I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM SEPTEMBER 25, 2009 MEETING

The meeting was called to order at 9:34 a.m. Dr. Nilges-Charles asked for approval of the September 25, 2009, minutes. One correction was made to the minutes regarding an update to the QCom Review and Procedures. Members decided to address this outstanding issue at today’s meeting to make sure the committee’s procedures are up to date. The minutes were approved as written and will be posted on the COE Documents page.

II. REVIEW OF SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAM

Dr. Nilges-Charles reminded the members that they received documentation from the program that included their association’s (APA) assessment plan, the University’s assessment plan, and other appropriate documentation. Dr. Connolly reminded the members that the documentation they received are only portions of all the paperwork that the program representatives forwarded to her office. Members entertained discussion regarding what documentation they received and what outstanding issues they identified to explore further with the program representatives.

Program representatives joined the committee to discuss the program review in further detail. The members introduced themselves. Dr. Nilges-Charles provided an overview of the committee’s charge and the work that will happen in today’s meeting.

Dr. Huebner provided an overview of the program, director changes, and what preparation they made for their 2008 accreditation visit by APA. He distributed examples of data from the program that are included in their reports for APA and the University. Specifically, he highlighted an example of a portfolio that they require their candidates to complete. Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification on the kind of data that the program collects and how they retain those data over time. Dr. Huebner responded that they report standardized test scores, feedback from internship supervisors, grades in courses, rubric-related data, survey information. They do this currently, as a result of prior QCom review and more recently their APA review. He added that the program uses much qualitative information from practicum supervisors for program input. They prepare a response for the program on candidates’ performances, but when APA came for their review the reviewers noted that more quantitative data would be helpful for program input and change.

Dr. Van Scoy asked Dr. Huebner to expand on what data collection will look like in the future, as a result of the APA review and what the program has implemented. Dr. Huebner pointed out some examples of how the
program will report data in the future. He highlighted how the criteria and expectations in the assessment plan can translate into data collection, review, and decisions made as a result of the data. There are approximately 6 students a year, in a 4 year program, with some ABD students still in the program.

Dr. Nilges-Charles asked for clarification of how the program has collected data and made changes. Dr. Huebner reported that the process is in place, but data are still coming in so have not been aggregated to look across the program. He pointed out a supervision recommendation from APA and noted how future data will help inform the program in this area. He reminded the committee that APA requests an annual report from the program which includes specific information related to the review, necessary quality issues, and other pertinent information related to the program.

Dr. Meeks asked for clarification from program representatives regarding insuring reliability across assessment instruments in the program. Dr. Hill addressed the question explaining that multiple people address some assessments and discuss findings that are recorded. Additionally, Dr. Huebner commented that all faculty review each student each year to reduce reliability issues that may surface and they also monitor first-year students more closely. Also, he informed the group that because of the selective nature of the program and the quality of the students they receive, they seldom have big issues related to variability and reliability among faculty raters and supervisors.

Dr. Nilges-Charles asked for information on the clinical experiences that candidates go through in the program. Dr. Hill is the first clinical track faculty that handles these experiences. Field experience begins in the first year and there is some additional opportunity in each year the candidates are enrolled. Each experience builds on another and includes observations in a class, school, and professional settings. Practicum is required at least three of their four years, but most candidates complete a practicum experience all four years. In addition, many courses in the program include mini-practicum experiences. Many of the candidates complete APA internships which are very rigorous, in addition to the program requirements.

Dr. Virtue asked for clarification as to how the program addresses diversity related to practicum experiences. Dr. Huebner addressed that the nature of the program and the clients that are served represent a diverse population of students and special needs. Faculty try to coordinate experiences across the years so candidates gain exposure to different ages, school types, disabilities, ethnicities, genders, geographic locales. He reminded the members that very often candidates are in various setting in the same semester because of the various practicum experiences and the mini-practicum experiences in courses.

Ms. Byrnes asked for information on the research expectations of the program. Dr. Huebner explained the foundation requirements in the first year, the masters’ thesis requirements in the second year, and the additional experiential and dissertation requirements in the third-fifth years. Dr. Hill reminded the members that they encourage candidates to find a mentor and lab early on.

Dr. Liu asked for further information on how they track their candidates after they leave the program. Dr Huebner reported that APA is very interested in the post-graduate experience and the program tries to maintain that feedback from graduates. They receive a healthy response from their follow up surveys although admit that graduates are hard to keep track of.

III. COMMITTEE RATING RECOMMENDATION FOR PROGRAM

The committee entertained discussion on a rating and strengths/areas for improvements for the school psychology program.

Recommendation: Meeting criteria that ensure quality

Strengths: Endured and successful in a thorough rigorous APA review process; implemented more rubric-based approach to grading; intensity of diversity among practical experiences; scientist-practitioner approach within the program
Committee encourages: Systematic data analysis and aggregation; refinement of rubrics

IV. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION OF THE PROGRAM REVIEW/CONSENSUS PROCESS

A. Review of Internal Process
Dr. Nilges-Charles distributed the existing procedures and rankings and asked for input on what exists and if any improvements should be made. Members discussed deciding on rating for each program and make it clear if there are any strengths or areas for improvement to highlight on their communication letter. Members decided to discuss program strengths/areas for improvement on a case-by-case basis depending on how many programs are being reviewed that day. They decided that multiple conversations may be required during a meeting if there are multiple degrees presented.

Dr. Connolly agreed to work toward a more clear process with the programs that are coming up for review. She will send them the QCom Review Sheet many weeks prior to their meeting so they understand more fully what to expect and so they have time to get materials through Dr. Connolly’s office.

Members suggested that wording in the existing rating levels be adjusted to show that programs are continually working to meeting criteria. Changes include:
- Change “Meets criteria that ensure quality” to “Meeting criteria that ensure quality”
- Change “Does not meet criteria that ensure quality” to “Not meeting criteria that ensure quality”

B. Review of Notification Letter to Program Area
Members discussed sending one notification from the committee to the program area. A letter with the agreed-upon rating and any strengths or areas for improvement will be included. The letter for school psychology will be sent to Scott Huebner, Les Sternberg, Mary Ann Fitzpatrick, and John Richards (Chair, Psych. Dept.)

IV. ESTABLISH QCOM SCHEDULE FOR REMAINDER OF 2009-2010 YEAR

Music Education & Speech Path.  December 10, 2009 – 1:00 p.m.
Art Education (BFA, IMA, MA, MAT)  Thursday, January 28, 2010 – 10:00 a.m.
Counselor Education and Library and Information Science  Thursday, February 18, 2010 – 10:00 a.m.
Athletic Training  Thursday, March 25, 2010 – 10:00 a.m.

V. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:33 a.m.