

CASAA MEETING MINUTES  
November 14, 2007  
3:00 p.m. Adams Room, Harris Hall

Members attending: Bob Stark, Sarah Bloom, Dennis Patterson, Terri Hopkins-Cossey, Sue Martin, Sayeed Mehmood, Mary Heady, Carole Efird, and Larry Smith. Veronica Studards had reviewed the report and sent her rubric but was unable to attend the meeting.

The **Division of Agriculture and the Taylor Library** reports were reviewed using the rubric as a point of discussion in the context of the nine questions.

The following remarks for the **Division of Agriculture** were noted:

Question 1. Two members had questions regarding how the SLOs would be measured, specifically #2 “Perform critical reasoning, perceive assumptions, and make judgments based on the basic principles of animal science, plant and soil science, and agricultural economics.” Is also noted that the website is not specific to SLOs because they are listed under the mission statement. It is suggested that a separate link on the website address SLOs. It is suggested that this be corrected for the next assessment report.

Question 2. The mission (goals) of the Division of Agriculture adequately linked to the mission of UAM.

Question 3. Several members noted that there is no information regarding how prospective students are notified. A question was noted: how is information conveyed to students on recruitment days? The availability of a brochure was addressed by two members. Dr. Stark noted there is a brochure, but it was not included in the assessment report. A copy of the division’s brochure should be attached to the assessment report as documentation. It is noted that the SLOs need to be clearly stated in the catalog. No sample syllabi were included as appendices to the report; it was noted that several syllabi are on-line, but there was no specific website listed for how to access the syllabi. There is no need to repeat the SLOs from Question 1 again in Question 3. These suggestions should be incorporated as soon as possible for inclusion in the next assessment report. Sample syllabi should be included as appendices.

Question 4. Several members noted that historical trends were not addressed. The use of the pre/post testing was a positive means of assessing student success; however, it is only one means. It is suggested that for the next assessment report, graduation rates and information regarding the quantity of hands-on work completed by students and how this data is used to assess SLOs be included in the report.

Question 5. Two members noted that the grade distribution was included but there was no discussion of how the analysis of this information is course related. Three committee members noted there was no discussion of how the faculty determined the need for the disease control course. There was no discussion of how/why the unit decided to offer

more specific minors. The decline in enrollment was noted on the report but there was no discussion of why the decline was noted or what has been done to increase student enrollment. The response to this question should be expanded to include these points in the next assessment report.

Question 6. The response to this question was noted by one member to be “the weakest link.” Two members noted there was no discussion of how the unit analyzes and selects a course of action. Dr. Stark indicated there is no specific employer survey but word of mouth is relied upon heavily. Although Senior Surveys were noted in the report, there is no discussion of how the curriculum was impacted by these surveys.

Question 7. There was no prioritization of the issues noted, the use of “faculty” rather than assigning names to projects/goals makes completion of a project difficult because there is no person who can report on progress. The response to this question is vague. One member noted the response did not adequately answer the question. One member noted the information would have been more readily understood if the list had been prioritized. It is suggested that the response to this question be improved in the next assessment report.

Question 8. The response to this question was weak: one member noted that the response “somewhat discusses problems.” While it is noted that the Division of Agriculture depends heavily on hands-on experiences, there seemed to be no current interest by faculty in attempting to expand alternative learning modes.

Question 9. It is noted that the unit has several student organizations but they do not directly affect assessment, or if they do, there was no discussion of this point. It was not noted in the response to this question if student end-of-course evaluations were considered as part of the assessment process.

The following remarks for the **Taylor Library** were noted:

There were several appendices to the report but they were not addressed in order in the body of the report. It is suggested that if an appendix is used to supplement a question, notice of the appendix be included with the response to the question.

Question 1. Several members noted that the mission and goals of the library were clear and easily readable, but student learning expectations were not addressed. The response seemed to be more geared toward faculty and staff. One member noted that the word “student” was not even mentioned in the report until page 5. The response to this question should be reviewed and revised by the next assessment report to adequately address student learners.

Question 2. The mission (goals) of the Taylor Library adequately linked to the mission of UAM.

Question 3. One member noted that the place to put the SLOs is not in the “about us” section of the website but there should be a direct link on the side bar to SLOs. One member noted that the response to this question seemed weak. It is suggested that the response to this question be improved in the next assessment report.

Question 4. The response to this question was not clear, there was no specific evidence given. It was noted that the use of the workshop survey information could easily have been included here. It was noted that no historical trends were addressed. For the next assessment report, answer the following question: How does the library determine when something is not being used enough? Perhaps random student surveys could be conducted to obtain student input. The response to this question should be re-addressed.

Question 5. The report clearly provided evidence of measures of student performance that was collected and analyzed.

Question 6. Three members noted there were no minutes or other documentation of unit decisions. There were not list of committee members as documentation; this should be included in the next assessment report.

Question 7. The response to this question was very vague. The response did not indicate who would perform tasks or how the tasks would be performed. This response should be re-addressed.

Question 8. The answer to this question did not address historical patters or trends. The response should have indicated hours of operation outside the normal business hours as one means of making the library more accessible.

Question 9. The following were noted as ways to improve student input into the assessment process (1) random student surveys in the library; (2) a suggestion box in the lobby; (3) have student membership on the Library Committee. The Committee would like to see some of these suggestions used and included in the next assessment report.

Respectfully submitted,

Ranelle Eubanks, Recorder