Members present:
Ed Dickey, Chair and ITE Rep.
Irma Van Scoy, COE Associate Dean
Debbie Donovan, Representative, Lexington District Two
Catherine Luthren, Certification and Quality Assurance
Renee Connolly, Accreditation and Quality Assurance

I. Call Meeting to Order & Approval of April 21, 2006 minutes

Dr. Dickey called the meeting to order at 1:45. The minutes from April 21, 2006, were approved.

II. Discussion and Approval of Recommendation Report for Library (School Media) programs

Committee members entertained discussion to clarify the relationship of the school media track of the certificate, MLIS, and SLIS. Members reviewed and approved the Recommendation Report for Library (school media).

III. Committee Member Rotation and Appointment

Dr. Dickey reminded the members that he has contacted Ken Stevenson (EDLP) to discuss assuming a QCom Chair role and the next EDLP representative. A new SC State Dept. representative will have to be identified and it was decided that Dr. Van Scoy would ask Dr. Meeks for suggestions as to an appropriate person might be for this role. Dr. Monsma reported to the group that she will continue on as the physical education representative for the next two years.

IV. Review and Discussion of QCom Initial Objectives

Dr. Dickey distributed a handout outlining QCom’s original Purpose and Structure, as approved by the PEU in spring 2003, and asked members to review prior to discussion. Dr. Van Scoy reminded the members that after the Year Four reviews, QCom will be involved in an overall review. She emphasized that, although a broad overview is helpful, QCom may not be the only appropriate group to review all the unit-wide data that are available. Dr. Dickey suggested that instead of only reviewing unit-wide data, that QCom be used to review outstanding assessment plans that have not been returned, per their Recommendation Report.
Dr. Van Scoy mentioned that part of the Year Five reviews, QCom consider data and groups such as:

- Annual Productivity Report from Office of Accreditation & Quality Assurance
- Reviews from Administrative Council
- Data from clinical surveys from Office of School-University Partnerships
- Data from PDS Technology Committee’s technology survey

Dr. Dickey reported that Dr. Field’s office is conducting surveys, but the compilation of these reports has not been forthcoming.

Ms. Connolly suggested that QCom consider reviewing the new Dispositions ratings that will be implemented, beginning fall 2006. She also suggested that the Year Five reviews include monthly reviews of various data sets from the COE and PEU, instead of regular assessment plans.

Dr. Van Scoy agreed with this idea, but emphasized the fact that waiting too long to review various data within the PEU should not be put off too long. While the idea to review data sets on a monthly basis is valid, she encouraged the committee to consider doing some preliminary reviews during Year Four to prepare for more complete reviews during Year Five.

The committee suggested that list of variables be prepared for presentation to the group at a later date, so it is clear how the unit collects data, where, and how they are used. Ms. Connolly agreed to compile this list with assistance from Dr. Van Scoy. This list will be shared with the COE Administrative Council for further discussion and comment.

Dr. Dickey asked for clarification on what instruments are used in the PEU to assess various procedures, intern experiences, graduates, etc. Dr. Van Scoy reminded the group that there are assessments happening, but further work should be completed to ensure that the Conceptual Framework is consistent with these surveys.

Dr. Dickey reported that the PDS Technology Survey that will assess the adequacy of the interns’ knowledge of technology. This survey has been completed with responses from over 80 interns and 70 cooperating teachers, comprising a representative sample of the various areas of teacher education in the PEU. The survey clearly reflected standards from ISTE. Preliminary findings indicate that cooperating teachers rated interns’ technology knowledge more positively than the interns rated themselves.

Dr. Dickey asked Dr. Van Scoy if any collective study has been done to identify the common assessments across all programs. This could be done through the use of Blackboard’s capabilities in establishing “organizations” of users. Dr. Monsma reported that she currently uses this mechanism to include certain types of users for specific responsibilities within courses and the program. He suggested that work samples might be an assessment that is shared among an identified set of users with included scoring systems and an aggregated list or array of how the students fair on the assessment.

V. Preliminary Discussion of QCom meetings

Dr. Dickey suggested that the committee meet in a similar manner as in the past, with a planning meeting at the beginning of the year. This includes two meetings in September 2006, with the possibility to use December 2006. He anticipates that some programs will ask for a delay in the review of their plans for various reasons.
Ms. Connolly agreed to send out six-month letters to business education, English education, and science education with preliminary dates (third Friday of each month).
The committee decided to review the M.Ed. in Teaching during February 2007, with the Ph.D. in Secondary. They noted that the M.Ed. in Elementary and the M.Ed. in Secondary have been eliminated and are not subject to a follow-up plan or review. Members agreed to review the plan for the new B.A. in Dance during Year Five, with a specific month to be determined at a later date.

Dr. Monsma asked if clearer direction can be provided to programs prior to each area’s review meeting. Ms. Connolly agreed to continue to emphasize the important points in each assessment plan. Dr. Van Scoy suggested that a checklist be given to programs to assist with clarity. Ms. Donovan suggested that additional emphasis be given to the importance of the logistics.

Dr. Van Scoy suggested that the QCom Review Sheet be revised to capture the importance of having data, not just a plan. There is an expectation on the national level and within the unit that programs should have aggregated data and how those data are used for program improvement, but one of the major problems over the years has been that programs are not producing and bringing enough data to meet this requirement. She emphasized that this should be a priority for the coming two years.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.