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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aviation Career Fair</th>
<th>Check ins via Handshake</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2023 Company Attendance

- SkyWest Airlines
- Gem Air
- NetJets
- Duncan Aviation
- Horizon Air
- FBI
- Zipline International
- Breeze Airways
- PSA Airlines
- Erickson Inc
- Robotic Skies Inc
- TEMSCO Helicopters
- SLC Mosquito Abatement
- Piedmont Airlines
- USU - AirForce ROTC
- USU - Army ROTC
- Alpine Air
- Skyfish
- Alaska Central Express
Per feedback from AAA office, updated Outcomes data to include AVTE Outcomes Standard and Compliance in Curriculum Development and Continuous Improvement statement.

AAA Feedback

June 13, 2023

Dr. Miller, Aaron and Chenese,

Thank you for the conversation today. I learned more about your programs and am excited for your plan to develop them. I will try to have a goodie bag with a toothbrush or other supplies next time.

From my notes, I had a task of looking into curriculog and its ability to track changes to your courses each year. I actually logged in just now and requested a report for course changes for your department from July 1, 2022 to June 1, 2023 as a test. It said it might take an hour or so but I will let you know what the report looks like and if we think it would be helpful in reviewing the substantive changes you submit each year/semester.

Other recommendations or future tasks that I had down for us to consider (or publish in an assessment report ;-) ):

- Consider mapping program learning outcomes with IDEA learning outcomes and identify courses where IDEA could be pre-selected and used as an indirect measurement of program learning. Our office is happy to help.
- Identify any program learning outcomes where identifying a specific measurement that is used to demonstrate mastery can be incorporated to give better insights into program improvement based on instructor, course, student, etc. We identified this may not work on all your learning outcomes, especially some you have adopted an industry standard “good-to-go” or “not-good-to-go” model.
  - E.g. students will demonstrate <insert program learning outcome> by passing <identified assessment artifact or assignment> with a score of meets expectations or higher/>70% on such and such test or in such and such course.
- Add a narrative that explains the “good-to-go” model and why it has been adopted in some areas of measuring student learning to your assessment reports
• Add an “Annual Feedback” button to your websites that discusses input and recommendations you receive from committees and other reviewers external to your department about your assessment plan as well as any discussion your department faculty have about the assessment plan.

• Add the narrative and any corresponding data that shows your own internal discussion and decisions based on the outcome data and as well as any indirect review from your external industry advisors and regulators such as the Airline reps, alumni, FAA about how students are demonstrating mastery of your learning outcomes and how that feedback/data is making changes to your program curriculum teacher development etc. Also include follow-up on past changes and whether or not they worked in this section.
  
  o E.g. “On Aug. 17 faculty met and reviewed the data and identified female students were performing lower on such and such outcome so we implemented such and such to see if it could help with the learning gap.”
  
  o E.g. “Feedback from our industry advisors, such as Tom Davis of SkyWest, at our annual event in the spring had a common theme suggesting our students could use more training on outcome #4, so we created an assignment in course whatever that helped student develop more in that area.”

• Show trends over time as you continue to collect data beyond this initial year.

• Reach out to our office for help linking any data you may not have as easy access to.

You may have other notes, but I wanted to share mine and I will send you thoughts on the curriculog report.

--

Nathan Laursen  
Outcomes and Assessment Analyst  
Analysis, Assessment and Accreditation  
Office: (435) 797-0693  
AAA

Meeting Notes

June 6, 2023

During the CFI meeting on June 6, 2023, several important points were discussed. Joran informed the attendees about the SIM instrument currency renewal process, explaining that a report would be generated every couple of weeks. Those who had completed currency renewals would receive an email from Joran regarding the amount owed, and payments could be made to either Joran or Jensea. It was emphasized that the renewal should be scheduled as a rental.

The instructors were reminded to upload documents and certificates for their students using the scanner rather than pictures. Jensea and Joran were designated for handling employee and student documents, respectively. It was also noted that Jensea and Joran would cover for each other in case one of them was absent. Importantly, it was stressed that make and models should not be included in the documents but rather in the certificates, as they were a requirement.

The proper procedure for scanning FL papers into the system was highlighted. Instructors were instructed to approach Jensea or Joran for assistance with scanning, and after scanning, the originals were to be placed in the basket at Richard's desk. In the event that a student needed a copy of the document, instructors were advised to provide one. To avoid confusion, it was advised not to assume that Joran or Jensea were aware of documents that needed scanning if they were placed in their respective boxes. Additionally, scanning anything to the dispatch docs email was no longer acceptable.
The meeting addressed the issue of instructors exceeding 60 hours per pay period. It was mentioned that in May, 17 individuals had surpassed the allotted hours when the opportunity to work 80 hours a pay period had been offered. The importance of collaboration and assisting each other in completing solos and duties was emphasized, as it was indicated that if the opportunity arose again in July, all instructors needed to finish within that semester.

Lance expressed his opinion regarding pre and post briefs, stating that their absence indicated the operation was not in compliance with 141 standards. Billing and recording these briefs were noted as distinguishing factors between 61 and 141. Instructors were advised to communicate with Aaron if they noticed that flight times were marked as zero to explain the circumstances.

The financial aspect of the training program was discussed, highlighting the importance of charging students for ground instruction even if they were running low on funds. Failure to do so could jeopardize the program’s status for the school.

The meeting addressed the issue of attendance and makeup sessions. It was announced that the makeup day for missing a mandatory CFI meeting would be on the Friday following the meeting. It was stressed that these meetings were compulsory, and failure to attend would result in grounding from Tuesday to Friday.

Regarding checkrides, a new scale of 1-5 was introduced to assess performance. It was specified that if a student claimed to have never done a particular task or if their instructor had not taught them something, it would result in an automatic failure. Instructors were advised to ensure that their students were adequately prepared before scheduling checkrides.

The meeting discussed the policy of carrying forward items in FL. While FL allowed carrying forward, it was stressed that only two items could be carried over. In cases where a student was absent for an extended period but had already completed a flight, consultation with a chief was necessary to determine the appropriate course of action.

Other points discussed included the availability of the Cessna 172, the importance of keeping students motivated, the implementation of AQP – WARTS and DMMS, and ensuring students were enrolled in the next stage of training in a timely manner.

Instructors were informed that the full-time position had been revised from 12 to 8 months. Those interested were instructed to inform Aaron. Extensions of flights required permission from a chief and adjustments in FL to reflect the correct due back time. Failed checkrides should be marked as unsatisfactory rather than deleted, and instructors were reminded to ensure that the scheduled flight in FL matched the assigned plane.

Instructors were advised to enroll 61 checkrides in the appropriate courses and to provide all necessary information when messaging a chief for assistance. It was announced that submissions for stage check requests, whether accepted or rejected, would be sent to the instructors’ USU email accounts, not their Gmail accounts.

After hours, instructors were reminded to ensure that students filed and closed flight plans. Safety concerns were to be reported to Terrell Oliver and Kyle Dalebout, who were now part of the safety committee. The submission of safety reports was encouraged.

Brandon had made revisions to the checkride course, and instructors were advised to consult with him for further details. Specific knowledge requirements for instrument checkrides were mentioned, such as understanding the differences between alternate air and alternate static systems. Matt’s checkrides required students to be aware of the necessary bonding check.

Proper entry of information in aggietime was stressed, including the student’s last name, flight number, and description. Instructors were advised to keep their phones handy between 0700 and 1100 on the 1st and 16th of each month to address any issues before the noon deadline if identified by Jensea during approval.
The meeting concluded by announcing the end of 40-hour workweeks for instructors who submitted time into aggieTime. The checkride process was briefly discussed, with the reminder that Matt, Josh, Mike, Kevin, Chris, Steve G, Steve H, and Tom scheduled through Jensea. Instructors were requested not to bypass her and directly schedule checkrides. If a DPE provided a date not known to Jensea, it should be communicated to her.