Members present:
Ken Stevenson, Chair and EDLP Rep.
Huynh Huynh, EDST Rep.
Mary Ann Byrnes, Asst. Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
Debbie Donovan, Lexington Two District Rep.
Irma Van Scoy, COE Associate Dean
Catherine Luthren, Office of Accreditation & Quality Assurance
Renee Connolly, Office of Accreditation & Quality Assurance

Program representatives:
Ed Dickey, ITE Department Chair and Program Faculty Rep.

Dr. Stevenson called the meeting to order at 1:36 p.m.

I. Call Meeting to Order and Review of Minutes from November 17, 2006
Minutes from the November 17 meeting were approved and will be posted at:
http://www.ed.sc.edu/Documents.asp

II. Review of Ph.D. Secondary Assessment Plan

Dr. Dickey provided an overview of the Ph.D. program as it has developed over the past few years. He highlighted the context of the degree within the COE Department of Instruction and Teacher Education, reporting that while there is a desire to maintain the program, there may be some program modifications proposed in the future. The past SC Commission on Higher Education (CHE) report cited some concerns from its last review and those comments have been part of the faculty’s consideration of program modifications to better address state and disciplinary needs. A new proposed name would be the Ph.D. in Instruction and Teaching, although other names have been discussed among faculty. The committee entertained some discussion on program modification changes and paperwork related to this degree. Dr. Dickey reminded the members that there are very few faculty who currently serve in the Ph.D. program as it stands now – himself (math.) and Dr. Christine Lotter (science). Dr. Styslinger (English) has suspended admissions to the English track and instead refers candidates into the Ph.D. in Language and Literacy. As of now, department faculty are not in opposition to proposed changes to this degree.

Dr. Dickey highlighted the key assessments, as outlined in the plan. He explained that there is little uniformity among faculty in the program due to a lack of permanent faculty serving in the program. He cited that rubrics for the assessments are assisting the available faculty in identifying weaker candidates. In addition, the program continues to assist candidates in building programs of study that are rich in content and thus comparable to a masters in the candidates’ content fields.

Rubrics are hard to use consistently in a dissertation defense, as cases vary so much. Dr. Van Scoy asked if there is consistency with a cultural question within the comprehensive examination experience. She explained that this may be helpful when considering program modifications to this degree in the future.
Dr. Dickey explained that data collection has not happened on a consistent basis based on long-term student matriculation or drop-out. Although it made sense when the plan was written to follow six candidates, that the nature of candidate movement and now the program’s health, have shown him that this is not helpful. Dr. Van Scoy encouraged Dr. Dickey to consider data collection on all students when new program modifications are discussed. He admitted that rubrics are used rather inconsistently.

Dr. Huynh asked for details regarding the number of candidates matriculating through the program and what the Data Summary Reports display. Ms. Luthren explained that data on the reports reflect the years in which candidates are admitted and may not appear to list all candidates as program faculty know them. Ms. Luthren and Dr. Dickey agreed that candidates are in the database, but because of the organization from the Accreditation and Quality Assurance office, that the listing is slightly different.

Dr. Stevenson asked if the AQA Office has any input on programs’ rubrics, based on what the State will ask for, for these advanced programs. Dr. Van Scoy reported that the CHE has not yet explained what “standards” or “guidelines” will be required in self studies. This also means that they have not articulated what rubrics should look like or include.

III. Review of M.Ed. Teaching Assessment Plan

Dr. Dickey explained that the M.Ed. in Teaching was developed to fill a need for advanced academic work for teachers, more focused on those specializing in grades 2-12. This M.Ed. was designed to help those candidates in their first several years of teaching to assist their development in the classroom. The assessments and the courses cited in the plan have been devised purposefully to assist candidates in very broad areas in their teaching within their grade levels. Because the program began accepting candidates in spring 2006, there is little data available at a midpoint as of yet. Based on the growing undergraduate graduate population, he anticipates that the program will grow and data will be available.

Just recently, Richland One District has agreed to provide funding for the first full year for teachers to enroll in the M.Ed. program, while they teach in a Richland One school. Eight students will be funded beginning fall 2007 and should help grow enrollment in the program. The program is called Beginning Teachers Scholars.

Dr. Stevenson asked about rubric development as key assessments are reached and Dr. Dickey reported that as syllabi are written, the rubrics will be part of those syllabi. As reported earlier, candidates have not reached many assessment points in the program yet.

Dr. Van Scoy reported concern that National Board Standards are not reflected in this masters level program. Since the PEU has prolific undergraduate programs now, there will be expectations that National Board standards be reflected at the masters level and not only at the Ed.S. and above level. Dr. Dickey agreed that a revision of the plan could easily reflect these standards.

Ms. Luthren asked for clarification regarding the admissions sheet and an indication of points, or lack thereof, from faculty completing these forms. Dr. Dickey agreed to remind faculty to complete all points on these admissions forms, so data can be entered accurately and completely.

IV. Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for Plans

Dr. Stevenson asked for consensus on the comments made for the two assessment plans. A review of the Ph.D. comments and inclusion on the recommendation reports include: a review of program data on a regular basis, a continuing leadership presence for data collection and maintenance, there is only one rubric being used consistently among candidate matriculation and experiences, importance of inclusion of an internship experience, and the implementation of the dispositions rating sheet.
A review of the M.Ed. comments and inclusion on the recommendation reports include: using the National Board Standards as a framework for the program and its assessments, full completion of admissions checklists by faculty reviewers, implementation of the dispositions rating sheet, data collection on all candidates and not only a sample number of candidates, importance of inclusion of an internship experience even if it is in his/her own classroom (with accommodation of diversity if it is lacking in his/her own classroom), consideration Masters review process include previous teaching experience

V. Review and Approval of Science Education Recommendation Reports
Dr. Stevenson asked the committee for approval of the recommendation reports for the MAT/MT and the IMA in Science Education. The committee unanimously approved both reports and Ms. Connolly agreed to submit these reports to appropriate program faculty and Deans’ offices.

VI. QCom Meeting Schedule for AY 2006-07
Dr. Stevenson asked the committee members to review the upcoming QCom dates and plans:
Math. Education, Social studies tentative Wednesday, March 14, 2007
Foreign Language, Middle Level tentative Wednesday, April 18, 2007

Dr. Stevenson asked for an update on the social studies review. Upon committee discussion, it was decided that the social studies assessment plan will be reviewed with the math. education plan in March. Ms. Connolly agreed to alert Ms. Kim Smoak, the current social studies faculty representative.

Dr. Van Scoy asked that the follow-up reviews might be considered during a possible May meeting. These follow up reviews are ones of plans that have been previously reviewed by QCom and are under request to submit a revised plan. Dr. Stevenson asked the committee to consider the option of having a May meeting, although a specific date was not discussed.

The committee also entertained discussion on moving the March 14, 2007, date to March 7, pending some members’ schedules. March 14 is during spring break.

Dr. Stevenson adjourned the meeting at 2:35 p.m.