

CASAA MEETING MINUTES
February 18, 2009
3:00 p.m. Library Conference Room A

Members attending: Sarah Bloom, Terri Cossey, Carole Efird, Carol Strong, Mary Heady, James Crow, Veronica Studards and Ranelle Eubanks.

The **School of Mathematics and Sciences** report was reviewed using the rubric as a point of discussion in the context of the ten questions.

The following remarks were noted concerning **the Math and Sciences** report.

Question 1. The SLOs were succinct; however, there was no website indicated where the SLOs could be found on the unit's home page.

Question 2. The student learning outcomes align with the mission of UAM.

Question 3. Several members noted that it was not clear how prospective students were made aware of the SLOs. SLOs were not on the website; SLOs are not in the unit brochure. Dr. Efird indicated SLOs would be in the next brochure printed.

Question 4. This question reviewed evidence of how the unit assesses whether a student has achieved the unit's student learning outcomes. There was a good discussion of the PCAT exam and a brief discussion of the common final examinations. A historical review of the item analysis would have been good documentation of the item analysis. The use of the Student Evaluation of Teaching as evidence of students' achieving learning outcomes is questionable since student learning outcomes specific to mathematics and sciences are not part of the Student Evaluation of Teaching form.

Question 5. Regarding evidence of measures of student performance that the unit collects and analyzes regularly, the response to this question was acceptable

Question 6. This question involved evidence of how the unit utilizes information other than student performance to determine necessary documentation. The response to this question was broad generalizations; i.e. "the school attempts to be a good listener." Documentation is needed to provide evidence of information other than student performance.

Question 7. The response to this question which asked for a prioritization of the unit's future course of action including a plan for who will do what and to what extent was too general. There was no mention of who would do what and no timeline was indicated. The response to this question needs to be reviewed.

Question 8. This question involved the unit's efforts to make learning accessible. There was a narrative discussion of the unit's efforts with some historical review. Attaching a

course schedule indicating when and how courses have been offered over time would have been helpful. There was no discussion of the 8-week classes in the response.

Question 9. The response to this question was acceptable.

Question 10. The response to this question was acceptable. Most committee members thought the unit did a very good job of trying to retain students.

Respectfully submitted,

Ranelle Eubanks, Recorder