Members present:
Lynda Nilges-Charles – QCom Chair and P.E. Rep
Steven Liu – EDST Rep.
Mary Ann Byrnes – College of Arts & Sciences Rep.
Anita Parker – SC Dept. of Education (substitute for Kathy Meeks)
Irma Van Scoy – Assoc. Dean College of Education
Renee Connolly – Dir. Accreditation & Quality Assurance

Program representatives:
Elaine Frank – Communication Sciences Disorders Chair
Hiram McDade – Graduate Director and Faculty, Communication Sciences Disorders
Jeremy Lane – Faculty, School of Music
Bob Pruzin Faculty, School of Music

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM NOVEMBER 20, 2009 MEETING

Dr. Nilges-Charles called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. She welcomed the members and asked for approval of the minutes from November 20, 2009. Members approved the minutes and Dr. Connolly agreed to have them posted on the COE Documents page.

Dr. Nilges-Charles encouraged the members to discuss any questions or concerns about the review of the speech-pathology programs. Dr. Van Scoy clarified the known ADEPT issues related to this discipline. Members decided to pursue this issue once the program representatives joined the committee members.

II. REVIEW OF SPEECH-PATHOLOGY PROGRAMS - MSP, MCD

Dr. Lynda Nilges-Charles welcomed the program representatives from speech/language and communications disorders and asked for introductions from all members. She briefly explained the process of QCom and speech/path. and communication sciences relationship with the committee.

Dr. Frank explained the MSP and MCD programs and the reason for two degrees, although the programs are the same. Dr. McDade explained that, several years ago, the SC Commission on Higher Education required that the distance education delivery of the MCD required that it be a named and separate program. They are both fully-approved by the Council on Academic Accreditation (CAA), which is an arm of ASHA. Both programs are initial certification areas, although they are masters-level programs. Dr. Frank explained discipline-specific requirements that require certain degree-level acquisitions and practicum hours that require this be a masters-level program, but initial certification level. When candidates complete the programs, they are eligible for state certification in schools, if candidates desire.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification on one citation noted on the accreditation letter regarding facilities. Dr. Frank commented on this issue explaining that program faculty, classrooms, and labs are scattered around the campus, but excellent facilities are available for faculty and candidates. Ideally, accreditors seek program faculty and facilities that are grouped in one central location, explaining the citation on the accreditation letter. Dr. Frank assured the group that this is a preference within the discipline and not to be understood as a weakness of the program.
Dr. Nilges-Charles asked for clarification on clinical experiences. Dr. Frank highlighted exceptional services and lab experiences available to candidates including involvement with the Speech and Hearing Services. Candidates’ initial experience happens under the close guidance of clinicians and faculty at the SHS lab for approximately one semester. After that candidates usually experience 5-6 additional practicum experiences, that may happen in the over 400 sites that the program uses. Additionally, Dr. Frank explained that many candidates participate in national 10-week clinical experiences at nationally-known hospitals, schools, and other service units. She commented on diverse placements for candidates that include different ethnic groups, disabilities, and personnel (Catawba Indian Nation, study-abroad experiences in Hispanic countries, private companies).

Dr. Dickey asked about how many candidates choose to go into a school setting. Dr. McDade reported that about half of candidates in each degree choose a school setting. He further commented on the number that do not choose rural settings. He added that the program has tried to identified rural candidates who will choose to stay in those settings and choose to work in the schools. Through the work with a grant in the program, they have identified approximately 50 candidates who reside in rural settings and have agreed to stay in those settings upon completion of their degree.

Dr. Nilges-Charles asked for clarification on candidate ADEPT preparation and completion. Dr. Frank reported that the program does include instruction on lesson planning, candidates are provided a link to help them understand the standards to inform parents, and the program uses State-recognized standards. She feels confident that the program prepares candidates to be aware of ADEPT requirements although it is not a detailed, integrated assessment in the program. Dr. Dickey asked if they hear from their candidates regarding their preparation in ADEPT. She answered that the program does a good job keeping up with their graduates and they do have opportunities to hear from former candidates about how they have/have not been prepared to deal with ADEPT once they are in the school system in SC. Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification from Ms. Parker about what the State will need on ADEPT information. It was clarified that information on ADEPT can be found within syllabi in each discipline and what data can be pulled from the IHE Portal system, run by the Department. Dr. Dickey asked for additional clarification on ADEPT for those candidates who do NOT stay in this State. Ms. Parker reminded the members that efforts should still be in place across a program with the assumption that students MIGHT stay in the State. Dr. Frank asked for a copy of the State’s required plan for how ADEPT should be implemented within programs like speech.

Ms. Byrnes asked for clarification on how the program aggregates data. Dr. Frank explained that their formative assessments allow them to look at how many candidates are meeting standards, giving them opportunity to speak to candidates at key points. She cited issues based on exit survey input and faculty use of data to make program updates and changes. She also added there is an anonymous complaint box available to candidates for which the program makes at least 2-3 adjustments each semester. She retains aggregated data in her office from assessments (course and competency-related) and input instruments (surveys). Dr. Frank also identified additional ways that the faculty know and understand that candidates understand the knowledge and possess the skills to put their knowledge to work.

Dr. Van Scoy commented on a concern she has regarding the National Board of Professional Standards of Teaching and its relationship to speech. The State typically requires advanced programs for teachers to align preparation with the National Board requirements, but she is going to double check with other State representatives to make sure this is the case for a program like speech (some are certified teachers and some are not). Dr. Meeks verified that the NBPST does not include standards for speech therapists.

Dr. Liu asked for information regarding the distance education program (MCD) regarding completion and attrition. Dr. McDade reported on the slight differences in the on-campus program and distance program.
III. REVIEW OF MUSIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS - BM, MAT, MME

BM Degree
Dr. Connolly distributed additional materials to the committee members that the program provided for committee members on the morning of the meeting. Dr. Van Scoy provided some clarification on some of the issues that may be applicable to the programs being reviewed in the meeting.

Dr. Nilges-Charles asked the program representatives to provide a status on the MAT, as this is a newly-approved/proposed program. Dr. Lane explained the professional need for the degree within the profession. They have identified 10-15 students who are interested in transferring into this degree upon final approval. It was agreed that since this program is not fully-approved, there is not a pressing need to review intricacies of this program. Dr. Lane reminded the members that a full plan for this degree will be included in the next round of planning documents required for USC’s Institutional Assessment and Compliance Office.

Mr. Pruzin reminded the group that the NASM visit will happen in February 2010, with a final letter expected from the association a few months after the visit. Mr. Pruzin explained the undergraduate program, highlighting the curriculum issues and some practicum and internship requirements. Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification on practicum experiences. Dr. Lane commented that the music program has established a partnership with Hand Middle School that allows candidates a diverse experience for their first immersion experience. Candidates’ experiences put them into the middle school for six weeks. Dr. Lane explained that the 100 hours are met with these observations, teaching private lessons, music lessons at child care centers, working with band/choral leaders. He informed the group that the program is doing a better job tracking the number of hours the candidates spend in schools prior to student teaching. Dr. Van Scoy asked if the Strings Project counts as hours in schools, as the program allows for many hours of student-contact. Dr. Lane and Mr. Pruzin confirmed that this is the case for the candidates who choose to participate in this project. She volunteered to have the COE assist the program in tracking the number of hours prior to student teaching. Dr. Dickey also suggested a way to have the candidates maintain their hours. Dr. Lane informed the group that this is an issue the Degree Program Assessment Committee will address in the School. The members and program representatives discussed ways to meet these State-hour requirements within the requirements of the accrediting agency, NASM. Members entertained discussion on how COE course requirements may be able to assist disciplines in meeting these state hour requirements (enabling the program to administer its own 401 and 401P experiences).

Dr. Nilges-Charles asked for clarification on how the program uses data for program changes and improvement. Dr. Lane highlighted an example of data provided to the committee (Evaluation in MUED 568) that they have used to make program improvements. He also commented that the USC Office of Institutional Assessment and Compliance suggested the program not make too many significant changes since their external review has not been completed.

Dr. Van Scoy asked for clarification regarding one issue cited in the assessment plan related to communication with the COE. Dr. Connolly suggested that this was an old issue of knowing who BM students are too late. Dr. Lane reminded the group that this issue has been resolved through his course at the 200 level.

Dr. Lane addressed an outstanding concern of when music candidates are advised to take Praxis I and take the EEDA online modules.

Dr. Van Scoy reminded the program representatives that there is a way to assess Dispositions early, if that is helpful. Dr. Connolly suggested that the program send their forms to her office and she will assist in getting the program’s data in and reported back at certain points during the year.

MME Degree
Dr. Nilges-Charles asked for an overview of the MME. Dr. Lane explained the reason for the degree and the types of candidates who enter and complete the degree. Approximately 75% of the candidates are those who are
already certified to teach. There are three options of completion at the end of this degree. There are approximately 10 candidates in this degree each year. Dr. Lane provided some clarification on some courses and curriculum input. Dr. Dickey asked for clarification on how candidates work on diverse populations. Dr. Lane answered that candidates receive a bulk of this understanding in a course focused on administration, but most of the diversity experience happens across the curriculum.

IV. COMMITTEE RATING RECOMMENDATION FOR PROGRAMS

A. SPEECH-PATHOLOGY
The committee entertained discussion on the committee recommendation for the two speech programs. Dr. Nilges-Charles reminded the members of the possible recommendations and the criteria for each. Members discussed a recommendation of “Progressing.” A special note was made by the committee to have provided a recommendation of “Meeting,” except that the program did not have a current plan for ADEPT.

Strengths included: Accreditation through 2017, Multiple areas for diversity experience, extensive competencies data, nationally-ranked program, Program is addressing current State professional needs, Use of data for program improvement/change

Weaknesses included: No clear ADEPT plan in programs

B. MUSIC EDUCATION
The committee entertained discussion on the recommendation for the three programs.

MAT – Considering the fact that this program has not been officially approved, work in the future should include the development of an assessment plan.

Strengths included: NA
Weaknesses included: NA

BM – Progressing

Strengths included: Progressing toward performance-based assessment, use of rubrics in program, collecting data, maintained NASM approval (at final stages of preparation currently), development of 200 level program course to alert to Praxis I and Professional Program application

Weaknesses included: Make better use of available data; systematically ensuring completion of 100 hours of clinical experiences prior to final internship; systematic plan for ensuring experience with diverse populations

MME - Meeting

Strengths included: Maintained NASM approval (at final stages of preparation currently), clearly aligned with National Board standards

Weaknesses included:

V. QCOM SCHEDULE FOR REMAINDER OF 2009-2010 YEAR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Education (BFA, MAT, IMA, MA)</td>
<td>Thursday, January 28, 2010 – 10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Education and Library and Information Science</td>
<td>Thursday, February 18, 2010 – 10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletic Training</td>
<td>Thursday, March 25, 2010 – 10:00 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

Dr. Lynda Nilges-Charles adjourned the meeting at 3:18 p.m.