

**PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE (QCOM) – YEAR FOURTEEN
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2016**

**WARDLAW 274-N
1:15-3:15**

MINUTES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: DOYLE STEVICK, COLLIN WEBSTER, KIMBERLY WALKER, CINDY VAN BUREN, REGINA WRAGG, TOMMY HODGES, LISA PETERSON, JONATHAN OHRT, TRIA GRANT

- I. Call Meeting to Order – Dr. Doyle Stevick
Dr. Stevick called the meeting to order at 1:25 pm.

- II. Introductions, Overview of Meeting, and Approval of Minutes
New and returning members of the committee were introduced. Dr. Stevick then added that he has been on QCom for a year and a half, and that we will be electing a chair today. This is not an ordinary committee like other faculty committees in that QCom focuses on the Professional Education Unit which includes partners throughout the university such as Theatre, Dance, Foreign Language, etc. QCom is in a position now where we can revisit the purpose of the committee, what it can offer, and what we can contribute to these functions. The Office of Assessment has been tracking data, but what we haven't focused on so far is being a resource to the programs and playing a formative role as opposed to just a summative role. Dean Pedersen is on board with making this a more meaningful experience for everyone involved and not just a process that everyone is required to go through.

- III. Remarks from Dean Pedersen
Dean Pedersen believes that QCom offers a real opportunity for us as a college. So often educators have the need to be reflective and study their own work, and this committee allows for program areas to do this. It allows educators to think about their strengths, spires of excellence, gaps, and look closely at areas they can improve on. QCom needs to be more formative in this whole process and some ongoing feedback to the programs will be helpful in creating a community and receiving buy-in from departments and department chairs. He added that we certainly don't want this to be something that program areas dread and that we also want to create an environment where it is formative in nature and obtain buy-in from programs and program coordinators. Data that we get from this will be very helpful for him...we have to do a better job in education largely and our college specifically of promoting who we are and what we do. There is a lot of value in this committee to allow us to grow and promote ourselves to our constituents...must focus not only on the strengths, but gaps as well. There are areas where we always have room to improve.

Dr. Wragg inquired about Dean Pedersen's vision of being more formative by asking how he envisioned that process. Dean Pedersen remarked that he thinks they key is going to be

engagement. QCom must engage in conversation with program areas, possibly work in teams to meet with programs periodically, and increase the number of people in the committee.

IV. Discussion of Purpose and Function of the Committee

Dr. Stevick discussed his thoughts on the purpose and function of the committee. In the past, QCom has examined programs under a microscope, but only individually. What support could we provide? What structural challenges that may need to take place? We need to look at patterns and inform leadership. Another issue that Dr. Stevick added was the question on whether QCom has any teeth or not in the college. What is to expect from program areas once we produce the feedback letter? In QCom's original purpose, a response was expected to our suggestions and recommendations and program areas were obliged to follow up and act on what was referred to them. This was not for punishment sake, but to encourage a partnership.

Dr. Hodges added that Dr. Stevick and Dean Pedersen both mentioned something that is important...one side of it is the buy-in from program coordinators. The program coordinators must take the information back to program meeting and then share with program and work on how to implement and make changes. Working through the chairs is the first step in that. Dr. Hodges stated that the reason he was able to do well with his presentation last year was because he sat in on meetings for 3 years prior to this. Had he not been here, he may not have fully understood what to/what not to share. He also added that when he listens to the presentations live, he is not sure if the presentation fully represents every program area. This speaks to if our current format is our right format for us.

Dean Pedersen offered that the committee should reach out to program areas and ask about their thoughts on QCom. What value does this bring to you? How would you like to see this operate? Dr. Hodges saw value in the report he received back, but if there are programs that are not using it, why not? What can this committee do to close this gap/disconnect? Let's ask. Dr. Stevick added that part of the issue is that a lot of people do not understand what QCom is and what it is about. Dr. Hodges agreed and suggested that we ask program areas and offices what kind of feedback they might like. Do a needs assessment up front. It's every entity and committee on campus. Dr. Stevick also suggested that we could allow for programs to come to us for formative feedback. We could also produce both a formative and summative letter.

Dr. Van Buren said that a lot of our program areas embrace assessment because they are involved with SPA reporting, but others do not have a basis of assessment. We must change the culture of assessment in that it is not something to fear, but to use for continuous improvement. How do we know these programs are improving and using assessment data?

Dr. Wragg questioned how offices become a part of QCom. Do we want to continue this or focus only on program areas? Dr. Walker can assist us with our SACs requirements and the purpose.

Dr. Stevick responded that Dr. Dickey made a point that when they established QCom, they realized that all of the offices in the building play a critical role in our success and they may not

get the credit. This seemed to be the right place for the offices. We have not seen a review of the college as a whole, and the original purpose stated that the college would be reviewed every 5 years. This year would mainly focus on the offices. How do we know we are doing a good job at the COE?

Dean Pedersen added that he does like the idea of the offices being on here because we all have a purpose. Cindy mentioned that another reason some of the offices may be on here is due to external evaluation requirements and funding. We should ask each office: What would you like all of the offices/college to know about your work? What opportunities would you like for the colleges to see?

Dr. Stevick then passed out a handout regarding CAEP Standard 5, which focuses on continuous improvement, and commented that we would discuss this further at a later meeting.

V. OAA's Functions and Relationship to QCom

Dr. Stevick asked the Office of Assessment and Accreditation to discuss their functions and relationship to QCom. Dr. Wragg stated that being new to the process, we fell in line with how it was working previously, but now we are in a position to evaluate our processes. We do come in and give programs feedback, but there is no investment in that process. We situated people well in assisting and providing a service to these program areas. She also agreed that we should move to a more formative role, which she sees in 2 ways. First, having subgroups that would take on a different aspect of the rubric. Some are not as prepared as others and will assist with their growth in meeting that target level. The in-person presentation and meetings are great, but there has to be more of a space for collaboration. A virtual community where reviews can be done more consistently and not waiting on a cycle period. If we are going to give QCom "teeth", having this space would be important. If there then needs to be a presentation, we can then go from there. A more purposive meeting could then take place and we could solicit from the programs what they would like to hear from us.

Dr. Walker added that the institution as a whole is moving towards this formative feedback and with SACS, it now does not need to be the mad dash every 5 years. The Office of Institutional Research is now meeting with colleges and moving away from the impersonal, dry feedback that may have been given previously.

Dr. Stevick suggested that leadership could also refer programs. If there are programs that are not interested in using assessment data, they could be recommended. Dean Pedersen commented that the committee could build the importance of data and assessment. Dr. Hodges added that he was not trying to be a pessimist, but program areas are meeting external demands through SPAs, SACs, CAEP, etc. and QCom could be seen as just another set of standards to meet. Those that do not have SPAs may need more assistance with a culture of assessment. As the Interim Chair of ITE, he added that one question he often poses is: How does the best of what we know become the standard way of doing things?

Dr. Stevick then asked about OAA's current role with QCom. Dr. Wragg replied that she has been able to get the CAEP self-study story from being able to facilitate QCom, so we should continue to be a part of this. Dr. Stevick added that QCom would assist with this story in any way that they can. Dr. Wragg replied that she and Ms. Peterson will be working to determine what program coordinators' roles are in assessment to then create workshops for program coordinators so they will have a better understanding on why OAA asks for certain data. She then questioned where the expectation to make data driven decisions comes from. Dr. Hodges responded that in a formal way, the program change form that is submitted to the Office of Institutional Research. If key assessments are not being submitted by the program area, that is the chair's responsibility to resolve that. He also suggested that annually or bi-annually QCom submit trend data to chairs. As a chair, he would want to bring up the issue of tracking graduates into the field since that is trend data he determined from being on QCom last year.

Dr. Stevick then suggested that we move up the April 2017 OAA presentation to an earlier date so that we can get a better idea of their role. There are several spring presentations that are critical to the college's structure. How will we evaluate these offices? Relationship to desktop audit?

Dr. Hodges then added that the one presentation that really sticks out to him is the review on the Clinical Experiences office. He has advocated that the director of that office have faculty status and have experience in research. One opportunity that this committee has is to bring in all of the chairs that have been involved in the office and play a part in discussing what needs are/are not being met and who could fill this role. The office serves ITE particularly, so he would want to be involved. Dr. Van Buren then mentioned that someone may start in June in this role, so we may want to move up this February review date.

Dr. Stevick proposed that we add a December meeting and invite all chairs to evaluation of Office of Clinical Experiences. Dr. Van Buren added that Educational Administration is not currently serviced by the Office of Clinical Experiences, but this could be an area that we look into during the presentation.

Dr. Ohrt questioned how offices would be evaluated since the program areas rubric did not relate to offices. Dr. Wragg added that we have several college plans and documents with different visions and goals, but offices have very little input on these documents. What is each office's role? Service needs to be part of the rubric...to what extent are offices serving others appropriately?

Dr. Stevick then proposed that Dr. Wragg will draft the office rubric with visions and goals to present during our October meeting, and we will then vote on the rubric in November. Dr. Wragg also suggested that we create a position in QCom for the leader or chair of the Staff Council Committee. Ms. Peterson added that the first Staff Council meeting is September 23rd and that she will present this to the council committee. Dr. Stevick also suggested that there may also be value with having the chair of this committee work with the steering committee which includes the chairs of all faculty committees.

VI. Election of Committee Chair
Dr. Stevick volunteered to serve as chair of the committee. The committee then unanimously elected Dr. Stevick as chair.

- VII. Schedule for Future Meetings – Confirm Meeting Dates
- Educational Technology (MEd) – October 2016
 - Career Development Facilitator Certificate – October 2016
 - Theatre Education (MAT) – November 2016
 - Dance Education (BA) – November 2016
 - *Office of Clinical Experiences – December 2016 *This was moved from February 2017, we will test a new office rubric out on Clinical Experiences*
 - Foreign Language Education (BA/MAT) – January 2017
 - Office of Program Evaluation / Policy Center / School Improvement Council – January 2017
 - SC Geographic Alliance / SC Middle Grades Initiative / Writing Improvement Network – February 2017
 - Grants & Contracts – March 2017
 - Conferences – March 2017
 - Office of Student Services – April 2017
 - Office of Assessment & Accreditation – April 2017
 - Instructional Support & Facilities – May 2017

The committee unanimously decided to have meetings each first Tuesday of the month at 1:15. Ms. Peterson will request that Dr. Grant (Educational Technology) present in October and then move Dr. Milling's (Dance Education) presentation to November since she is unable to present in early October.

- VIII. Rubrics
- a. Technology Criteria Addition
 - i. Dr. Wragg suggested that the technology criterion could be broken apart into two criteria. Dr. Ohrt questioned if we were evaluating whether the program areas are using the technology or preparing students to use technology? Dr. Hodges added that CAEP has ambiguity as well with this, so both could be evaluated. The committee then unanimously decided that we would keep the rubric as is and edit in the future if needed.
 - b. Office Rubric Discussion
 - i. Regina will bring this back at the next meeting...send any suggestions to Regina and we will walk through as a team

IX. Other Business

There was not any additional business to discuss. Dr. Stevick adjourned the meeting at 3:11 pm.