

CASAA MEETING MINUTES  
December 5, 2007  
3:00 p.m. Library Conference Room A

Members attending: Bob Stark, Veronica Studards, Terri Hopkins-Cossey, Sayeed Mehmood, Mary Heady, Carole Efird, Leia O'Fallon, and Larry Smith. Sarah Bloom had reviewed the report and sent her review but was unable to attend the meeting.

The **School of Forest Resources** report was reviewed using the rubric as a point of discussion in the context of the nine questions.

The following remarks were noted:

Question 1. Several members noted that while the mission statement is good, only items 1, 3, and 5 appeared to be educational objectives for students. Because mission statements were not actually objectives, the question was raised regarding how these statements could be measured. There was also a question raised as to the meaning of "professional" objectives. Members questioned why SIS (Spatial Information Systems) was not included in the SLOs. The unit is accredited by the Society of American Foresters and a copy of the accreditation standards was attached. The next accreditation is 2010.

Question 2. While the educational objectives were aligned with the mission of UAM, a question was raised concerning the second paragraph of the response regarding the Arkansas Forest Resources Center and how it affected student assessment. More clarification is needed on this part of the response. The question was also raised regarding the regarding land-grant status mentioned in this paragraph. More clarification is needed here as well.

Question 3. The response noted brochures and "other materials" were distributed but there were no brochures attached in an appendix. It was noted that the unit has Forestry Days for prospective students that were not mentioned in the report.

Question 4. Several members noted that historical trends were not addressed. Dr. Mehmood indicated that because of the new system of course objectives there is insufficient data at this time to address the issue. He indicated that there would be data next year. Most members thought the response to this question was long and unclear with excessive information. The response seemed to focus on course descriptions and skills expectations, not assessment. Several members noted that all students make A's and B's and questioned if students were culled from the program. The following question was noted: What happens if a student fails the capstone course? How do faculty discern what the student is "missing"? Also, if GPAs are used as a tool, why do we not have other years GPAs for comparison?

Question 5. Question 5 addresses the evidence of measures of student performance that is collected and analyzed regularly with examples of how the analysis improves unit

decisions. The response to this question was poor. Several committee members noted that it was stated how the program was improved. It was not clear what types of data were collected. The response indicated “extensive data” but it was not clear what data was being noted. Questions included: How are presentations graded? Who grades them? What are the graders looking for in the presentations? Two members noted that the grade distribution was included but there was no discussion of how the analysis of this information is course related. The response to this question should be expanded to address these issues.

Question 6. The response to this question indicates that information is gathered but it is not clear how the information is used to determine unit decisions other than hiring/firing faculty. The paragraph on page 26 under the chart seems to be added almost as an afterthought. This response should be resubmitted and improved.

Question 7. The response to this question was vague. One member noted “just answer the question!” It was noted in the response that “major changes” have been made, but there is little discussion of how these changes came about. It is suggested that the response to this question be expanded and re-submitted.

Question 8. The response to this question indicated “several classes are offered in the evening” but there was no list or schedule of classes noted. The committee noted that while some courses in the unit did not lend themselves to on-line, perhaps CIV could be an option.

Question 9. Student evaluations are not used in the assessment process. The response indicates that a student serves on the assessment committee. It was noted that while student feedback is a type of assessment, it is only one type of assessment. There was no indication of how the instructors use the feedback they receive for their individual courses.

Respectfully submitted,

Ranelle Eubanks, Recorder