

**PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE – YEAR TWELVE
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25, 2015**

Members Present:

Katie Barber, Richland School District 2
Dennis Dotterer, SC Department of Education
Wendee Evering, Richland School District 2
Fred Greer, EDST Representative and Chair
Thomas Hodges, ITE Representative
Allison Jacques, Assistant Dean for External Partnerships
Zach Kelehear, Associate Dean Academic Affairs
Jim Mensch, PEAT Representative
Tiffany Rogers, Office of Assessment
Nicole Spensley, Institutional Research and Assessment

Program Representatives:

Collin Webster, Physical Education Programs
Jim Mensch, MS Athletic Training
Jeremy Searson, BS Athletic Training

I. Call Meeting to order

Dr. Jacques called the meeting to order at 2:04 p.m.

II. Introductions, Overview of Meeting, and Approval of Minutes

Dr. Jacques told committee members that once the notes from the February 2015 meeting were ready, they would be provided to committee members for approval.

III. Review of the BS, MAT, and PhD in Physical Education and the BS and MS in Athletic Training

Dr. Webster gave a brief overview of the Physical Education programs. The program at USC is one of the few national programs that still offers three degree tracks. The BS and MAT programs lead to K-12 licensure. The PhD has two concentrations: one in physical education pedagogy and one in developmental foundations (motor learning/development). There are currently 65 students in the BS program. There has been a decline in enrollment this year. This reflects a national trend in physical education programs, and is not expected to continue. Dr. Webster is confident that the program will continue to have good enrollment, especially since the program has been nationally accredited for many years. Both the BS and MAT in physical education have received national recognition from NCATE. Although the program received conditions with their last review, Ms. Aboyan noted they are easy to fix. Dr. Hodges also commented that such conditions were simple to fix, and were common in other programs.

The MAT currently has nine students, but enrollment so tend to fluctuate. Sometimes the program has had 15-16 students, while at times there have been fewer than five. Despite the fluctuation in numbers, Dr. Webster said that the MAT is a consistent program. The same assessment methods are used for the BS and MAT programs. Dr. Webster commented that they are essentially the same program, with the only difference being the time frame for graduation. The programs have a high graduation rate, with most students remaining in the field of physical education and many of them staying in South Carolina. The program does not currently track their graduates, but would like to do a better job of this in the future.

The PhD is consistently growing, with a total of 14 full-time students and 18 total students currently in the program. The program anticipates having 20 students in the program within the next year. The PhD in

physical education is one of the largest in the country, and most other PhD programs are also in the Southeast. The program uses the apprenticeship model. The program gives students appropriate experiences in order to know what it would be like to work in a research faculty position, do not try to dissuade students from pursuing non-research academic paths. The program involves 60 hours of coursework, a comprehensive exam, and a scholarship component (which includes the dissertation). Additionally, students are required to be co-author on two studies, present at one national conference by their third year, and to assist faculty in reviewing for publication. If students are not graduate assistants, they will not receive the same opportunities to teach, however all PhD students are required to prove that they can be effective instructors at least once during their program. As part of the service component, students must serve on a departmental committee for at least one year and help with service projects. While assist-type service roles are most common, leadership roles would be the target level of performance for students in the program. Ratings of target, acceptable, and unacceptable are used in evaluation.

Dr. Hodges asked if the experiences were scalable. Dr. Webster responded that as more students enroll in the program, the more scalable the experiences will be because productivity grows with more students. This results in students getting involved in other PhD projects. The program prepares PhD graduates to be team oriented scholars instead of independent scholars. Dr. Webster also added that directing dissertations is a challenge due to only having three pedagogy faculty. The program hopes to have another faculty member soon.

Dr. Mensch mentioned that the program recently lost three crucial faculty members, which would have an effect on any program. Despite this, the program feels that it is regaining momentum. Dr. Webster stated that their recruitment of new students has been fair, but they would like to be more proactive in their recruitment. Mr. Dotterer asked which conditions from NCATE were an easy fix. Dr. Webster said comingling, revision of assessment 4, and reorganization of how data is presented were given. He also stated that last time they had more conditions, and it only took them a couple of days to remedy. Therefore, he is confident that the adjustments can be made quickly, and Ms. Aboyan has estimated that they can be done by September (although the deadline is not until March). Dr. Mensch also mentioned that their website is in non-compliance but has been for a decade. He elaborated on the comingling issue by saying that inappropriate relationships were an issue when females were placed with football teams. Dr. Mensch also mentioned that there is an interdisciplinary collaboration between the Athletic Training and Physical Education program regarding the teacher certification.

Dr. Mensch gave an overview of the MS in athletic training. This program used to be the MS in Physical Education with a concentration in athletic training. While students could get certified at the bachelors level, they received two years of experience with an athletic training concentration. The course content did not initially match the degree option, butadiene of last fall, the MS in athletic training has been added, eliminating the MS in PE. This is an externally funded program with 17 to 38 available slots. Students in the program serve as athletic trainers in high schools and at various other sites. The MS in athletic training is a two year program with the mission of providing at variety of experiences to students. There is no thesis requirement, but students are required to complete an evidence-based project, with the end goal being a publication. Clinical classes have been added. Site evaluation and student evaluations serve as quality assurance measures before students are sent to a site. There are few MS athletic training programs in the country. They have been working on the MS degree program for 7 years, and the next step is moving towards accreditation. Dr. Mensch said the program keeps track of its graduates via social media sites. He also said that grant productivity, scholarship, and quality of faculty are strengths of the program. Dr. Mensch also commented on the amount of time it takes to manage all of their clinical sites, saying that they are currently advertising for someone to help with the clinical portion of the program. Ms. Spensley asked about assessment methods. Dr. Mensch said the research project was added, which helps keep students on track in year one and year two. They evaluate the site and the students' performance is

evaluated by the sites themselves. This information is tracked through Survey Monkey, but the data has not been pulled together. Dr. Mensch said they could be doing a better job of assessing the quality of where students end up post-graduation. Students also come into the program with high GRE scores and GPAs. Dr. Barber asked about the evaluation process. Dr. Mensch said that it is a form containing 5-point Likert items.

Dr. Searson provided an overview of the BS in Athletic Training. The number of students was 32, but they now have 83. The program has 83 preceptors and 42 unique clinical sites they use on campus. They are currently preparing for accreditation, which will occur in 3 years. Evaluation templates have to have 70% passage rates; over the past 4 years, the passage rate has been 84%, with those who took it in February achieving 100%. The program breaks the BOC exam into 5 domains and they backtrack information to specific classes in order to find areas for program improvement. Students are assessed at midterm and final, and preceptors attend a conference at each time. Students evaluate preceptors at the end of the semester, and unless issues are presented, that information is help for 1 year before it is released to the preceptor and the site. Reflection papers are used as informal measures of student progress. Dr. Searson said the program plans to use Chalk and Wire to better connect student learning to performance in the field and to look at data for evaluators. Dr. Searson said that the program has many strengths, including its growth and ability to maintain, its clinical sites, having a stable faculty, and the clinical experiences being provided across the program. He said that they are asked how athletic training is in the College of Education, and CAATE will be looking for statements that align with allied health professions. Dr. Kelehear asked if they anticipate the BS in athletic training disappearing. Dr. Searson said the program is evolving. He added that eliminating the BS would create a number of issues because more people apply and attend the BS instead of the MS. Additionally, undergraduate students would end up taking prerequisites in other programs (e.g., exercise science) if the BS was eliminated. Dr. Kelehear asked if exercise science could take over their domain in terms of athletic presence, and why they aren't comparative to field placements. Dr. Searson said there are too many student in exercise science for field placements.

IV. Committee Consensus on Programs

The committee discussed the assessment materials for the BS in Athletic Training program and came to the consensus that the program is performing at the **“Meets Expectations”** level.

Strengths of the program were noted and include:

- Diversity and number of preceptors and clinical sites
- National standing of program
- Variety of clinical experiences across program
- Use of BOC exam to backtrack into program

Areas for Improvement were noted and include:

- None were cited at this time

The Committee Further Encourages:

- Continued assessment of appropriateness for student site placements
- Continuing to develop assessment plan based on new Chalk and Wire resource

The committee discussed the assessment materials for the MS in Athletic Training program and came to the consensus that due to transition within the degree program, we are **unable to provide a rating at this time.**

Strengths of the program were noted and include:

- Diversity and number of preceptors and clinical sites
- National standing of program
- Variety of clinical experiences across program
- Use of BOC exam to backtrack into program
- Assessment methods (student and site evaluations)
- Seeking accreditation

Areas for Improvement were noted and include:

- Limited data

The Committee Further Encourages:

- Collection and availability of data regarding standing/rating

The committee discussed the assessment materials for the BS in Physical Education program and came to the consensus that the program is performing at the **“Meets Expectations”** level.

Strengths of the program were noted and include:

- Array of assessments and assessment data

Areas for Improvement were noted and include:

- Analysis of data (looking at the “why” of student performance data)
- No proactive plan for declining student numbers

The Committee Further Encourages:

- Explanation of how program will address areas of poor student performance on assessments
- Elaboration on plan of action for recruiting students to program
- Create a plan of action to address conditions from accreditation body

Further review of the data also resulted in the following question for your consideration: *Please consider student scores and what they mean for your program. Be prepared to respond to the analyses of negative trends in candidate performance data (in particular, assessments 5 and 8).*

The committee discussed the assessment materials for the MAT in Physical Education program and came to the consensus that the program is performing at the **“Meets Expectations”** level.

Strengths of the program were noted and include:

- Graduation rate
- Pass rates on tests
- GPA and GRE scores of students

Areas for Improvement were noted and include:

- No tracking of graduates

The Committee Further Encourages:

- Considering ways to consolidate BS and MAT programs for more efficient use of resources

The committee discussed the assessment materials for the PhD in Physical Education program and came to the consensus that although the presentation was strong, **an absence of data does not allow us to give a rating at this time.**

Strengths of the program were noted and include:

- Assessment rubrics
- Apprenticeship model
- Preparing students for research faculty positions

Areas for Improvement were noted and include:

- Presentation of data

The Committee Further Encourages:

- Exploration of new Chalk and Wire system for data collection and analysis

V. Schedule for Future Meetings

Programs to Review 2014-15

- Museum of Education & Educational Foundations of Inquiry (PhD) – April 2015
- Special Education (MAT/MEd/PhD) – May 2015

VI. Other Business

Dr. Jacques adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.