PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE – YEAR FOUR  
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 2007  

Members Present:  
Ken Stevenson, Chair QCom and EDLP Representative  
Irma Van Scoy, COE Associate Dean  
Allison Jacques, SC Department of Education  
Eva Monsma, PE Representative  
Mary Ann Byrnes, Asst. Dean, College of Arts & Sciences  
Renee Connolly, Dir. Accreditation & Quality Assurance  
Catherine Luthren, Accreditation & Quality Assurance  

Program Representative:  
Kim Smoak, MAT/MT Social Studies  

Dr. Stevenson called the informal portion of the meeting at 1:36 p.m.  

I. Call Meeting to Order and Review of Minutes from February 14, 2007  
Dr. Monsma motioned for approval of the February 14, 2007, minutes. Her motion was approved.  
These minutes may be reviewed at: http://www.ed.sc.edu/Documents.asp  

II. Review of MAT/MT Social Studies Plan  
Dr. Dickey introduced Ms. Kim Smoak and provided a background on her qualifications and her role in the social studies position. Initially, Ms. Smoak was hired to help revise the assessment plan and since then has become the initial social studies representative for the programs. She has refined the plan to better meet the NCSS standards.  

Ms. Smoak highlighted the recent changes to the plan that include a shift from many assessments to only 6-8 assessments and the implementation of new rubrics for data collection. Additionally, she highlighted some of the key assessments, as committee members reviewed examples of rubrics that are embedded in the plan and why those assessments were included. Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification on an assessment that reads, “grade in the course.” Ms. Smoak explained that this actually includes a dispositional rating. Dr. Dickey hopes to send Ms. Smoak to a national NCSS training as she may be a part of the program for a longer term.  

Ms. Smoak pointed out an inadvertent error with the “ability to plan instruction” assessment. Though listed as occurring “during student teaching” it is addressed in the required course EDSE 729 as a midpoint assessment. Additionally, she reminded the members that the NCSS themes for standard 2 are not applicable to our programs and thus are not included in the plan.  

Dr. Dickey pointed out that the committee should carefully review Praxis results more closely, as these could be more publicly-related concerns. The committee entertained discussion on how students are advised and what course they take prior to taking the exams.  

Dr. Stevenson asked for clarification between eight listed standards and the fact that only six are listed in the standards matrix. Ms. Smoak acknowledged that assessments seven and eight are not listed. Dr. Van Scoy noticed that the NCSS themes in 3.0 Programmatic Standards seem to ask for course grades, which is not like other professional associations’ requirements. She also suggested that all assessments do not have to meet each NCSS theme and Ms. Smoak acknowledged that this can be adjusted.
III. Review of MAT/MT Math. Plan

Dr. Dickey provided an overview of the two programs in math education, highlighting what types of students matriculate through the programs and the focus of each. He reported that the MT program averages between 1-9 graduates each year and the MAT program averages 1-3 graduates each year. There is some difference between the field experiences of the two programs. He reported on the success of the math. education students in relation to national scholarships, highlighting two recent graduates who have received national awards. A weakness that he cited is that the programs still do not produce the necessary number of math. teachers for the State. He acknowledged that the plans have only been revised at a minimal level, but there is real data collection happening.

He did argue that the Praxis results, ADEPT results, Unit work sample, and the comprehensive exam currently get at the NCTM standards, although they have not been revisited recently. The assessment plan reviewed by the committee has been revised operationally, but has not been recorded on paper in a new plan with logistics and directions. He acknowledged that the plan is in need of revision on paper and will have to include logistics, although at this point he is the only faculty member collecting data. Dr. Van Scoy reminded him that an important element to be included in the revision should be that there are clear program points of admission, a midpoint, and program completion. Dr. Dickey agreed that there are current assessments that happen across the program that will fit this revision. Dr. Dickey addressed Dr. Van Scoy’s concern of having less than three years of data with an explanation that faculty turnover has impacted plan implementation and revision.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification as to the difference in pedagogy between the two programs. Dr. Dickey explained that the differences are grounded in institutional history and how students arrive in the degree after not having a math. content-related background. Over time, the MAT has changed from a full partnership between the math. department and Education to one that is heavily driven by the College of Education. Dr. Dickey explained that his bigger concern is the value of the field experiences for the students.

IV. Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for Plans

Dr. Stevenson summarized the MAT/MT Math plan issues to include: a rating of “does not meet” with language that will emphasize clarity in language throughout the plan, acknowledging that operationally positive things are happening and will likely continue in the future, but they are not being recorded.

Summary of the MAT/MT social studies plans include: confirm NCSS standards and requirements, focus assessments to key standards (if that is what NCSS wants) instead of listing them all for each assessment, number of assessments needed should be confirmed with NCSS, rubrics that go beyond collecting course grades, how program points are represented (i.e. when assessments happen), clarifying logistic language to make sure that what is listed will/is happening, clarify which conceptual framework elements in Practice are represented for each assessment

Dr. Van Scoy expressed a concern that only College of Education representatives have been present to represent MAT degrees. Dr. Stevenson and Ms. Byrnes agreed that this would be nice to have included other representatives and for the future.

V. QCom Meeting Schedule for AY 2006-07

Dr. Stevenson asked the committee to firmly schedule Wednesday, April 18, 2007 for the review of assessment plans for foreign language and middle level programs.

He asked that the committee members reserve Wednesday, May 2, at 1:30 p.m. for the meeting to review revised assessment plans. Ms. Connolly agreed to send reminders to programs that have not submitted revised plans. During this last meeting, the members also agreed to discuss new members for
the 2007-08 year and what QCom’s review role will be for the Unit. Members entertained some
discussion on what reviews during this next year may look like. Dr. VanScoy agreed to bring a proposal
to the committee about how the committee might address the unit assessment component of
accreditation.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.