MEMBERS PRESENT:
Ed Dickey, QCom Chair and ITE Representative
Debbie Donovan, Lexington Two District Representative
Kathy Meeks, SC Dept. of Education Representative
Irma Van Scoy, COE Associate Dean
Renee Connolly, COE Director of Accred. & Quality Assurance
Catherine Stewart, COE Certification & Quality Assurance
Richard Wertz, EDLP Representative
Mary Ann Byrnes, Asst. Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Eva Monsma, PE Representative
Huyhn Huyhn, EDST Representative
Heidi Mills, EdS Teaching Faculty Representative
Stacie Mandrell, EdS Graduate

0. Core Committee Discussion of Plans
All core committee members were present for discussion. Dr. Dickey reminded the members for the reason for this preliminary time. He asked for committee questions and concerns from the members. Dr. Van Scoy began the conversation about some elements in the plan and with the rubric. Dr. Meeks addressed an issue related to the absence of the program’s core concepts and the committee discussed where, if at all, these concepts were included in the plan. Dr. Van Scoy clarified the use of course grades in the assessment plans and their true usefulness in relation to program assessment. Dr. Dickey emphasized the importance of this point. As committee members’ comments progressed, Dr. Dickey decided to provide some background of the program in terms of its origin, development, and culture.

I. Call Meeting to Order & Approval of September 9, 2005 Minutes – 2:00 p.m.
Dr. Heidi Mills and Ms. Stacie Mandrell joined the core committee at 2:00 p.m. and Dr. Dickey called the formal portion of the meeting to order and all members introduced themselves. Dr. Dickey reminded the program representatives of their membership on the committee from this point forward and some information on the make-up of the membership.

II. Review of Ed.S. in Teaching Assessment Plan
Dr. Mills provided the committee an overview of the Ed.S. program that included its beginning, reason for existence, and what types of students are enrolled. She emphasized the intimate relationship that this program has with the SC Reading Initiative and how Literacy Coaches in the State typically enroll in this degree program. Because of the influx of Literacy Coaches, faculty in the degree program were caused to review the program and how it meets the needs of the students. She informed the group of the other “type” of student who is enrolled in this program, who are not Literacy Coaches, but are students who are interested in furthering their academic experience beyond a Masters degree or Masters degree plus thirty (hours). Dr. Mills emphasized the importance of the Literacy Coach enrollment to the health of this degree in that approximately 81% of student enrollment represent literacy coaches. Dr. Van Scoy suggested that this program might consider two assessment plans in order to cover the two distinct student populations for which it serves. Dr. Mills agreed that this could be a viable solution and acknowledged that program faculty had already considered this option, but decided to get insight from QCom before proceeding.

III. Committee Discussion of Recommendation & Procedures for Plan
Dr. Mills provided clarification of which courses are applicable to the Literacy Coach students and the “other” students. The Committee entertained discussion on which data points may be similar and where an appropriate place would be to divide the plans among the two different types of students.
Dr. Meeks asked for clarification on the uniqueness of this program, as compared to a more general approach to another program. Ms. Mandrell provided perspective on why a more specialized program in one area (for the Literacy Coaches) is more helpful in preparing her to become a true specialist in the area of reading. Dr. Van Scoy asked Dr. Mills to expound on what kinds of data would be helpful to faculty to collect on/from their students. The committee discussed what places in this program might be helpful to identify for data collection and which courses or projects in courses would satisfy this and help meet the elements of the conceptual framework.

Dr. Huyhn asked if there are data that demonstrate candidate improvement between projects/courses in their attitude and effectiveness. Dr. Mills acknowledged that although this may not be represented in a concrete manner, that program faculty know improvement occurs. She clarified what is required in some of the project and course requirements. Dr. Dickey reminded the committee that because of SCRI requirements, this program asks for additional course requirements (42) than other specialist programs (36).

Dr. Mills informed the group that there are data that have been collected from students, but that program faculty are interested in the recommendations from this committee. Dr. Van Scoy suggested that there might be some point for which all students in the program obtain approval of the program of study. This may help faculty determine from which candidates data will be collected. For example, the point at which program faculty counsel students of their progress in the program may be a time that could serve as a midpoint for data collection.

Dr. Meeks addressed the fact that there has not been any mention of competency-based assessment and progress. She suggested that there could be common competencies that transcend the requirements for these two different types of students. Dr. Dickey reminded the committee that because of the variability of the course in the program, that competencies may also be difficult to define.

Committee members assisted the program representatives with identifying candidates to collect data from, at which point to make the candidates aware of appropriate courses to take, how competencies may fit in the two broad areas of this program. Dr. Dickey suggested that program representatives consider the core courses as a natural point for which to name a midpoint. Because these are common courses between the two types of students, it appears to be a solid point for which the program focuses on midpoint data. Dr. Mills reminded the committee that candidates in the program typically do not take these courses at the same time or sequentially. She added that these courses are provided via distance education delivery, which also impacts when and how the candidates complete the courses.

Dr. Dickey suggested the idea that this program focus on one specific research question for a period of time and when answered, move to another general question for upcoming years. Dr. Van Scoy reminded the program representatives that they remember to continually assess candidates against the conceptual framework. Dr. Dickey summarized that a process like this could still address the entire program and its comparison against the conceptual framework over an appropriate timeframe. In addition, a procedure like this could also help identify program changes. The committee helped the program representatives identify how to track program changes within the EdS Task Force. Dr. Mills noted that they should compile a summary of what has happened to this point and, from this point forward, what changes are made as result of data.

Dr. Huyhn explored the nature of a candidate’s required letter of intent for admission and what courses candidates take. Dr. Meeks followed up with a suggestion of program completer information and how valuable that may be in determining what the program offers. Dr. Dickey reminded the program representatives of the process for recommendation and program response after the conclusion of the meeting. Committee members will have an opportunity to review the recommendation and provide any additional comment.

IV. Spring 2006 Review Meetings
The committee decided to meet on the following days for Spring 2006:

- Friday, January 20, 2006: Elementary
- Friday, February 17, 2006: Language & Literacy
- Friday, March 17, 2006: Theatre & Speech
- Friday, April 21, 2006: Library
- Friday, May 12, 2006: Wrap-up (tentative date)
V. **Follow-up Review Assignments from 2003-2004**

Dr. Dickey reviewed the list of outstanding follow up reviews from 2003-2004. Art education and physical education have been granted one more additional deadline of November 15, 2005. Outstanding programs include:

A. Art Education – BFA, MAT, IMA, MA – “progressing”, revised plans due September 15, 2005
   *These plans were not submitted 9/15/05*
B. Health Education – Certif., MAT – “progressing”, revised plans due November 15, 2005
C. Speech Lang. Path. – MSP, MCD – “progressing” criteria, revised plan due November 15, 2005
D. Music Education – MME, PhD – “progressing” criteria, revised plan due November 15, 2005
E. School Psychology – PhD – “progressing,” revised plan due November 15, 2005
F. Physical Education – BS, MAT, IMA, MS, PhD – *no follow up report/plan submitted during 2004-2005*

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.