

**PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE – YEAR FOUR  
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2006**

**Members Present:**

Ken Stevenson, Chair & EDLP Rep.  
Ed Dickey, ITE Rep  
Michelle Jay, EDST Rep  
Debbie Donovan, Lexington 2 District Rep  
Mary Ann Byrnes, Asst. Dean, College of Arts & Sciences  
Eva Monsma, P.E. Rep.  
Catherine Luthren, Quality Assurance Office  
Renee Connolly, Quality Assurance Office

**Program Representatives:**

Dana Hutto, Asst. Dir. Center for Science Education, IMA Rep.  
Bob Feller, Professor & Dir. Center for Science Education, IMA Rep.  
Christine Lotter, MAT/MT Rep.

**I. Call Meeting to Order and Review of Minutes from October 18, 2006**

The minutes from October 18, 2006, were approved and can be reviewed at:

Dr. Stevenson acknowledged the work of Dr. Dickey as Chair for the past three years. He provided an overview of how he would like to conduct the meeting.

Dr. Dickey suggested that the rubric the committee uses may not be as helpful to NCATE-related programs, by reminding the members that what the professional association needs may not be clearly represented on the review sheet that QCom uses. Dr. Van Scoy agreed that his comments may be relevant. Dr. Stevenson summarized the comments by suggesting some minor revisions to the review sheet and suggested some topics for discussion regarding the development of this review sheet.

Ms. Connolly reminded the members that the IMA assessment plan may need significant revision, as it has not been formally rewritten since fall 2003. The committee entertained some discussion on the background of this degree.

Dr. Stevenson called the formal portion of the meeting to order at 2:10 p.m. and asked for introductions from all members.

**II. Review of MAT/MT Secondary Science Assessment Plan**

Dr. Lotter summarized some of the strengths of the key assessments cited in the MAT/MT plan. She focused on the different sections of the electronic portfolio, all of which have been aligned to the National Science Teachers Association (NSTA) standards. Dr. Stevenson asked for clarification as to how the assessments are specifically connected to the NSTA standards.

Dr. Lotter explained the nature of the elements of the program-length portfolio and confirmed that the NSTA assessments are represented. Committee members emphasized the importance of clarifying the different elements of the portfolio within the plan, so it is clear how the specific requirements of each element differ and meet NSTA standards. Drs. Dickey, Stevenson, and Monsma provided an overview of some clarification issues that will help strengthen this issue within the plan. Dr. Van Scoy provided an example in another program that illustrates the use of a section of a portfolio as a key assessment.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification of data collection, maintenance, and review issues. Dr. Lotter explained that the administrative assistant for secondary enters the data and the Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance can analyze and summarize the data for program use. Dr. Lotter also explained that she reviews candidate data approximately three times for candidate success. There was not any additional comment on how often faculty within the program meet to discuss data for program changes or updates, so the committee suggested that clarification be added as to what faculty meet to discuss program changes.

The committee entertained discussion of courses that may be most useful for the content knowledge required and how they may be configured to allow masters level students to take them.

### **III. Review of IMA Assessment Plan**

Dr. Feller explained the nature of the IMA program and the kinds of students that come through the program, emphasizing the uniqueness of each case and how different a course of study (and therefore required assessments) may look across the students enrolled in the program. Dr. Van Scoy asked for comments on the history of the program and the partnership with USC Aiken. Dr. Feller provided an overview of this information.

The committee entertained discussion on the data and how they are organized as a result of program faculty's concern that the numbers did not appear to be accurate. Ms. Connolly reminded the members that the data are correct, but the organization of it was developed by her office. She encouraged program faculty to help her office understand how to organize the data in the most effective way so it reflects what is maintained in the database more accurately.

Dr. Feller explained the comprehensive examination and portfolio requirements and included its emphasis on self reflection, performance, activities, and attitudes. Ms. Hutto commented that the portfolio requirement has changed over time and is now more connected to NSTA standards. Dr. Van Scoy asked for any data that are recorded as a result of the portfolio or comp. exam. Dr. Stevenson acknowledged that it sounds as if there are helpful, formative assessments, but in order for the program to have data that are helpful, they could be recorded in a more clear way.

Dr. Dickey outlined some helpful assessments that program faculty outlined (admissions, comps, portfolio, etc.) that may be included in a revision of the assessment plan. Dr. Van Scoy reminded the members that this program is reviewed by the Commission on Higher Education, but at this point, the CHE standards are not clear. It may be helpful to the program if they focused on a number of key assessments that are conducted in the program.

Ms. Hutto pointed out that their students have had problems with some of the special topics courses and human growth and development and asked for direction on how to handle these issues. Drs. Dickey and Van Scoy provided some clarification on her questions.

### **IV. Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for Plans**

Dr. Stevenson summarized the procedures at this point and reminded the program representatives that a summary report will be sent to program representatives for their response. A synopsis of the issues discussed includes:

For the MAT/MT assessment plan – Need clarification of the elements w/in the portfolio to align w/ NSTA standards, should have documentation of how NSTA standards are addressed by the 8 main assessments, need clarification of rubrics to better align with NSTA standards (including a URL that has helpful information), need clarification of what faculty gather to discuss data for program changes

For the IMA assessment plan – The comprehensive exam. and portfolio should be aligned with NSTA standards, the newly-revised conceptual framework should be used, strengthen communication with colleagues to review data and make program changes, add more meaningful assessments (rather than just course grades), need for IMA reps work together to identify common points

### **V. Review and Approval of English Education Recommendation Report**

Dr. Dickey motioned for approval of the Recommendation Report for the MT/MAT English education assessment plan. Ms. Byrnes seconded the motion and the report was approved, as presented.

### **VI. QCom Meeting Schedule for AY 2006-07**

Dr. Stevenson reminded the members of the upcoming dates for reviews during spring 2007. Dr. Dickey suggested that some of the meetings be collapsed. He suggested canceling the January meeting and combining the social studies review with another meeting.

Social Studies Education  
Secondary Ed., Teaching  
Math. Education  
Foreign Language, Middle Level

***meeting has been cancelled on*** Wednesday, January 17, 2007  
*tentative* Wednesday, February 14, 2007  
*tentative* Wednesday, March 14, 2007  
*tentative* Wednesday, April 18, 2007

The meeting was adjourned at 3:34 p.m.