Members Present:
Ed Dickey, Chair & ITE Dept. Rep. 
Alissa Lowrey, EDPY Rep. 
Eva Monsma, PE Rep. 
Irma Van Scoy, COE Associate Dean 
Renee Connolly, COE Accredit. & Quality Assur. 
Debbie Hamm, Richland Two School District Rep. 
Michael Welsh, EDLP Rep., substituting for R. Wertz 
John Lowery, Higher Education & Student Affairs 
Katherine Chaddock, Higher Education Leadership

0. Core Committee Discussion of Plans
Dr. Dickey asked for introductions from all committee members as one committee member, Dr. Michael Welsh, was a substitute committee member for the EDLP representative.

I. Call Meeting to Order & Approval of February 18, 2005 Minutes
Dr. Dickey called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. as the program representatives joined the core committee members. Dr. Dickey asked for introductions from all members. Minutes from the February 18, 2005, meeting were approved. Dr. Dickey reminded the members of the procedures and process for QCom reviews.

II. Review of Assessment Plans
A. Overview of Certificate in Higher Education Leadership
Dr. Chaddock distributed a handout that outlined the purposes of the certificate program. She emphasized that candidates are admitted to this program only if they are currently faculty or administrators in a technical college. In addition, the handout outlined required courses, what the program prepares candidates to do, how courses are delivered, how slots in the program are identified (from each technical college in the State). She informed the group of how the higher education faculty have had consistent and intense meetings to shape the program and what it would offer. During that summer, the members built a revised certificate program that included some course changes and other guided ideas from the technical system. The SC technical colleges pay for the candidates to complete the program and give each of them a pay raise at their home institution when an employee completes the certificate. Many courses are administered through distance education courses, a strong cohort group. Between 24-28 new students are accepted each January. The program is assessed by the Curriculum Committee within the technical college system (Presidents from some of the technical colleges) and include periodic visits from the Director of the SC Technical College system. The Director reviews syllabi from the courses and is approved by the technical college system. In addition, Dr. Chaddock explained the nuances of a certificate program and how it is different than degree programs.

Dr. Chaddock informed the group of a major assessment activity at the end of the first cohort (and plans are underway for each December as a cohort finished). This reflective student feedback was used by program faculty to learn what might be changed or conducted differently. She reported that changes were made as a result of this feedback – two courses were shrunk into one, an assessment course was added, added an orientation session for new candidates, technology issues were addressed and upgraded at some delivery sites, and changed instructors for some courses. She emphasized the importance that the technical college Curriculum Committee has a great impact on changes made in the program.
B. Overview of M.Ed. in Higher Education and Student Affairs
Dr. Lowery distributed a general handout that described the elements of the M.Ed. program. The program has existed since the 1960s and has undergone revisions through the past forty years. Dr. Lowery acknowledged that he and program colleagues have had discussions about revisions that may be needed in the assessment plan, but that those revisions will be made after recommendations from this committee so that all recommendations can be considered at one time. He informed the members that candidates have expressed an interest in being an integral part of any program revisions that may happen in the near future.

C. Overview of Ph.D. in Educational Administration (Higher Ed. track)
Dr. Welsh reminded the members that the higher education track is one of two tracks in the Ph.D. program in educational administration. Candidates are mostly part-time and preparation is for the “scholarly administrator,” and not only to enter the professoriate. The degree is designed around five major areas: Higher education component, cognate area (designed to prepare these administrators to teach at the collegiate level by providing SACS’ 18 hours in an area), research area, foundations area, cultural awareness area (includes language area and multi-cultural courses).

Dr. Knapp asked for clarification on where these candidates usually aspire to progress professionally. Dr. Welsh explained the type of academic positions for which these candidates are capable of entering or become eligible for.

III. Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for all Plans
A. Certificate program
Dr. Dickey asked how the current set up of the program relates to what is written in the assessment plan. He acknowledged multiple assessments that are happening in the program, but asked for clarification as to how these issues can be expressed in the written plan. Dr. Chaddock acknowledged that the major revisions in the program happened after the plan was written and agreed that what is happening in the program can be documented more appropriately in a written plan. Members recognized that there are multiple data and multiple assessment points, but that this information is not made clear in the plan as it is written now.

Dr. Knapp asked for clarification on the recommendation process for candidates to become eligible for admission to the program. Drs. Chaddock and Welsh clarified that while a recommendation is necessary for consideration, it is not a guarantee for acceptance into the certificate. In addition, Dr. Chaddock informed the group that they have received feedback on how to make the recommendation process smoother.

Members had some discussion on how the research questions in the plan might be strengthened to show ideas that are truly important to the program representatives. Dr. A. Lowrey emphasized the importance of revising these questions so they more accurately reflect what is important to those involved with this program.

B. M.Ed. program
Dr. Dickey asked for clarification on the CAS standards, as they are mentioned in the plan. Dr. Lowery informed the group that the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) is a set of criteria that holds programs in higher education accountable for a set of best practices. They were published in the 1950s and revised in the most recent decade. Dr. Lowery told the group that these guidelines were used when program faculty were preparing the self study for submission to the Commission on Higher Education.
Members asked Dr. Lowery to discuss when a midpoint is identified in the program. He acknowledged that a midpoint in the program is hard to identify, as candidates are allowed to take courses as they choose. Discussion was held on points that might be used such as completion of the program of study, comprehensive exam, or completion of certain courses. Further discussion helped define some strength for the case of a clearer program guide that might help candidates and faculty define a midpoint time. Additional discussion was held on using the internship requirement as a possible midpoint indicator.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification on data mentioned in the plan that are not being collected. Dr. Lowery acknowledged having discussed these missing data with Ms. Connolly after recommendations of this committee are returned to the program faculty. He expressed an interest in pursuing these missing data once all recommendations are taken into consideration.

C. **Ph.D. program**

Dr. Van Scoy asked if any future revisions are in the works for this program. Dr. Welsh informed the group that one major shift in the program has been an emphasis on movement through the program in cohort groups. He described the common elements of the program for which the cohort members progress and move together such as the policy seminar and the intense writing experience. In addition, Dr. Welsh informed the group of a new initiative that will pull all the cohorts together for one day to discuss issues, progress through the program, and an opportunity to trade ideas. Dr. Knapp acknowledged how helpful this initiative would be as a point in the program to obtain assessment or feedback information.

Dr. Dickey expressed concern in this program on more narrow questions that will accurately address the real needs of the program. He acknowledged that there may be more assessment points identified in the plan than may actually be necessary, but that it sounds (from description provided) that there are opportunities to obtain helpful information.

Dr. Knapp asked for the possibility of using employer feedback on each candidate while these candidates are working full-time. This would be a way to get some evaluative remarks on this set of candidates. The members had some discussion on how this could be conducted and how it might help the program. Dr. Dickey added that specific items could be addressed on this type of survey so program faculty could gain information on how enrollment and participation in the program is helping the candidate. Dr. Van Scoy mentioned that the program might be able to focus more specifically on what its goals are and how assessments like the one mentioned might help get at assessing these goals.

IV. **Committee Discussion of Spring 2005 Committee Activity**

A. **Follow-up Reports for 2003-2004 Plans**

Discussion was held on how to proceed with the follow-up reports that are listed below. Members decided that a second follow-up memorandum would be sent to those programs that have not submitted a report. Dr. Dickey and Ms. Connolly will prepare and send these out. Also, members who were active on the committee during 2003-2004 agreed to review the follow-up reports to make final determinations and recommendations. Ms. Connolly will be sending the follow-up reports to those members.

- B.M. in Music Education - received
- M.M.E. and Ph.D. in Music Education - received
- M.C.D. and M.S.P. in Speech Pathology – received
- Ph.D. in School Psychology – outstanding, due February 1, 2005
- B.S., M.A.T., I.M.A., M.S., and Ph.D. in Physical Education – outstanding, due
February 1, 2005
Certificate, M.A.T., Ed.D. in Health – outstanding, due March 1, 2005

B. Calendar
An additional wrap up meeting for the committee was scheduled for May 13, 2005, at 1:30 p.m. Dr. Dickey reminded members that several committee members will be rotating off from the 2004-2005 year and prospective members are needed to replace these individuals.

C. Approval of outstanding recommendation reports
Committee members approved recommendation reports for the following programs:
  M.Ed., Ed.S. and Ph.D. in Educational Administration
  M.Ed. in Educational Technology
  M.Ed. in Educational Research, and the
  Ph.D. in Educational Psychology and Research (both tracks)
Ms. Connolly will prepare the final draft and send the reports to program faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:32 p.m.