IEGC Meeting  
Tuesday, May 4, 2004, 1:00 p.m.  
Dean’s Conference Room, Wardlaw Bldg

Members present:
Roger Sawyer, Associate Dean, College of Science and Mathematics  
Jamal Rossi, Dean, School of Music  
Charles Bierbauer, Dean, College of Mass Communications and Information Studies  
Cheryl Addy, Associate Dean, Norman J. Arnold School of Public Health  
Gordon Smith, Dean, Graduate School  
Thorne Compton, Interim Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts  
Patricia Moody, Dean, Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management  
Les Sternberg, Dean, College of Education  
Irma Van Scoy, Associate Dean, College of Education  
Ed Dickey, Professor, College of Education  
Renee Connolly, Dir. of Accreditation & Quality Assurance, College of Education

Guests:
Ralph White, Dean, College of Engineering and Information Technology  
Mike Perkins, Dir. of Student Services, College of Engineering and Information Technology  
Charles Brice, Professor, College of Engineering and Information Technology

Dr. Sternberg called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m.

I. Introductions and Review of Committee Charge – Les Sternberg
Dr. Sternberg explained the structure of the IEGC and what its purpose is within the Professional Education Unit. He emphasized that representatives from the College of Engineering and Information Technology were present due to some new initiatives and programs that they along with the College of Education are interested in pursuing. He outlined why the committee meets.

II. Update on Accreditation Results – Les Sternberg
Dr. Sternberg announced that his office had just received notification from NCATE that the Professional Education Unit (PEU) had received continuing accreditation as result of the October 2003 visit. This letter was sent to the President and all appropriate personnel on the campus. He explained that accreditation is good for the next 5 years and may be moved to every 7 years. Although two programs have been mentioned as areas for improvement, this is an issue that was not cited in the BOE team’s exit interview, but is being addressed by Dean Sternberg with NCATE.

III. Status of MAT/IMA Programs – Gordon Smith
Before Dr. Smith’s report, Dr. Van Scoy updated the members on the status of the IMA programs. After consolidation and revision only four IMAs currently exist. She has recommended that these programs be wholly administered within the college/school where the discipline is found and faculty in each IMA area concur with the recommendation. The four IMAs are: Physical Education, Art, Business, and Science.

Dr. Smith explained that the MAT issue is more complicated since it is truly a more interdisciplinary degree. The MAT degree is currently housed in the Graduate School. He suggested the idea that the MAT be housed in the College of Education and not in the Graduate School. This idea led to several committee and unit discussions. This shift is primarily for ease in administering the degree and not to diminish any discipline-related responsibilities with these degrees. He announced that he is working through a memorandum of understanding that will specify what requirements and responsibilities will belong to colleges/schools with an
administrative move to the College of Education. He informed the group that some original concerns concerning this move have been eliminated somewhat so that admissions and graduation are shared responsibilities, content is left to the discipline area, and pedagogy is left to the College of Education. Dr. Smith noted a lack of a paper trail in relation to the history and home of the MATs, so this memorandum will help clarify the situation. Dr. Compton expressed his understanding of the shared responsibilities and asked which College/School would be listed on the candidate’s degree. Dr. Smith agreed to check on this issue with the Registrar’s Office and report back.

Dean Sternberg explained that the College of Education’s intent with this move is to provide some administrative consistency and to justify the use of college resources to designate individual to oversee the MAT candidates and programs.

IV. Review of Unit-wide Assessment Plan
Dr. Van Scoy distributed a handout to the members that highlighted the components of the unit-wide assessment system. She expressed the importance of this system to help make better-informed, data-driven program decisions and reminded the group that this plan has been purposely connected to what SACS requirements now dictate and to the University’s requirements in the Strategic Plans. The piece of the plan that holds everything together is the PEU’s conceptual framework, *The Professional Educator as Leader*. She reminded the members that this is a shared vision among all seven colleges/schools in the PEU.

She highlighted a few of the elements of the plan such as: more performance-based data, use of data for program change, and the collection of helpful data. Each of these is an extremely important part of making the plan work throughout the PEU.

There are several offices within the College of Education that will be an essential part in making this plan real over the next several years. These offices are the Office of Student Affairs, the Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance, and the School-University Partnerships Office. All these offices can collect and report data to faculty as they need it for assessment plans and other program needs. She highlighted briefly the role of the PEU Quality Assurance Committee and how it fits into the overall plan.

V. Demonstration of PEU Electronic Database for Program Assessment Plans – Ms. Renee Connolly
Ms. Connolly provided the members an electronic view of how the database is coming into shape. She explained that this database is in its early stages of availability, data collection, and data analysis. Her office, along with the Office of Student Affairs, work to maintain this database and can aggregate and report necessary information to faculty within the PEU. The data are currently being analyzed in a simple way, but as technology changes and program needs change, the data will become more meaningful to programs and the analyses more helpful. She also showed the members an example of aggregated data that her office can produce for faculty or administration.

VI. Review and Approval of Quality Assurance Committee (QCom) Procedures – Dr. Ed Dickey
Dr. Dickey outlined the charge of QCom and reminded the members that they had approved the establishment of the Committee during Spring 2003, although not all procedures for administration of the Committee had been approved. Dr. Dickey highlighted what QCom has accomplished during its first academic year and reviewed several handouts that the members were provided. The format of the Committee has been structured similar to a peer-review process for journal submissions. He reminded the members that over the next several years all programs in the PEU will be reviewed. He called the members’ attention to the levels of ratings that the Committee has been using, explaining what the Committee looks for when assigning and making these recommendations. He explained that the most common themes they have seen are programs relying on course grades and programs not having a systematic process for review of collected/aggregated data. He also explained
the process that is currently in place for forwarding final recommendation reports. He asked for members’ approval of the procedures and rubrics that are being used in QCom. Dr. Sternberg asked for members’ questions and input. Dr. Rossi asked for clarification of the process for program input after a recommendation is made. Dr. Dickey explained that members of the program become QCom committee members while the committee is reviewing the plan. During this time, those faculty have an opportunity to clarify misunderstandings or misinterpretations prior to QCom’s recommendation. In addition, they have an opportunity to clarify when the plans are presented again.

Dr. Sternberg provided clarification on what he needs from the Deans/Dean Designees for QCom. He asked the Deans to consider lending strong support to these recommendation reports when they come from his office.

Hearing no objections, the procedures and rubrics for QCom were passed by the IEGC members.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.