

**PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**FRIDAY, DECEMBER 1, 2006**  
**WARDLAW BLDG, RM. 110, 1:30 P.M.**

**ATTENDEES**

Les Sternberg, COE Dean & Director of Teacher Education  
Irma Van Scoy, COE Associate Dean  
Emma May, COE Director of Office of Student Affairs  
Bruce Field, COE Director of School-University Partnership/Clinical Experiences  
Rob Dedmon, COE Asst. Director Undergraduate Programs  
Renee Connolly, COE Director of Accreditation & Quality Assurance  
Catherine Luthren, COE Accreditation & Certification  
Elaine Frank, School of Public Health, Dept. Chair, Communication Sciences & Disorders  
Hiram McDade, School of Public Health, Communication Sciences & Disorders  
Mary Ann Byrnes, Asst. Dean, College of Arts & Sciences  
Lara Ducate, College of Arts & Sciences, Foreign Language  
Lara Lomicka, College of Arts & Sciences, Foreign Language  
Bob Feller, College of Arts & Sciences, IMA Science, Center for Science Education  
Susan Anderson, College of Arts & Sciences, Dance Education  
Lynn Keane, College of Hospitality, Retail, & Sport Management, Business Education  
Bob Brookshire, College of Hospitality, Retail & Sport Management, Business Education  
Donna Shannon, College of Mass Communication & Information Science, School Media  
Elizabeth Miller, College of Mass Communication & Information Science, School Media  
Susan Prior, USC Office of Institutional Assessment & Compliance  
Bob Pruzin, School of Music  
Karen French, COE Physical Education  
Tina Hall, COE Physical Education  
Panayiotis Doutis, COE Physical Education  
Lynda Nilges, COE Physical Education  
Betty Garren, COE MAT Program, Beaufort  
Teri Kuhs, COE, Elementary Education  
Ed Dickey, COE, ITE Department Chair, Secondary Education  
Herman Knopf, COE Early Childhood Education  
Christine Christle, COE Special Education  
Zach Kelehear, COE Educational Administration, CD-12  
Diane Harwell, COE Educational Administration, CD-12

Dr. Van Scoy called the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m.

**Welcome**

Dean Sternberg welcomed everyone from other colleges and schools within the Professional Education Unit (PEU) and thanked them for attending. He thanked the COE's Offices of Student Affairs, School-University Partnerships, and Accreditation and Quality Assurance for their continued support and good work in providing services to students, faculty, and staff in the entire PEU.

**Overview of PEU Services and Website**

Dr. Van Scoy introduced the newly-created PEU website to the committee. She highlighted the current News section and each page for the three main offices that work with all programs in the PEU – the Office of Student Affairs, the School-University/Clinical Experiences, and Accreditation & Quality Assurance. Each office has posted relevant PEU information and Directors' contact information. She asked for introductions from each Director, who then provided an overview of his/her office and its responsibilities.

### **Revised Conceptual Framework**

Ms. Connolly reviewed the newly-refined conceptual framework to the committee, highlighting the new names (Collaborative Educational Leader and Collaborative Educational Leader and Advocate) and combined terms within the framework. She emphasized the collaboration among faculty from across the PEU to complete this work in spring 2006 and reminded the committee that all assessment plans and reports should be aligned to this framework. The next step in this refinement process will be to create an image for display in the colleges and schools of the PEU. Each committee member was given a hard copy of the new framework and referred to the website for additional information.

### **Dispositions Rubric for all PEU Programs**

Dr. Van Scoy reviewed the newly-developed dispositions rubric to the committee. All those attending were provided with a copy. She explained that the rubric was developed by a representative committee of PEU members during 2005-06 for implementation during fall 2006. Procedures for implementation are detailed for the PEU pre-service programs during the internship year/directed student teaching. Advanced programs will implement procedures that will assess their candidates against the framework's dispositions, but have much more leeway in how those procedures are defined. She noted that many PEU programs are already using the dispositions rubric in creative ways. Dr. Van Scoy explained that the rubric uses the dispositions to assess candidate behaviors in nine focus areas of professionalism, supportive interactions, demonstrating intellectual curiosity, self-assessment/reflection, appreciating diversity, and providing learning experiences for all. She mentioned that Dr. Field would be explaining the pre-service implementation in more detail later in the meeting.

### **Collecting Meaningful Data and Data for Institutional Requirements**

Ms. Connolly reminded the members that three years of aggregated data will be the minimum requirement for the submission of September 2009 program reports (NCATE programs) and self studies (Commission and State Department programs). So that her office can assist PEU programs in aggregating data and assisting with report preparation, it is imperative that all PEU programs be collecting performance-based data based on key assessments within the program, this fall. These assessments are a part of newly-revised assessment plans, that were requested by August 15, 2006, and should be in place now. She informed the group that she and Catherine Luthren, of her office, can help programs in their assessment plan development and translation to the electronic database. Assessment plans will continue to be reviewed as part of the QCom process, but her office will be entering, maintaining, and reporting data to programs on a regular basis. She emphasized the connection between what the PEU is completing for assessment plan development and data collection and what the USC Office of Institutional Assessment and Compliance is requesting for SACS requirements. Ms. Prior reiterated Ms. Connolly's statements, confirming that they should be similar processes so programs are not completing two extremely different exercises in assessment. Dr. Van Scoy reminded the members that the PEU process was aligned specifically to help meet SACS needs and should be a compliment to what programs have to complete for that process. Ms. Connolly and Ms. Prior reported that they will develop a comparison of "NCATE/Commission" terms and "SACS" terms to ease in accreditation reporting requirements.

### **Quality Assurance Committee (QCom) Update**

Dr. Dickey, outgoing QCom Chair, reported on behalf of Ken Stevenson, current QCom chair on the first three years of work for this committee. He reminded the members that this committee was approved by all Deans of the PEU to be a collaborative committee that will review assessment plans, data, analysis, and data review for all programs in the PEU. The committee is in its fourth year of existence and has noted consistent issues among program assessment plans that are critical to improvement within the PEU. These issues include: 1) the need for a formal plan for the collection and storage of data that includes specific faculty and administrative assistants, 2) a greater emphasis on meeting professional association standards first, through assessments and collected data, 3) the need for consistent use of rubrics or scoring criteria, where appropriate, 4) clear documentation in plans of how data are reviewed by program representatives and used to implement program change, 5) clear documentation/record keeping of program changes, and 6) the need for better communication with the COE Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance to eliminate duplication, strengthen data collection efforts, and general data and plan support. He reminded the members that the committee uses a four-level rubric

for evaluating each plan and makes recommendations to programs for what issues programs may want to strengthen.

## **INITIAL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM ITEMS**

### **ADEPT Update**

Dr. Bruce Field announced that recent changes have been made to the State-mandated review of candidates called ADEPT. New USC ADEPT procedures were piloted this fall with candidates in Internship I and will be used with all candidates in Internship I and II beginning Spring 2007. Final adjustments are being made to the revised ADEPT Handbook which will be distributed in January. Changes to the system include: 1) ADEPT "Performance Dimensions" (PDs) have been changed to ADEPT "Performance Standards" (APSs) under which there are four "domains" which each include a number of "elements" 2) candidates will complete a written unit work sample instead of the oral assessment interview, which will help with professional association requirements; 3) a broader definition of professional responsibilities has been included under ADEPT APS 10; 4) a new observation form has been developed that has more focused, specific questions; and 5) the choice to "recommend with reservations" has been eliminated (reviewers only have two options – "recommended" or "not recommended"). The committee entertained discussion on program concerns regarding the format for materials distribution (i.e., packets versus stacks of different forms) and the need for cooperating/coaching teachers to have a hard copy of the ADEPT manual. Dr. Field recommended that any program needing additional copies contact him directly. Dr. Field announced that he will provide training to supervisors in all areas in January so that they are prepared to provide orientations on the new ADEPT to experienced coaching/cooperating teachers. **A formal training will be held on Saturday, January 6, 2007, for those who have not previously been ADEPT trained.**

### **Dispositions Rating Sheet**

Dr. Field highlighted the dispositions rating sheet that was piloted in the Internship I courses in pre-service programs this fall. This rating sheet was developed by the Dispositions Task force 2005-06 from the dispositions rubric that was mentioned earlier in the meeting. Its implementation has been well received and it has been particularly helpful in providing feedback to candidates. Dr. Field noted that the system is a work in progress, as programs continue to decide what is helpful. Dr. Pruzin commented that music education programs have modified the rubric to include a four-scale rating system. Likewise, Dr. Christle noted that the special education programs have implemented a five-point system.

### **Clinical Experiences Policies and Procedures Manual**

Dr. Field noted that the Policies and Procedures Manual for Clinical Experiences is out of date. Revisions to the manual are in progress. Dr. Van Scoy introduced a proposed amendment to clarify one component in the manual immediately. The committee entertained discussion on the wording of the change. Dr. Van Scoy asked for tentative approval to change the wording which referred to a Grievance Committee of the "ITE Department" to a Grievance Committee of the "PEU" and related minor changes. The members agreed to recommend the language change to the Intercollegiate Education Deans' Council (IEGC). Dr. Fields' office will continue to work on the more thorough revision which will include consultation with the USC legal office.

### **Praxis and Certification Updates**

Mr. Dedmon highlighted major changes in Praxis I and II score requirements including the allowance of an SAT score of 1100 (verbal and quantitative) or an ACT score of 24 in lieu of a passing score on Praxis I. He urged committee members to monitor the new PEU website and to get in touch with Ms. Catherine Luthren for additional details and reminders regarding Praxis and certification updates.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:43 p.m.