

**CASAA Meeting Minutes**  
**October 3, 2007**  
**3:00p.m. Library Conference Room A**

Members attending: Terri Hopkins-Cossey, Bob Stark, Sarah Bloom, Dennis Patterson, Mary Heady, Carol Efird, Veronica Studards, Todd Fearer (for Sayeed Mehmood), Carolyn Hart and Ranelle Eubanks, Chair.

The **College of Technology-Crossett** report was reviewed using the rubric as a beginning point of discussion in the context of the nine questions. The following remarks were noted:

Question 1: The report clearly listed two student learning goals (outcomes). The report did not include a specific website address where the learning outcomes could be accessed. A question was raised that the wording “advanced degree” typically refers to a master’s or doctorate and that the use of associate and baccalaureate degrees should be listed.

Question 2: The report made acceptable links between the unit’s goals and the mission of UAM. There was one point that Goals 1 and 2 did not necessarily teach students to “act creatively.”

Question 3: The report indicated there was a brochure, but it was not included in the report. The use of a specific website would have been helpful. “Various recruitment activities” is vague; there should be narrative explaining types of activities. Appendix C and D were indicated, but were not in .pdf format and many members could not view the contents of those appendix. Paragraph 3 of the response indicated electronic message are used to keep students informed— informed of what? There were no examples included.

Question 4: Historical patterns/trends were not addressed, only trends of enrollment, not achievement of student learning outcomes. Sample tests were provided, but there were no outcomes; i.e. decisions were made to change “x” because something happened. What does CCNA stand for?

Question 5: There were few examples of surveys but no analysis of data. There was little detail in the report regarding how student performance had been used to improve unit decisions. The results were not current (04 and 05). There were no recommendations given.

Question 6: The minutes were not current. There was no discussion in the minutes of changes that will/were made and how decisions were made. The Appendix L2 was unclear in its purpose. The use of occupational advisory committees was applauded.

Question 7: The report does not indicate specifically who does what task. The use of “faculty and administration” does not give ownership and is vague when assigning tasks. The report addressed the Strategic Plan.

Question 8: The response to Question 8 regarding how the unit is making student learning accessible was answered well. A reminder was given to spell out words the first time acronyms are used.

Question 9: It was not clear what changes had been made in the computer maintenance and networking program. The description does not show how the unit involves students directly. While student surveys were indicated, there was no explanation or detail regarding the surveys. Paragraph 2 is out of place because it is old information.

The report is to be re-worked in places where answers are insufficient; all appendices are to be appropriately inserted and the report re-submitted.

Respectfully submitted,

Ranelle Eubanks, Recorder