Members present:
Ed Dickey, Co-chair and ITE Rep.  
Bob Brookshire, Business Education Rep.  
Ken Stevenson, ELP Rep.  
Lynn Keane, Business Education Rep.  
Huynh Huynh, EDST Rep.  
Catherine Luthren, Quality Assurance Rep.  
Debbie Donovan, Lexington Two Rep.  
Irma Van Scy, COE Associate Dean

Program Representatives:
Robert Brookshire, Technology Support and Training Management
Lynn Keane, Technology Support and Training Management

I. Call Meeting to Order and Review of Minutes from September 8, 2006
The committee gathered informally at 1:30 p.m. to review questions and issues related to the assessment plan reviews. Dr. Dickey called the formal portion of the meeting to order at 1:54 and provided an overview of the QCom meeting and process, in general. He asked members for introductions. The minutes from the September 8, 2006, meeting were accepted, as submitted.

II. Review of Business Education Plans
Dr. Dickey outlined the process for which the committee would review the plans and asked the program faculty for relevant program information that they may want to share with the committee. Dr. Brookshire provided the members with an overview of the current business and technology education programs to include their College’s perception of the importance of the programs and the national outlook for business education teachers. The teacher certification and graduate education programs are part of the Technology Support and Training Management (TSTM) program of the College of Hospitality, Retail, and Sport Management. Dr. Brookshire outlined the health of each of the three degree programs citing the MAT functions as the biggest program, the IMA existing as a service program to enhance content development of current teachers, and the BS program only recently approved and implemented (enrolling students for the first time in Fall 2005). Although they are not seeing large numbers of transfer students into the new undergraduate program, they anticipate growing numbers over the upcoming years. Dr. Brookshire acknowledged that they need to focus more efforts in recruiting and notifying the public about its existence.

Dr. Dickey asked for input on what role the MAT will play when the BS grows. Dr. Brookshire reported that the faculty will continue to support the MAT program, as they see that as a true “career changer” program and will still serve a need within the education community. He informed the members about the outside groups that faculty are working with to help potential students understand the existence and availability of the program.

The National Business Education Association (NBEA) is the national association that has a set of standards for which the faculty will use, but is not recognized by the National Council for Accreditation for Teacher Education (NCATE). The programs are reviewed by the State Department of Education. Dr. Brookshire informed the group that they are very willing to work with the COE and other members of the Professional Education Unit (PEU) for data collection and review.

A. B.S. in Business and Technology Education
Dr. Van Scy acknowledged that the assessment plan is clearly aligned to the NBEA’s standards, but asked how faculty collect data on candidates to show program quality and improvement. Dr. Brookshire acknowledged that former lists of assessments may not be as
necessary now, but they are willing to use a smaller set of assessments that will be more meaningful to the program. Dr. Dickey clarified that plan development should 1) meet the professional association standards and 2) provide data that allows for more consistent review of data. The BS plan currently focuses on a fewer number of assessments.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for explanation on how faculty plan to use data for future program development. Dr. Brookshire reported that they hope to use state needs for how many teachers to produce. He acknowledged that no formal mechanism exists for discussion of data for program improvement but that they should add some format for this. He also explained what and how faculty are involved with teaching in the business education program and what types of courses business education majors take.

A. **M.A.T. in Business Education**

Like the BS assessment plan outlines, Dr. Dickey reminded program faculty that the MAT plan might benefit from the same format found in the BS. In addition, he encouraged program faculty to develop rubrics and guidelines that align with the assessments listed in the plan. Dr. Van Scoy emphasized the importance of collecting the data on the assessments and the helpfulness of the COE’s Office of Accreditation and Quality Assurance. Dr. Brookshire acknowledged that they will be working more closely with Ms. Connolly and Ms. Luthren over the semester to ensure that they get data to their office for inclusion in the unit assessment system. Dr. Van Scoy reminded the program faculty that there are already numerous data being collected that are helpful to the program such as admission scores, Praxis scores, and ADEPT ratings.

Dr. Dickey asked for additional information on the comprehensive examination. Dr. Brookshire explained that there are two main components to the exam – a reflective section and a written exam. Dr. Dickey emphasized the importance of having a rubric for such an important assignment within a plan. Dr. Keane asked for clarification on what helpful rubrics or guides look like and the members provided some explanation on descriptions and ratings for rubrics that identify candidate work that falls below, meets, or exceeds specific requirements.

B. **I.M.A. in Business Education**

Drs. Dickey and Van Scoy emphasized the importance of the size of the program in terms of required productivity standards with the SC Commission on Higher Education. Dr. Brookshire informed the members that online delivery plans for the IMA have been approved by the Provost, but he will not allow the program to charge in-state tuition, thus putting plans for delivery on hold. Program faculty recognize the need for the program, but are hoping for a reversed decision from the Provost’s office so they can offer the program more economically.

III. **Committee Discussion of Recommendations & Procedures for Plans**

Dr. Dickey informed the program faculty that the members will compile all their review sheets and as a result of those and the discussion in the meeting, will prepare a Recommendation Report. Program faculty will receive a copy of this Recommendation Report and will have an opportunity to respond to the report. This report should be sent to the faculty within a month.

Dr. Stevenson asked for a review of understanding from the committee members. Members discussed major items for inclusion of new plans such as more formalized data reviews, creation of rubrics for key assessments, more performance-based assessments, and formalized data collection.

IV. **QCom Meeting Schedule for AY 2006-07**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Education</td>
<td>prefers Wednesday, Oct. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Education</td>
<td>Friday, November 17, 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies Education</td>
<td>tentative Wednesday, Jan. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Ed., Teaching</td>
<td>tentative Wednesday, Feb. 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Math. Education  
Foreign Language, Middle Level  
tentative Wednesday, March 14, 2007  
tentative Wednesday, April 18, 2007

The meeting was adjourned at 3:15 p.m.