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
Ms. Falicia Harvey, Coordinator, SC Dept. of Ed. Office of Teacher Quality
Dr. Debbie Hamm, Chief Information Officer, Richland District Two
Dr. Irma Van Scoy, Associate Dean, College of Education
Ms. Renee Connolly, Dir. of Accreditation & Quality Assurance, College of Education
Dr. Elaine Frank, Assoc. Professor & Chair, Department of Communication Science & Disorders, School of Public Health
Dr. Hiram McDade, Assoc. Professor & Graduate Director, Department of Communication Science & Disorders, School of Public Health

0. Core Committee Discussion of Upcoming Review of Plans
The Committee reviewed the information in the crates for these two programs and discussed issues and questions among themselves until the speech-language faculty representatives came in.

I. Call Meeting to Order & Approval of March 26, 2004 Minutes
Dr. Dickey called the meeting to order at 12:50 p.m. He called for introductions from the committee members, outlined the charge of the committee, and explained the set of criteria and rubrics that are used during the review.

II. Review of Speech-Language Pathology Assessment Plans

A. Overview of MSP and MCD Programs and Plans – Drs. Elaine Frank and Hiram McDade
Dr. Frank explained the two masters programs and their organizational set up. The MSP is a full-time program on campus, while the MCD is a part-time, distance education program. She added that these programs are the longest masters level programs on campus (hours) and that they have been accredited by ASHA for approximately 30 years. She reported that their recent ASHA visit extends their accreditation until 2008. The CAA, an “arm” of ASHA has recently revised the accreditation process due to a national change in standards, so the Department has adopted the new standards and as part of the process has become engaged in formative assessments. She reported that they have always had levels of assessments at particular points in the programs such as graduate surveys, employer surveys, focus groups with employers, student meetings while they are in the programs, and new forms (examples supplied to the committee) that outline the knowledge, skills, and competencies that are required by ASHA. Dr. Frank outlined the forms and how they are used in the programs, making specific references to practicum and internship requirements. She explained that students are required to show how they have achieved skills in the program through various assessments.

Dr. Frank explained that the MCD program was designed to bring baccalaureate-level students up to the masters level. Upon completion of this program, candidates are eligible for “masters + 30” pay grades in the school system. This program now reaches to Georgia, Mississippi, and the Virgin Islands. Dr. McDade explained that because of Commission on Higher Education requirements, this was created as a new degree in order to comply with state guidelines for distance education requirements.
Dr. Frank explained in detail what various experiences candidates receive in their practicum and internship experiences. In addition, she reported that employers are continually surprised at the personal growth of students who complete the distance education program and then begin working. Dr. McDade commented on some of the changes that faculty have noticed in the types of students who enroll in the MCD. He reported that they are seeing more students in the MCD who have completed teacher preparation programs. In the past, the students were more “non-traditional” students. Dr. Frank added that they are continually contacted by other states who are interested in the Department starting a cohort of the MCD in their state. This program is self-supported and is totally revenue driven.

Dr. Frank explained that both degrees are bound by the same competencies and assessments. Their only difference is their delivery method. Dr. McDade emphasized the fact that faculty purposely tried to make the degrees as similar as possible. He also explained that in order to enter the MSP a candidate has to have some experience in speech and language, but that they are continually working to ensure that candidates adequately exemplify some prerequisite knowledge.

Dr. Frank explained the process of the assessments. She reported that candidate exit interviews have been a successful component of the plan and that candidates are very open in their responses. She discussed how the Faculty Evaluation Committee uses the input from candidates to implement program decisions and changes. In addition, the School of Public Health has their own assessment instrument that is given to candidates and for which results are reviewed by faculty. The Committee includes a candidate, a faculty member, and the Department Chair. Dr. McDade reported that several curriculum changes have been made as a result of the data gathered from candidates and employers. Dr. McDade informed the committee that these new required assessments are relatively new for the profession as a whole, although the Department has had great success in implementing them and in using data.

**B. Committee Review of Assessment Plans for the MSP and MCD**

Dr. Knapp expressed interest in the origin of the programs’ candidates. Dr. Frank explained that candidates who come with an undergraduate degree in the field begin at a different time than those who do not. She explained that the program is very interested in getting candidates from diverse backgrounds and may not necessarily have a sole background in speech-language. As a result, their pool is a very rich one representing a diverse background of academic experiences. Dr. Dickey inquired as to the number of candidates who come through the programs each year. Dr. McDade explained that they accept approximately 35 candidates each year and that USC is the largest graduate level speech language. Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification on teacher certification requirements before candidates enter the programs. Drs. Frank and McDade explained that some candidates do enter with teacher preparation degrees, but that it is not a requirement. They see, however, that most of the MCD students come in with some background in education.

Dr. Dickey asked for clarification on how faculty know that candidates meet the competencies listed rather than simply “checking off a course.” Dr. Frank explained that another layer of review exists that asks faculty to comment on candidates’ completion of competencies. This layer was not obvious in the paperwork given to the committee, but it was confirmed that the activity is happening. Dr. Dickey emphasized the importance of making this aspect of the assessments more clear in the assessment plan. Both faculty representatives acknowledged that because these new ASHA assessments had only been implemented last year, that there are still many aspects that should be made more clear.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification on how the program faculty maintain all the data so it can be used in aggregate form. Dr. Frank explained that faculty retain weak competencies in order to understand candidates on a person level. For program evaluation, weak competencies are aggregated in order to find possible “holes” in courses or activities that can be strengthened. Dr.
Frank explained that as the Department Chair she receives this type of information and systematically reviews the data. Although this process is new, her plans are to bring any noticed weaknesses to the Curriculum Committee. Dr. Van Scoy clarified the importance of gathering aggregated data so as to display to future accreditation concerns that summarized data are being used for program improvement. Dr. Dickey asked for clarification on what point(s) they feel make up a possible midpoint, while acknowledging how difficult this may be. Both faculty representatives admitted that there is not one place called a midpoint, but that the competency form is reviewed at the end of each semester. Dr. Knapp asked for clarification on how faculty know when candidates should not continue in the program. Dr. Frank acknowledged that this is an issue, but they are struggling with finding how to implement some mechanism for counseling candidates who may be in this situation. She did inform the group that since the competency forms are reviewed each semester, that they have some way of catching these types of candidates, although there are some issues still related to helping them work on weak points. Dr. Dickey emphasized the importance of implementing new procedures as discussed in Committee, but that program faculty keep in mind what will be most helpful to them in the program.

III. Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for Speech-Language Pathology Programs
Dr. Dickey explained what process the Committee will follow after the meeting in terms of recommendations and further reports to the faculty representatives and to the Deans of the schools and colleges in the PEU. The Committee discussed the possible recommendation to the program to make one aspect of the assessment more clear. Specifically, this involves the follow-up procedures that happen when a candidate completes the competency form with a faculty member. In addition, the Committee also discussed recommending that faculty include a plan to help identify and counsel weaker students and what system would be helpful for keeping up with who these students are and how the program can help them.

IV. Committee Consensus for all Art Education Recommendation Reports
Dr. Dickey asked for approval for all art education recommendation reports. The Committee had discussion about receiving the necessary information electronically versus hard copy format for the next year.

V. Committee Discussion of Final Spring Semester Meeting
Dr. Dickey outlined what business he would like to conduct at the last meeting which may include: development of a process for election of a chair, finalizing the last reports (music and speech), and the rotation of outgoing members. The Committee tentatively decided to meet on Thursday, May 6 at 1:00 p.m. to discuss final responsibilities for 2003-04.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:10 p.m.