MEMBERS PRESENT:
Ken Stevenson, QCom Chair & EDLP Rep.
Kellah Edens, EDST Rep.
Nate Carnes, ITE Rep.
Eva Monsma, PE Rep.
Mary Ann Byrnes, Asst. Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Michelle Taylor-Brown, Richland Two Rep.
Deborah Larkin, SC Dept. of Education Rep.
Irma Van Scoy, Assoc. Dean, COE
Catherine Luthren, Office of Accreditation & Quality Assurance
Renee Connolly, Office of Accreditation & Quality Assurance
Emma May, Director, Office of Student Affairs
Elna Moses, Office of Student Affairs
Rob Dedmon, Office of Student Affairs

MEMBERS NOT PRESENT:
All members were present

I. PRELIMINARY DISCUSSION AMONG QCOM MEMBERS (1:30-2:00)
Dr. Stevenson highlighted the agenda for the upcoming meeting and outlined his ideas for progressing through
the items on the agenda. He asked for input from the committee members regarding the best way to move
through the discussion of today’s review. In addition, he summarized the committee’s recommendations from
the November 28 review meeting of the Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance. Dr. Van Scoy
highlighted some changes that the Office of Student Affairs incorporated in their documents in preparation for
this meeting and after committee discussion at the November meeting. Members reviewed available documents,
as provided by the Office of Student Affairs in relation to their documentation for today’s meeting and
entertained discussion regarding the available information.

II. CALL MEETING TO ORDER

A. APPROVAL OF NOVEMBER 28, 2007 MINUTES FOR OFFICE OF ACCREDITATION & QUALITY
   ASSURANCE
   Dr. Stevenson called the formal portion of the meeting to order at 2:08 p.m. Minutes from the
   November 28, 2007, meeting were approved and accepted. Dr. Connolly agreed to have the
   minutes posted on the COE Documents web page.

B. INTRODUCTIONS
   Dr. Stevenson reviewed the structure and function of QCom and asked the office representatives
   and committee members for introductions.

III. COMMITTEE REVIEW OF OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS
Dr. Stevenson asked the office representatives for an overview of the office responsibilities and structure and the
information they provided. Ms. May spoke to the general functions of the Office of Student Affairs (OSA)
including processing applications, data entry related to candidate information (undergraduate – doctoral level),
advise, scholarship applications, and certification. She highlighted that they serve all programs within the Professional Education Unit in these capacities, serving approximately 1,000 candidates. Each OSA representative explained their relationship with outside constituents as related to the education programs across the Unit.

Dr. Stevenson asked for further explanation on the evidence provided to the committee members in support of the OSA documentation. Ms. May highlighted each piece of evidence including the internal candidate database; undergraduate satisfaction survey (i.e. exit survey); advisement procedures and processes (including information dissemination, testing requirements, and registration processes); graduate student satisfaction survey; certification documentation and information; student enrollment application and graduation numbers; and the support office survey.

Dr. Stevenson asked the representatives for some of the most pressing challenges and concerns the OSA faces. Ms. May discussed software problems related to the application process with the Graduate School and a lack of ease in which the OSA receives accurate, timely information related to candidates’ applications and paperwork. More often than not, files are received in an incomplete manner thus delaying faculty review of potential candidates and negatively impacting candidate enrollment and perception of the College of Education. In addition, Ms. Moses suggested that internal personnel resource issues make it difficult at times, to shift responsibilities due to growth and normal College change. Ms. Luthren suggested that required certification fees have posed the most recent logistical problems with the University’s Bursar’s Office.

Dr. Van Scoy asked the committee to look at the newly-developed assessment plan for the OSA. She briefly highlighted the main elements within the plan and asked Ms. May to expand. Ms. May explained some of the assessment plan elements such as personnel reviews, work resources, staff meetings, reallocation of work responsibilities, and University bulletin changes.

Dr. Carnes asked for input from the office representatives regarding how they chose which elements of the Conceptual Framework they address. In addition, Ms. Byrnes asked for their reaction as they reviewed the College’s Blue Print for Quality and how they assess it. OSA reps addressed these ideas with examples from the office that highlight how they support elements of the framework and fulfillment of the Blue Print for Quality. Ms. Byrnes highlighted the helpfulness of the OSA staff in working with faculty from the College of Arts and Sciences.

Dr. Van Scoy suggested that the OSA supports faculty professional development in many ways that may not be reflected in their table of information.

IV. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION OF OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

Dr. Stevenson explained the process at this point from the committee’s perspective and allowed the office representatives to be excused. The committee entertained discussion on the challenges and weaknesses cited by the OSA staff regarding needs and issues related to the Graduate School. He summarized the consensus among the committee members that inaccurate and non-timely information from the Graduate School greatly impact candidate support within the office. Committee members agreed this should be highlighted within the review sheet and be reflected in the Recommendation Report. He emphasized the importance that the OSA continue to follow the newly-developed plan. Dr. Carnes and Ms. Byrnes agreed that the office is a tremendous support to faculty in- and outside the College, as well as the regional campuses for which the College has programs. Dr. Van Scoy highlighted the OSA’s efforts in relation to diversity in hiring. The committee agreed the OSA should receive a rating of “Meets criteria.”
V. Other Business

A. Rating Recommendation for Office of Accreditation & Quality Assurance
Members agreed that a preliminary rating of “Progressing” would be assigned to the Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance, in the absence of a formal plan for assessing outside perception of the services of the office. Because this office was not abreast of the need for such a plan, the committee understands that they will be preparing such a plan for future review and implementation. Dr. Connolly agreed to complete a draft Recommendation Report and forward it to the committee for final review.

B. Spring 2008 Meeting & Review Schedule
The committee discussed meeting dates for the spring semester. Preliminary discussion included meeting dates to include:

Thursday, January 24, 2008 at 10:00 a.m. – Review of the School-University Partnerships & Clinical Experiences Office

Additional meetings may be scheduled on the third Thursday morning of each month:
February 2008 Program Evaluation, Policy Center, School Improvement Council
March 2008 Instructional Support & Information Technology
April 2008 Business Office, Grants & Contracts Office
May 2008 Dean’s Office, Conferences Office, Development Office
                  Museum of Education (?)

The meeting was adjourned at 3:19 p.m.