0. **Core Committee Discussion of Plans**

Committee members reviewed materials from the educational administration programs prior to faculty representatives joining the meeting. During this period, Dr. Dickey explained that the CAPE program is changing to Curriculum Studies, their student population is changing; and the program currently has only three faculty members with one retiring soon. Regardless of these issues, the committee will go forward with the assessment plan review despite the unknown future of the program. Dr. Dickey asked the members if they had questions regarding the educational administration programs. Dr. Meeks inquired as to how committee members can truly know if any of the programs are meeting specific assessment points and Dr. Dickey commented that the committee cannot assess absolutely everything in the plans. He added, however, that plans should include more than only course grades and averages as projects and other work should be used as well. Committee members should evaluate the plans secure in the knowledge that the program is accredited by an appropriate professional organization, and trust that the NCATE system is working. Dr. Van Scoy added that the committee should look to see that the programs are following the Conceptual Framework of the PEU and that assessment criteria meet the professional association’s criteria as well. Dr. Meeks clarified that the name of the Division of Teacher Quality has been changed to the Division of Teacher Quality and School Leadership.

I. **Call Meeting to Order & Approval of November 19, 2004 Minutes**

Dr. Dickey asked committee members to introduce themselves when all program faculty representatives joined the meeting.

II. **Review of Plan for M.Ed. in Community and Adult Programs in Education**

Drs. Jeffries and Schramm-Pate provided an overview of the M.Ed. in CAPE program, as it has and will continue to undergo major program, curriculum, and faculty revisions. The CAPE program was formerly titled Community and Occupational Programs in Education (COPE) and was housed in the Department of Instruction and Teacher Education. CAPE recently had four faculty members but upon the resignation of one and the retirement of another, the program will have only two members, which makes CAPE program representatives unsure about the future of the program. During an inactive year-long period, curriculum courses were integrated into the program to increase its viability. Drs. Jeffries and Schramm-Pate reported that they have prepared significant changes to the intent and structure of the CAPE program and are working with Dr. Van Scoy to determine the best course of action for implementing these changes. When decisions are made regarding the future of CAPE, they will be in a better position to redefine the program’s assessment system.
Currently, students are enrolled in the program so the quality of the program needs to be maintained. Dr. Van Scoy commented that the College should understand more clearly the direction of the program before the end of Spring 2005. The committee discussed the current program assessment system and offered suggestions on how it might be refined.

### III. Review of Educational Administration Program Plans

Dr. Dickey asked educational administration faculty to provide a sense of what their programs are about and how they are using their assessment plans. Dr. Stevenson explained that the Department of Educational Leadership has three programs in education administration. The M.Ed. and the Ed.S. are certification programs and those in the CD-12 track of the Ph.D. enter superintendent positions. The two degrees and one track combined, total 100 semester hours of credit. The Educational Administration program is nationally recognized by its professional association, the Educational Leadership Constituency Council (ELCC).

The Praxis exam for administrators is built into the M.Ed and Ed.S educational administration program and students cannot graduate if they do not pass it. The program assessment system is broken into 7 areas with 63 standards that are used to improve the quality of the program. The program is also using GRE scores and grades in courses to assess quality. In Dr. Robert Johnson’s spring semester survey course, students are required to create a survey instrument to evaluate how the Master’s students rate the program and to survey graduates of the program to evaluate the program in general. Program faculty routinely review these survey data. The program also uses portfolios to document field experience that faculty members believe are more helpful than “paper and pencil” assessments, since portfolios can be viewed as a diary of what the students are learning. Enrollments in the programs are high, and faculty have been asked to deliver the program at external sites. Specifically, the faculty was asked to deliver the Masters program via distance education to an 18 school district consortium which was later contracted. The program will begin its third contracting cycle this year. The M.Ed. is offered via live television broadcast, and faculty members are trying to move forward with an online degree, which has required them to review and redesign courses. Drs. Stevenson and Jenkins hope to have an analysis of this online course restructuring completed by summer 2005.

The committee discussed several aspects of the program assessment system that crossed over the three programs under review, including the collection and analysis of the data, the systems in place to aggregate the data, and how to make programmatic decision based on analysis of the data. Program faculty explained the various assessment methods used as well as how the information is used to improve quality.

Related to educational administration, Dr. Meeks highlighted the reorganization of the State Department of Education in light of state standards as related to this area. School organization is now part of the Division of Teacher Quality and principal performance will now be evaluated in future program reviews. The Program for Assisting, Developing and Evaluating Principal Performance (PADEPP), is a new statute and requirement related to evaluation. Alice Rice at the State Dept. of Education can give more information about the use of PADEPP as it may be used in evaluations.

#### A. Overview of M.Ed. Program and Plan

As reported above, the M.Ed is an advanced level certification program. The portfolio is a course-by-course component and when put together provides the reviewer (and the student) a conceptual idea of the entire program. Faculty members in the M.Ed program were asked to deliver the Masters program via satellite to an 18 school district consortium that was later contracted. The program will begin its third contracting cycle this year. The M.Ed. is offered via
live television broadcast, and the faculty is trying to move forward with an online degree so courses are being analyzed and rebuilt. Ken Stevenson and Kevin Jenkins hope to have an analysis complete by this summer

B.  Overview of Ed.S. Program and Plan
As reported above, the Ed.S is an advanced level certification program. The portfolio project is similar to the M.Ed. portfolio requirement.

C.  Overview of Ph.D. Program and Plan
As reported above, students in the Ph.D. CD-12 track enter into superintendent positions. The portfolio is not a course-by-course project. Instead, there is an ultimate portfolio, (i.e. the dissertation) which is a more traditional culminating experience for a doctoral program.

III.  Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for all Plans

A.  CAPE Program
The Committee discussed several items that will be included in the final recommendation report for the CAPE program.

B.  Educational Administration Programs:
The committee noted many of the outstanding performance based measures used in the educational administration program and discussed recommendations that will appear in the final report.

IV.  Committee Approval of Counselor Education Recommendation Reports
The Committee approved the recommendation reports for the Ed.S. and Ph.D. Counselor Education assessment plans. One concern was noted that it be made clear in a cover memo (i.e. underline) to program faculty in these areas as to when they need to meet again and the due date for a follow-up report.

V.  Committee Discussion of Spring 2005 Committee Activity

A.  Follow-up Reports for 2003-2004 Plans
Committee members acknowledged that follow-up reports will begin coming in after February 1, 2005, from the 2003-04 academic year.

B.  Calendar
   February 18, 2005  M.Ed. in Educational Research; Ph.D. Educational Psychology & Research (two tracks); & M.Ed. in Educational Technology
   March 25, 2005    M.Ed. Higher Education & Student Affairs; Certif. in Higher Ed. Leadership; Ph.D. in Educational Administration (Higher ed. track)
   April 22, 2005    Ph.D. Foundations of Education
   TBA                 Additional review or wrap-up meeting, as needed

The meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.