Members Present:
Eva Monsma, PE Rep.                                Irma Van Scoy, Associate Dean of COE
Lorin Anderson, Curriculum & Instruction program    Rhonda Jeffries, Curriculum & Instruction

0. Core Committee Discussion of Upcoming Review of Plans

Members of the committee had some preliminary clarification discussion on what they reviewed in the assessment plan for the Ed.D. in Curriculum and Instruction.

I. Call Meeting to Order & Approval of October 1, 2004 Minutes

Minutes may be viewed at: http://www.ed.sc.edu/Documents.asp

Dr. Dickey called the formal portion of the meeting to order at 2:02 p.m. and asked for introductions from all members.

Dr. Dickey reminded all members of what materials had been distributed to complete the review of the assessment plan. He gave all members an overview of the work and procedures of the Quality Assurance Committee (QCom). He reminded the faculty program representatives that the findings of this committee will be recommendations to the program for aspects that may strengthen the plan.

II. Review of Curriculum and Instruction Program

A. Overview of Ed.D. Program & Plan – Dr. Lorin Anderson and Dr. Rhonda Jeffries

Dr. Anderson distributed a handout explaining the program and its elements. The handout highlighted the number of faculty, students, and a survey of graduates (1991-2001). He emphasized the fact that he and Dr. Jim Sears will be leaving in the near future and that there has been talk of eliminating this program at the doctoral level and instituting it at the masters level. Dr. Anderson provided a historical perspective on number of faculty and attrition over the last eight years. Dr. Anderson pointed out that, according to the faculty’s count, there are 37 active students (active defined here as currently enrolled in some kind of course). He called the members’ attention to the list of students with their corresponding points in the program – beginning, middle, and end. As the committee moved through the handouts, Dr. Anderson explained internal faculty roles in relation to program requirements and expectations.

Dr. Anderson reported the types of occupations that graduates from this program enter and currently occupy. He emphasized that students from this program fulfill multiple roles at the institutions where they work.

In addition, he highlighted the graduate questionnaire that the faculty distributed in its ten-year look at past graduates from 1991-2001. The items included in the handout focused on strengths and weaknesses of the program and demographic-types of questions.

He also focused on the annual doctoral conference, which gives new and current doctoral students an opportunity to become involved with the program and network with other students.

Upon request from Dr. Dickey, Dr. Anderson commented on their use of only EDCS courses in the plan. Dr. Anderson expressed concern that using courses outside of their “control” is often not helpful as they do not control the content or rigor of the course. Dr. Jeffries commented on the required courses and cognate courses that are required and how the program focuses on their development outside the program.
B. Committee Review and Question and Answer for Assessment Plan

Dr. Dickey asked for additional information on how the program uses the data that are collected to inform program changes. Dr. Jeffries reported that faculty currently use data on an informal basis, but recently Blackboard groups have been formed to assist students and faculty in this endeavor. Dr. Anderson also reported that two formal measures include a formal assignment in EDUC 899 and a required letter to the student’s advisor. These two exercises are retained among the faculty and shared in aggregate form in faculty meetings and discussion. At the end of the program, the dissertation proposal process presents opportunities for the students to provide knowledge and skills to faculty and they in turn can make determinations and judgments on how students should continue in the program.

Dr. Knapp suggested that all the informal points in the program that happen be aggregated in a more formal nature so as to better help faculty make determinations and program changes. Dr. Jeffries provided some clarification that the program study plan (“pink paper”) outlines for students when particular points in the program come up and when recommendations happen from faculty. Dr. Meeks suggested more formal ways to highlight how their assessments inform decisions. In addition, Dr. Dickey suggested that clearer procedures be documented when changes are made that are based on data from students or assessments.

Ms. Connolly asked for clarification on the timeline for the survey. Dr. Anderson reported that the survey is scheduled to be administered every five years, with the next administration to come within the near future. Graduates from 10 years prior are included in the survey. In addition, he commented that the data are used in administrative meetings, some program additions, and discussions on diversity issues (race, class, gender, etc.) within the program. Dr. Anderson commented that a major discussion on the program’s minority changes has caused the faculty to focus more intently on the results of the survey because of some of the demographic information that was reported.

Dr. Meeks asked Drs. Anderson and Jeffries’ opinions on how they know that their students will progress successfully from the beginning point to completion of the dissertation. Dr. Anderson commented on what success factors they are interested in looking for, while admitting that life situations do get in the way of completion.

Dr. Van Scoy suggested that the program faculty might use the services of the Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance, for appropriate measures. Dr. Dickey emphasized that a central data house will assist the unit in developing data counts and summaries for future review or accreditation visits.

The committee entertained extensive discussion on ways that quality assurance and performance-related issues can prove what knowledge and skills doctoral students display in programs and how relevant some issues are over others. Dr. Monsma acknowledged the several strong assessments items that are included in this plan and commended Drs. Jeffries and Anderson for their work. Dr. Knapp also commended the faculty representatives for their work in this program and with its assessment plan.

After this discussion, Drs. Anderson and Jeffries excused themselves from the meeting.

III. Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for Curriculum & Instruction Program

Dr. Dickey reviewed the next steps that the committee will take in producing a recommendation report for this program’s plan. He reminded the group that this report will be returned to the program faculty and ultimately to the Director of Teacher Education (Dean, College of Education). Members held discussion on what issues of quality data collection issues are relevant in relation to assisting this program’s plan. Members commented on how recommendations might be made to help the program due to the declining number of faculty in this program, while preserving quality and meaningful recommendations.

IV. Committee Discussion of Follow-up Reports

Dr. Dickey suggested that each program be notified in writing that is up for a second review during Spring 2005. Members who were on the committee in 2003-04 will review the follow-up reports from each program.
V. Review of Upcoming Meetings
Dr. Dickey reminded the members of the review meetings that have been scheduled for the remainder of 2004-05. Those meetings are as follows:
Friday, November 19, 1:30-3:30 Counselor Education
Friday, December 3, 1:30-3:30 Educational Administration
Friday, January 21, 1:30-3:30 Community & Adult Programs in Education
Friday, February 18, 1:30-3:30 Educational Psychology & Research, Ed. Technology
Friday, March 25, 1:30-3:30 Higher Education/Student Affairs – Tentative date
April Educational Foundations – TBA

The meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.