Members Present:
Irma Van Scoy, COE Associate Dean   Alissa Lowrey, EDES Dept. Rep.
Renee Connolly, COE Dir. Accrediation & Quality Assur.

0. Core Committee Discussion of Plan
Members clarified any outstanding issues regarding the assessment plan for the Ph.D. in Foundations of Education.

I. Call Meeting to Order & Approval of March 25, 2005 Minutes
Dr. Dickey called the formal portion of the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m. He provided a brief overview of the committee and asked for introductions from the members. In addition, he outlined the purpose of the meeting and guided the members in what the committee business would happen.

II. Review of Assessment Plan for the Ph.D. in Foundations of Education
Dr. Wieder provided a handout to the committee members that outlined the major characteristics of the degree, the self evaluation schedule, and surveys of graduates. He commented on the SC Commission on Higher Education’s last review during the Fall 2003 review/accreditation visit, and informed the members that faculty in this program are trying to move this program into one whereby candidates attend on a full-time basis. He emphasized the nurturing and mentoring opportunities and the minority enrollment figures. In addition, he highlighted how important the Dispositions of the Conceptual Framework are in their plan and their view of what is important. Dr. Wieder acknowledged that omitting the “justice” disposition in the plan was an oversight. Drs. Wieder and Carper outlined which courses are required in the program and how they relate to some terms of the conceptual framework. There is a great amount of flexibility in what courses are required for these students.

Student work is represented more from committee work with the candidate and not driven by the program, as outlined in written materials. Because of the flexibility in the program, the diversity among faculty, and candidate needs, student work is guided in a unique way, producing examples, but often hard to evaluate in terms of strict assessment measures. Dr. Wieder highlighted admissions requirements and explained how it has been developed, what is acceptable, and why.

Dr. Knapp asked for clarification on what backgrounds candidates have prior to entering this program. Dr. Wieder explained what experiences and degrees some recent candidates have brought in. Discussion centered around how this is a very unique way to administer this program, but how difficult a tailored program may be in regard to assessment. Dr. Wieder described how one major assessment – the qualifying exam – is geared to each student. He mentioned some recent work in adjusting the written comprehensive examination in a way that will assist candidates in their professional work. This change involves the writing of three separate papers with three separate professors that are intense and will be followed up with oral defenses. Dr. Wieder explained how candidates are nurtured and supported at the dissertation stage. This stage of the process is fairly traditional as compared to other programs.

Candidates have an opportunity to interact with faculty throughout the program, but this idea is introduced at the orientation. Faculty received feedback from these interaction points and for the first time have just
received negative feedback. They review this input and try to apply it as necessary. Faculty nurture students and try to develop their research and writing as well as provide mentoring opportunities for teaching and research assistants. Candidates have entered a variety of professions, representing small and large institutions, as well as religious, state-supported, and historically Black institutions.

Dr. Weider described the Self-Evaluation Schedule that faculty have adopted to provide data and evaluation of the program. He mentioned the different phases and timetable for each. The collection of student data and the composition of student evaluation letters were completed this week allowing the program to determine the effectiveness of the process. Dr. Weider shared a sample letter addressing progress sent to students.

III. Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for Plan

Dr. Meeks asked for clarification on where the qualifying examination was listed on the plan. Dr. Wieder agreed that it is very much a part of a candidate’s progression, but was inadvertently left off the plan. Dr. Knapp recommended that the graduate survey be emphasized at a more important level since the faculty have and continue to have such rich communication and correspondence with the candidates in this program.

Dr. Wieder showed the members how a newly-developed form will help faculty in the program keep track of annual performance reviews for candidates. Prior to the use of this new form, this information was available on all students, but never kept in one place so faculty could review quickly how candidates are progressing. In September of this year, faculty have decided to get together in program areas (in all of EDES Dept.) to determine what the data are telling faculty about what program changes may need to be made. Faculty have begun to think about the logistics of how this form may be compiled and completed. They and committee members had discussions about how to operationalize the logistics of completing the form and recording other helpful information.

Members had some discussion on what candidates are included in the data summary pages and which ones are truly enrolled and active in the program. In addition, members asked program faculty to clarify how grades in courses are meaningful to faculty. Dr. Wieder explained that they are willing to look again at the use of these grades and how useful they may or may not be. Members continued discussion on how other data may be useful in showing faculty what patterns may exist, which may drive needed change. In addition, Dr. Van Scoy emphasized the importance of formalizing some of the processes which happen on an informal basis.

Dr. Meeks and Dr. Weider discussed the criteria used to determine a student evaluation rating of 2-Satisfactory. Dr. Weider expressed an interest in finding a better term than “satisfactory” and “meets expectations” was suggested.

IV. Committee Discussion of Spring 2005 Committee Activity

A. Follow-up Reports for 2003-2004 Plans

Dr. Dickey distributed the follow up reports to those committee members who were members during 2003-04. These members were instructed to review the follow up reports and reminded the members that the input will be reviewed at the May 13 meeting. Members discussed how the review should be conducted and what the discussion and materials will look like when the committee convenes in May. Six members of the committee will be involved in the follow up report. Reports that have been received will be reviewed and discussed during the May meeting. Those and the reports that are still outstanding are listed below:

B.M. in Music Education - received
M.M.E. and Ph.D. in Music Education - received
M.C.D. and M.S.P. in Speech Pathology – received  
Ph.D. in School Psychology – received  
B.S., M.A.T., I.M.A., M.S., and Ph.D. in Physical Education – outstanding, due February 1, 2005  
Certificate, M.A.T., Ed.D. in Health – outstanding, due March 1, 2005  

Dr. Dickey announced that he will be returning as the ITE Department representative and he has agreed to act as Chair during 2005-06. As part of his agreement to serve again in this capacity, he asked that a chair be identified from the incoming members for 2005-2006 be identified.

B. Calendar  
Dr. Dickey reminded the members that the last meeting is scheduled for Friday, May 13, 2005, at 1:30 p.m.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:13 p.m.