Members Present:
Dr. Ed Dickey, Committee Chair, Professor and Chair, Department of Instruction and Teacher Education
Dr. Lynda Nilges, Assoc. Professor Department of Physical Education & Physical Education program representative
Dr. Alisa Lowrey, Asst. Professor, Department of Educational Psychology
Dr. Loren Knapp, Asst. Dean, College of Science & Mathematics
Dr. Debbie Hamm, Chief Information Officer, Richland District Two
Dr. Michael Seaman, Associate Dean, College of Education (for Irma Van Scoy)
Dr. Katherine Chaddock, Assoc. Professor, Department of Educational Leadership and Policies
Ms. Renee Connolly, Dir. of Accreditation & Quality Assurance, College of Education
Dr. Wendy Valerio, Assoc. Professor, School of Music
Mr. Bob Pruzin, Professor & Undergraduate Director, School of Music

0. Core Committee Discussion of Upcoming Review of Plans
Prior to the meeting committee members reviewed program assessment data and documents included in the NCATE crates for the three music education programs under review.

I. Call Meeting to Order & Approval of February 20, 2004 Minutes
Dr. Dickey called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and asked for introductions from committee members. He briefly reviewed the charge of the committee, what its tasks are in relation to the PEU programs, and what procedures follow after the review meeting. The Committee approved the minutes from the February 20 meeting.

II. Review of Music Education Programs
   A. Overview of BM Music Education Program & Plan – Mr. Bob Pruzin
      Mr. Pruzin highlighted the number of students in the BM degree who are actually teacher preparation candidates. In addition, he informed the group of how many students are involved in student teaching and how many are in the various areas of music, most of whom are in the band area. He provided an explanation of the basic emphasis of the program and how students balance some of the unique expectations of this program like individual lessons, juries, and expectations to continue. He reported that their candidates are constantly being evaluated on their music content knowledge and application at many different points due to the nature of the discipline. In addition, he pointed out his responsibilities as Undergraduate Director to identify and help remediate candidates who may not be doing very well which emphasizes the fact that candidates are continually being assessed. Mr. Pruzin also noted that their activities are closely related to NASM’s expectations, explaining that faculty are very interested in making sure that they correspond.

   B. Committee Review of Assessment Plan for the BM
      Dr. Knapp agreed that assessment was alive in this program and encouraged the music faculty to more clearly integrate all the ongoing assessment activities so it is clear to reviewers that all this is happening. Dr. Dickey also encouraged the faculty to consider pulling out the true items that will help the program assess where their students are. In addition, Dr. Dickey expressed the concern that it was not clear where and how faculty sit down to discuss how data are used for program improvement and changes.
      Mr. Pruzin informed the members that a student handbook illustrates clearly for students what assessment points are expected of them. He acknowledged, however, that faculty are not
currently involved in a formal process of reviewing data to make program improvements. He did state that faculty do this in an informal way and that the program is currently undergoing many curriculum changes, which may be able to encompass some of the data as a result of this plan. Dr. Seaman encouraged the faculty to use a data-driven approach when they discuss program improvements and that a more formal process would be helpful in bringing together all the individuals who assist in collecting information. Ms. Connolly reminded the representatives that her office can support faculty in ways that may fulfill these data-driven decisions by analyzing what is available or making adjustments of what is being collected.

C. Overview of MME and PhD Programs & Plans – Dr. Wendy Valerio
Dr. Valerio informed the members how many students were in the program and what tracks and foci are available to graduate students in the Masters level program. Most of their recruits are typically from SC. Dr. Valerio told the group that an outstanding choral faculty member has been added to this program, which has helped guide candidates in this program in relation to what the state atmosphere is like. She reviewed the criteria of each track for candidates entering the Masters program and what areas they typically enter upon graduation. She highlighted the various assessments that are used through the program and how some changes have affected the courses that candidates take.
Dr. Valerio reminded the members that there are many similarities between the PhD and the MME. She gave the members an idea of the number of students and ethnic diversity in the program. She expressed concern that the required credit hours in the program are less than what is typically expected in music doctoral programs. She emphasized some of the strengths and weaknesses of the candidates who enter the program and how the program addresses these. She reminded the members of the different assessments such as their application process requirements, the candidacy exam, different courses, a possible statistics language requirement (to replace a foreign language requirement), comprehensive exams, and the dissertation process.

D. Committee Review of Assessment Plans for the MME and PhD
Dr. Dickey asked about the relationship of NASM to the MME and Dr. Valerio reported that some new technology efforts have been implemented as a result of their recommendations. Dr. Knapp expressed interest in how the proposed data collection efforts are being administered and what the formal review process is like. Dr. Valerio expressed concern that there has not been an active process in place for reviewing data, although some interaction has happened informally. Dr. Lowery expressed concern that program changes (like that mentioned in the NASM example with technology) be noted so that it becomes more clear as to how the program has benefited from reviews. Dr. Seaman emphasized the importance of proceeding with these plans in relation to what is expected for better programs, University strategic planning processes, and not simply for accreditation purposes.
Dr. Dickey asked what NASM reviewed and for what they made recommendations after the review. Dr. Valerio acknowledged that since there has been a slight increase in the number of faculty available in the program, that there should be some changes in the rigor and organization in the program to fulfill what the needs of the students are in the discipline. Dr. Seaman explained how helpful it could be to the program to actively use their multiple data and their multiple points in ways that will truly help in program evaluation. He noted that faculty should concentrate on what pieces of the data will be helpful when trying to determine weak areas. Members made some recommendations to the representatives as to how they could get better student and post-graduate input for program improvement.

III. Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for Music Education Programs
Dr. Dickey explained what the next step in this review process will entail for the music programs and highlighted the levels of how programs are reviewed. He reported that the Deans of all the units in the
PEU will receive a copy of the recommendation report. The Committee will make its recommendations for the music plan and forward them to the music faculty representatives. Dr. Dickey asked for any additional committee member recommendations. The members commented on some new areas and some that had been mentioned during the discussion. These included: national standards included for advanced, BM attention to Praxis II, a formal plan in place for using and reviewing the data, and using what is really meaningful for the programs. Dr. Nilges suggested producing examples of exemplary programs after the work of the committee is complete for this year. Along those same lines, Dr. Knapp made some suggestions of compiling the year’s work so that it is more clear to programs what kinds of issues are important.

IV. Committee Consensus for all Art Education Recommendation Reports
Dr. Dickey informed the members that he will be emailing the art recommendation reports for the committee’s review and comment.

V. Committee Discussion of Final Spring Semester Meeting(s)
Dr. Dickey suggested that the Committee wait to schedule their final meeting during the next Qcom meeting on Friday, April 9.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.