMATYC attractive to retirees such as conference sessions focusing on retirement and reduced conference registration.
- The success of Project ACCCESS; thanks to various individuals and groups for supporting ACCCESS.
- Conference dues: A request was made that the Board consider prorating lifetime dues; appreciation was expressed for keeping the conference costs low (a very important matter for self-funded attendees); the Board was asked to consider a registration discount for retired members.
- A delegate from MichMATYC “challenged” the other affiliates to follow their lead and contribute $100 per ACCESS fellow to the Foundation.

XI. Announcements

The president thanked the Jacksonville local events coordinator, Jerrett Dumouchel, and the local conference team for their hard work on the Jacksonville conference, the parliamentarian, Tim Wynn, for his assistance at the conference, and all delegates to the assembly.

The SW Region announced their annual regional conference in Flagstaff, AZ (June 14-15).

XII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 PM.
ATTACHMENT A

AMATYC Position Paper on Proctored Testing
for courses taught at a distance
Approved by the ITLC February 9, 2012, Edited September, 2012

1. What is meant by proctored testing?

Proctored testing means that students are supervised by an approved proctor, provide verification of identity, and remain in continuous line of sight of the proctor while taking a test. Frequently the proctor is a testing official or faculty at an accredited college or university, or other sites approved by the instructor. Electronic proctoring is an acceptable alternative to traditional proctoring. Electronic proctoring means that students are supervised by webcam in conjunction with other measures such as a lockdown browser and the ability of the proctor to take over each student’s computer.

2. Why require proctored testing?

To ensure the integrity of grades assigned to students taking mathematics classes taught at a distance, all students should be required to take at least two tests in a proctored setting or complete other assessments such as a class project that demonstrates mastery of the course material and verifies student identity. Such controlled assessments give credibility to and respect for the grade students earn in their distance learning courses as well as to the distance learning program itself. Some institutions may not accept mathematics classes taught at a distance as transfer credit without documented proctored tests. When colleges stop allowing credit transfers from other colleges without proctored tests, it is a serious indicator of the need for authentic assessment. It is important that guidelines and position papers such as this one are published, and that two-year colleges create regulations that verify student identity.

3. What are some guidelines for setting up a secure proctored environment?

The institution should have proctoring available for students at a campus site. Students should be informed of the proper procedure for arranging a proctoring situation that is approved by the instructor and the institution.

Any student taking classes at a distance who is unable to come to a campus site for testing has the individual responsibility to find an acceptable proctor and/or acceptable testing site, and cover any associated costs.

Proctor information must be communicated by students to faculty in an established time-frame for approval purposes.

The faculty member will convey testing information to the proctor, such as, what may and may not be used during the test by the student, the test password in the case of an online test, and how to return the test to the instructor.

4. What is the recommended number of proctored tests and how should they be weighted?

When proctored tests are used as an assessment of student learning for classes taught at a distance, the final should be proctored. It is suggested there should be at least two proctored tests including the final and proctored tests should comprise a meaningful portion (50% or more) of the course grade.