PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE – YEAR SEVEN
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 2010

Members present:
Lynda Nilges-Charles, QCom Chair & P.E. Chair
Anita Parker, SC Department of Education (substitute for Kathy Meeks)
Jennifer Wilson, ITE Representative
Lynn Harrill, EDLP Representative
Steven Liu, EDST Representative
Renee Connolly, Accreditation and Assessment
Laura Aboyan, Accreditation

Program representatives present:
Donna Shannon, School library program
Elizabeth Miller, School library program
Virginia Wallace, School library program
Sam Hastings, Program Director, School library

I. CALL MEETING TO ORDER AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 28, 2010 MEETING
Dr. Nilges-Charles called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m. and provided an overview of the programs being reviewed during the meeting. The minutes from January 28, 2010, were approved. Dr. Connolly provided an overview of the items the committee members received and some of the bigger issues that may be important to the school library program.

II. REVIEW OF SCHOOL LIBRARY PROGRAMS
Dr. Nilges-Charles welcomed the program representatives and asked for introductions from all members. She provided a short overview of the QCom process and how school library fits into the committee review and structure.

Dr. Hastings provided an overview of the three programs in this area and focused on how the 30-hour school library requirements fit into the structure of the programs. Dr. Shannon highlighted that most students complete the masters and if they enter the certificate and specialist they hold the masters degree. Many of the students are teachers who return to complete the masters and complete requirements for school library certification.

Dr. Shannon explained the data collection process that begins at entry into the school library program and continues through coursework and internship experience. She explained that they have developed a midpoint within the program and have some initial and endpoints. Their ALA process is not as much a data-driven process as other review agencies at this time.

Committee members entertained discussion on available data, rubrics, and processes that are in place. Ms. Parker asked for additional information on how ADEPT is implemented within the program and explained the IHE Portal system that is available to institutions to see how their candidates fare in the ADEPT system once they graduate.

Dr. Nilges-Charles asked for comment on how the program review data and use that to make program changes and updates. Dr. Shannon explained that the assessment plan was developed but admittedly they have not been able to review them on a consistent basis.
Dr. Miller highlighted the clinical experiences that students have in the program. She speaks frequently with students. They look specifically for “coaching librarians” who hold the MLIS degree, have finished in an ALA accredited program, are familiar with ADEPT, are well-versed in the field. Dr. Shannon reminded the members that this is the only school library program in the state. Their clinical experiences are on a part-time basis when students go into the field. They typically work 10-12 weeks for part of the day. Although part time, their supervisors give them midpoint and final evaluations and feedback. Dr. Miller tries to visit all students in their sites (including the distance education sites) but encourages use of technology with her and their peers that are scattered across the sites. The program encourages discussion about conducting work in the field across peer groups via technology. She continues to visit to alleviate problems or concerns that arise and can put special attention into the few students who may not be certified teachers and who may not have been able to complete an experience in schools. Initially, students meet in Columbia before they enter their clinical experience. At that point, she can give them direction in behaviors and expectations in a school. Prior to entering this final experience, they complete course work that involves time and projects in schools/related to school media centers. There is a formal application when individuals are interested in being a Supervisor.

Dr. Connolly asked the program representatives to elaborate on how they ensure diverse experiences for their students in clinical settings. Dr. Miller highlighted some examples of how their students have worked in diverse settings, especially with special needs populations. Additionally, Dr. Wilson asked for comments on systematic ways that the program ensures diverse experiences for all students. Dr. Wallace reminded the members that Supervisors are ALA trained and approved. Dr. Miller commented that in addition to their clinical setting, students are required to “visit” other schools via BlackBoard work and expectations within their coursework. Ms. Parker asked the representatives to elaborate on these virtual visits. Dr. Miller explained that students are asked to complete journal entries and the Supervisor has opportunities for feedback. If she feels that the student’s experience is being compromised or is not as fulfilling as promised, then they quickly take the time to intervene and resolve an issue.

Dr. Wilson asked for comment on how the program is integrating discussion/prevention of bullying into their program. Dr. Miller explained that efforts are being made to inform students that this is happening through the 761 course (more specifically cyber-bullying).

Dr. Harrill asked for clarification on distance education offering versus on-campus offerings. Dr. Shannon explained that 75% of their delivery is distance education and most often (if not always) there is NOT an on-campus cohort. It would be very difficult to complete this program only on campus. A student could complete the program 100% distance education and not have to come to Columbia at all. Members entertained discussion of how the distance education students are supervised and who travels to provide supervision for these experiences.

Dr. Liu asked for clarification on their low-mid-high category system, as presented in the assessment plan and what the program has noticed about their students. Program representatives commented that they have not completed a thorough start-to-finish analysis of what their data are showing them about the progress of their students.

III. COMMITTEE RATING RECOMMENDATION FOR PROGRAMS

The committee consensus for the program’s recommendation is that they are “Progressing”

Strengths: Maintain ALA accreditation; Intuitive, reflective practitioners/faculty in the program; Programs reflect attention to state/region/national needs in discipline; Stellar technology integration within program delivery methods
Weakness: Systematic way of ensuring diverse experience in clinical settings, In-depth orientation for ADEPT reviewers, Systematic data analysis for program improvement/change, Movement from student-centered data to program-level use of data;

Specific comments on Draft ADEPT Plan: The Summative evaluation in Draft ADEPT plan needs to include more specifics relative to ADEPT (mention of a rubric, so need to see the attached rubric); Additional review materials for referenced items mentioned in Draft ADEPT Plan should be included in the plan when submitted to the State Department; Elaborate on the ADEPT process/content training requirements for supervising faculty and cooperating teachers.

IV. QCOM SCHEDULE FOR REMAINDER OF 2009-2010 YEAR

Athletic Training and Counselor Education  Thursday, March 25, 2010 – 10:00 a.m.
Meeting confirmed with program representatives and counselor education rescheduled from Feb. 18

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

There was no other business.

Dr. Nilges-Charles adjourned the meeting at 11:42 a.m.