Members present:

Ed Dickey, Chair and ITE Rep.
Debbie Donovan, Lexington School District Two
Kathy Meeks, SC Dept. of Education
Irma Van Scoy, COE Assoc. Dean
Robert Johnson, EDST Rep. (for Dr. Huynh)

Richard Wertz, EDLP Rep
Eva Monsma, PE Rep.
Catherine Stewart, Cert. & Accred.
Renee Connolly, COE Accred.

Program representatives:
Cheryl Wissick, MAT Special Education
Erik Drasgow, MEd in Special Education
Kathleen Marshall, PhD in Special Education

Dr. Dickey called the informal portion of the meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. with the core QCom members.

0. Core Committee Discussion of Plans
The committee reviewed the examples from the special education programs. Dr. Dickey provided the committee with an overview of how the meeting will progress with the three assessment plans that will be reviewed.

I. Call meeting to order and approval of September 30, 2005, Minutes
Dr. Dickey welcomed the program representatives and called the formal portion of the meeting to order at 1:54 p.m. The Minutes from the previous meeting were approved as posted. He asked the members to introduce themselves and provided an overview of how the meeting would progress to review all three plans. In addition, he outlined for the program representatives what work the committee had completed and how the business of the committee would be conducted.

II. Review of Special Education Assessment Plans
A. MAT in Special Education – Dr. Cheryl Wissick
Dr. Wissick began by acknowledging the helpfulness of the process that this has allowed the faculty to engage in. She highlighted the program overview information sheet, focusing on the various areas (4) in which candidates receive certification. Additionally, she commented on the number of candidates who finish each year, and some of the characteristics of why numbers fluctuate each year. Dr. Dickey asked for information on how the students divide into the four different areas. Drs. Wissick and Drasgow explained that since the program has a grant that funds this area, more of the students are in the emotional/behavior disorder track.

Dr. Dickey asked for comment on how faculty decided how to integrate the conceptual framework within the CEC (Council for Exceptional Children) standards. Dr. Marshall explained that the physical layout of the plan may not accurately reflect the close relationship that the program has with its professional association’s standards. All members acknowledged that this issue was simply one of organizing the layout of the plan.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification within the plan when it states that candidate projects will be collected, but grades are listed in the plan. She emphasized the importance of these artifacts to CEC and NCATE’s interest in assessment. Discussion continued to include the importance of grades, rubrics that describe the assignment, and long-term
data. Dr. Wissick and Ms. Connolly acknowledged that some of these grades have been reported and recorded in the database. Dr. Van Scoy continued to emphasize how important it will be to have the data in the database so the Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance can assist faculty when they prepare the CEC program report.

Dr. Drasgow reported that the program is also interested in collecting data that will help them understand subtle differences in candidate success. To this end, they have created the annual performance review rating system. Dr. Johnson asked why an interview is not included as part of the annual performance review. Dr. Wissick explained that this is due to the extremely high number of MATs as compared to the MEd.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for examples of more meaningful data collection. Dr. Drasgow commented that more in-depth analysis/assignments are required that provide a more reflective opportunity for candidates. He also mentioned that they will be implementing a pre-measure at admission point and later a post-measure. Dr. Van Scoy suggested that a clearer rubric to describe more key assessments would be helpful. Dr. Dickey suggested that the program consider fewer assessment items (data point) and concentrate on a smaller number that provides meaningful, useful information for program decision making.

B. MEd in Special Education – Dr. Erik Drasgow

Dr. Drasgow highlighted the characteristics of the MEd program that included the number of candidates their professional dispositions. Dr. Dickey asked for clarification on the practicum and its placement in the assessment plan. Dr. Drasgow expressed an interest in looking for a way to explore candidates’ progress within the program, especially those who experience problems in the program. Dr. Meeks suggested that there may be some baseline data that could be collected to give faculty a clearer picture of candidates’ success. Dr. Drasgow acknowledged that the improved admissions process has allowed them to gauge the possible success of their candidates at an earlier point.

Dr. Drasgow acknowledged that the improved admissions process has allowed them to gauge the possible success of their candidates at an earlier point.

C. PhD in Special Education

Dr. Marshall explained the two areas of the PhD program – focus on administration and a focus on teaching. This program is focused on outcomes. Most candidates in administration obtain a masters degree along the way and these candidates enter field in administering special education programs typically at the district level. Candidate in teaching tend to be more interested in college teaching positions at colleges and universities. Most of the candidates are mid-career level professionals. She reported that a grant in the program has caused them to focus on what the candidates know and what skills they possess. For this reason, the research questions included in the assessment plan have also been reshaped to help them focus on these two areas. Dr. Marshall reported that one candidate graduates every semester. They have entered positions in higher education and at state agencies.
Dr. Dickey asked for clarification on the candidates’ internship requirements. Dr. Marshall explained some of the internship experiences that the candidates who are in the teaching track have. These represent major initiatives that prepare them to teach upon graduation. Administrative candidates have many different types of internship experiences.

Dr. Van Scy asked for clarification on where the database for this program is housed, as it is specified in the plan. Dr. Marshall clarified that some data are necessary to keep in the program office and that these data are different than what is maintained in the Accreditation and Quality Assurance Office.

Dr. Van Scy asked for clarification on how and when faculty meet to discuss program changes. Dr. Marshall reported that after each milestone in the candidate’s program, faculty get together to discuss the candidate’s work. She acknowledged that while this makes it hard to see trends, faculty do meet together informally to discuss program changes as a result of observations and data. Dr. Van Scy acknowledged that it sounds as if this is happening, but it might be clarified more specifically in the plan.

Dr. Dickey commented that the list of program changes has been made, but that the process of how they are discussed has not been formalized. Dr. Monsma suggested a way to include some preliminary data points that may help faculty ascertain how candidates are progressing. Dr. Van Scy also suggested that more information be provided than simply pass/fail on comprehensive examinations, or other pieces of data. Dr. Meeks added that data across the program may provide commonalities to provide stronger data to faculty about candidates.

III. Committee discussion of recommendations & procedures for plans
Dr. Dickey asked for clarification on leadership responsibility for maintaining the plans. Dr. Marshall explained that their program has enjoyed consistency in program coordinator roles, but that faculty tend to work in one area until he/she leaves the University. At this point, each program representative in the meeting is the person who will maintain responsibility for the plan. Dr. Van Scy suggested that the logistics section in each plan might be finalized more concretely so as to allow for program changes. She also emphasized the importance of including student assessment information and also overall program assessment.

IV. Review and approval of EdS in Teaching Recommendation Report
Dr. Dickey asked for discussion and approval for the Recommendation Report for the Ed.S. in Teaching. Committee members approved the report for submission to program faculty.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:21 p.m.