0. Core Committee Discussion of Plans
The core committee members reviewed available program information of the plans scheduled for review during the formal session of the meeting. Members used this time to ask clarification questions of each other and Ms. Connolly provided some general descriptive information to the members.

I. Call Meeting to Order & Approval of January 21, 2005 Minutes
Dr. Dickey called the formal portion of the meeting to order at 2:00 to include the core committee members and the faculty representatives. He asked for introductions from all members and then proceeded with the committee’s business.
Minutes from the January 21, 2005, meeting were approved and can be viewed at: http://www.ed.sc.edu/Documents.asp.

II. Review of Plan for M.Ed. in Educational Technology
Dr. Lee distributed a handout that explained the major characteristics and dimensions of the program. She emphasized the fact that this is a joint program between USC Columbia and USC Aiken. Some graduates are still finishing an older program, on which the basis provided revisions of this M.Ed. She highlighted some of the areas in which candidates enter employment fields upon completion of the program. The second part of her handout provided an outline of what the program is doing with assessments and what program decisions have been made based on collected and ongoing assessments. Dr. Lee informed the group that faculty are in the midst of exploring ways in which the program can more effectively use the COE’s Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance Office’s data collection system for the unit.

III. Review of Plans for the M.Ed. in Educational Research and Ph.D. in Educational Psychology and Research
Dr. Huynh reminded the group of the one area in the M.Ed. and the two tracks in the Ph.D. program. He provided some historical information on what was formally configured as three degrees. He reported that as a result of one Commission on Higher Education review, some degrees were consolidated. The M.Ed. was originally designed to provide an overview of research areas so candidates could improve their skills in the research field. Some candidates enroll in this program and are also enrolled in completely different programs outside education. He distributed the admissions checklist for the M.Ed. program and explained that this program has a very precise process in place for making admissions decisions and comprehensive exam evaluations. They employ the use of a rubric for evaluating the comprehensive examination that follows the format of an AERA proposal. There is a lot of flexibility in the program for candidates.
Dr. Huynh reported that the Ph.D. is very well-recognized within the southeast. A variety of students are attracted to this degree from a multitude of disciplines. Lately, there has been an increase in the number of full-time candidates due to an increase in financial support resources through the Program Evaluation Office. The admissions process is also very precise at the Ph.D. level and candidates usually exceed the required admission tests scores. Faculty take different components into consideration.
including references and personal statements. The qualifying examination is also a precise process organized around the candidate’s research area and design. Program faculty closely follow the candidates after they pass their qualifying examination to determine with which faculty member the candidate will work.

The comprehensive exams are guided by rubrics that faculty use and the process involves a period of four half-days. There is also a rubric that guides evaluation of the oral process. Completion of the dissertation and the dissertation defense are also important components of the assessment process. He reported that graduates over the last four years have found academic placements at prestigious institutions and in key roles with research and state agencies. In addition, candidates are typically recipients of recognition awards and financial awards. Many students are active presenters at local and regional conferences. Student evaluations are an important part of the system as well and feedback are used from these assessments. Program faculty plan to use candidate surveys from those who are in the workforce in order to guide program changes. The psychology track has made significant steps in outlining which program changes have been made as a result of the data.

IV. Review of Assessment Plans

A. Overview of M.Ed. Educational Technology Assessment Plan

Dr. Dickey asked for clarification on the program’s use of the portfolio requirements and assessments and also asked for clarification on how, in the future, the program will use the collected information to make changes. Dr. Lee explained that they have been using the portfolio to satisfy some of the plans requirements, but expressed a willingness to use the data collection system in a more systematic way to help them with future program decisions. Dr. Van Scoy asked for an example of one of the program’s electronic portfolios so the committee could review this and determine in a better way, its relationship to the program requirements and elements of the assessment system (i.e. conceptual framework). Dr. Lowrey encouraged the use of this to help track future changes. Dr. Van Scoy encouraged program faculty to work with the COE Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance to help faculty keep up with useful data for program changes and decisions.

Dr. Dickey asked for additional information on how the program will meet the ISTE standards if only the portfolio is being used. Dr. Lee and Ms. Quinn explained that in addition to the portfolio, course grades and projects in the courses are important elements in the assessment system. Dr. Dickey asked that the faculty make sure they are thinking through how the combination of these assessments will truly help them to make decisions and in the future will help them through an external review. One item to consider is how many ISTE standards the program will realistically maintain and check on. Dr. Dickey asked Dr. Van Scoy for clarification on what NCATE expectations are in relation to the number of assessments. Dr. Van Scoy provided some explanation on general requirements and how they will be changing in the future. This information will hopefully help guide the program in developing and shaping what assessments may be helpful.

Dr. Van Scoy highlighted the possibility that when an external review is conducted again that the team may ask for data on all candidates – even those enrolled at USC Aiken. She emphasized the importance of developing a way to track the USC Aiken candidate data and all program faculty agreed that this is an important issue and should be operationalized.

Dr. Knapp asked for some clarification on where a candidate receives a degree from if this is a shared program. Faculty tried to provide some clarification, but agreed to look into this issue so this and its implications are clear and easily understood.

B. Overview of M.Ed. Educational Research Assessment Plan

There are two main factions of students who come through – one who will continue through to complete the Ph.D. and one who comes into the program with other degrees or enrolled in other degrees. There is a precise admissions process and comprehensive examination review process.
Dr. Huynh reminded the members that the important issue right now is that they look at whether or not they actually prepare and present. Dr. Knapp asked for clarification on what teaching experience the candidates get. Dr. Huynh reported that some receive assistantships that give them experience in research and some teaching, but also provide an informal system of evaluation.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification on the database that was mentioned. Dr. Huynh reported that data in files will be moved into the central database for the COE. There will be a more concentrated effort to revise the assessments and the database elements, as most appropriate for the program. Dr. Van Scoy asked for a copy of the rubric that is used to assess the comprehensive examination.

C. Overview of Ph.D. Educational Psychology and Research Assessment Plan (both tracks)

Dr. Knapp asked for clarification as to how program faculty monitor the development of the candidate after they pass the qualifying examination. Dr. Huynh provided clarification that candidates are not left in a state of “limbo” and that they are assigned a temporary advisor while they continue to develop their research area and interest.

Dr. Dickey asked if the administrative assistant keeps data for both tracks and he was assured that she does, ensuring that logistical procedures for both programs are consistent. Dr. Huynh distributed the criteria used to determine ratings of comprehensive examination completion. Faculty are engaged in much discussion regarding candidate data and program data.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification on how and when program decisions are reached. Dr. Lee commented on a program change that involved the doctoral comprehensive examination and why the program made that decision. There is a specific time that comprehensives are administered (after Spring Break) and, according to their plan, faculty gather in the following Fall semester to make decisions on candidates’ exams and what program decisions may need to be implemented. Dr. Dickey acknowledged that this seems to be a good idea to make consistent program decisions. Faculty from each track meet together but then also meet as a degree program to discuss findings. Dr. Huynh reported that faculty have tried to make concentrated efforts to assist candidates and encourage their work with faculty projects and research.

Dr. Dickey commented that Dr. Huynh’s explanations can help provide some answers to the consistency used in the psychology track. Dr. Huynh emphasized that admissions, comps, and dissertation processes are quite consistent in terms of their use of rubrics and precise processes.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification on how successful the program has been in tracking support resources and opportunities. Dr. Huynh agreed that this information would be helpful and it sounds like something that could be maintained. Drs. Dickey and Van Scoy agreed that this might be helpful to implement as part of the annual performance review of students. Ms. Connolly reminded the members that these data are being maintained now as part of internal databases in the COE for graduate assistants. Dr. Huynh added that the program provides travel funds for candidates.

Dr. Dickey reminded Drs. Huynh and Lee that the committee will make recommendations in the form of a report and send that on to program faculty.

III. Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for all Plans

There was no formal committee discussion outside of the interaction with the program faculty representatives who attended the meeting. All present committee members returned their completed criteria sheets.

IV. Committee Discussion of Spring 2005 Committee Activity

Dr. Dickey reminded the group that a final meeting will be needed in May, but the date will have to be set at a later date. Dr. Van Scoy asked the chair to consider adding an item to the May meeting that will involve the review of the overall unit plan. Dr. Dickey suggested that this task would be better managed over a longer period of time to provide a more thorough review. Dr. Van Scoy agreed that if the information could be
distributed prior to a review meeting, that it would give the committee time to look at it. Dr. Dickey expressed some hesitancy in taking on too much more work in a concentrated amount of time, while still accomplishing what the committee has been charged to do in relation to the unit’s work. Dr. Van Scy agreed to discuss these details with him outside of this meeting.

A. Follow-up Reports for 2003-2004 Plans

B. Calendar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March 25, 2005</td>
<td>M.Ed. Higher Education &amp; Student Affairs, Certif. in Higher Ed. Leadership, Ph.D. in Educational Administration (Higher ed. track)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 22, 2005</td>
<td>Ph.D. Foundations of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBA</td>
<td>Additional review or wrap-up meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The meeting was adjourned at 3:36 p.m.