

**PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION UNIT QUALITY ASSURANCE COMMITTEE – YEAR FOURTEEN
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2016**

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

MINUTES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: DOYLE STEVICK, KIMBERLY WALKER, CINDY VAN BUREN, REGINA WRAGG, LISA PETERSON, JONATHAN OHRT, DOUG MEADE, JENNIFER GILLESPIE, CRAIG WHEATLEY

PROGRAM AREA PRESENTERS: MICHAEL GRANT, KATHY EVANS

I. Call Meeting to Order – Dr. Doyle Stevick

Dr. Stevick called the meeting to order at 1:20 pm.

II. Welcome and Approval of Minutes

New members that were unable to attend the last meeting were introduced and Dr. Stevick gave an overview of the committee to these members. He said that the program areas give an overview of their program area and data with a 10 minute presentation and then the committee can pose questions regarding their state and needs. We then work our way through the rubric and share our feedback in a letter to the program coordinators and chairs. Dr. Van Buren added that we try to be a service and advocate for program areas. Dr. Wragg added that the diversity of those members at the table provides the program areas a new perspective they may not have received before.

Dr. Ohrt then moved to approve the minutes from the September meeting. Dr. Ohrt seconded the motion. The minutes were subsequently approved.

III. Review of Educational Technology (M.Ed.) – Michael Grant (1:30)

While support worked to troubleshoot technology, Dr. Grant gave a quick overview of his program area while Dr. Stevick posed a few questions. Michael arrived at the university two years ago, but the program has been in place for over ten years. He replaced the one person and until one year ago, he was that one person, but now there has been additional faculty added. With his Master's degree, he has five faculty, three of whom are new this fall and four are on the tenure track. There are two professors in Aiken; one just retired and was replaced with a new assistant professor. Historically, Aiken has taught 2/3rds of the courses. Dr. Grant was hired as an assistant professor, but he was tenured, promoted, and almost full at his previous institution so he is going up for tenure and promotion to Associate professor now.

Dr. Stevick asked if there were accommodations in place for the unusual loads the program is facing. Dr. Grant replied that he cannot do any course releases because he is needed to teach. Educational Technology flew under the radar, partly because Aiken played a major role, and there is little or no institutional memory, so the faculty members have rebuilt everything themselves over time. When Dr. Grant arrived, there was no one who could explain the history or rationale or

traditional practice for what had been done. The program concentration had already been approved at CHE, but few at USC were aware that this approval was happening. Dr. Grant is mentoring three faculty members, but also has administrative responsibilities. Dr. Meade asked if the college was aware of his load. Dr. Grant replied that the program is in transition mode...at the college level, they are aware, but he is in the process of training faculty.

Dr. Stevick said that we see our role with QCom as advocating for program areas...what would your dream be for the program? Dr. Grant replied that the best case scenario would be that there would be another senior faculty member. Because the doctoral program (Ed.D.) is research intensive/research heavy and every semester there is a new cohort, he did the projections looking at the first three cohorts and every year he would have to add a faculty member to keep up with teaching loads and advising loads. He is considering proposing that they only continue to host one cohort a year after the first year at the doctoral level as opposed to three a year. He said that there are 17 new doctoral (Ed.D.) students in this cohort and there could have easily been more due to the competitive application pool, but they decided to cap it at this number due to available resources. Dr. Grant added that this is the only doctoral program that is currently in the state for this degree area, and Dr. Stevick replied that it seems to be a tremendous opportunity in a field that is booming and will continue to be.

Dr. Grant then began his overview of the program areas with his prepared PowerPoint.

M.Ed. in Education Technology:

- 36-hour advanced degree with no licensure/certification
- Shared degree program with USC Aiken
- 100% online
- Accreditation occurs both at Columbia & Aiken
- Approximately 12 graduates per year
- Historically, approximately 2/3 of courses taught at USC-Aiken

Ed.D. in Curriculum & Instruction –Ed Tech Concentration

- 60 hours
- Began Fall 2016
- 100% online
- Admitted 17 students
- Cohort based
- Embedded dissertation
- Action research methodology

Dr. Grant added that all rubrics and key assessments for the M.Ed. program are aligned with AECT standards, developed by tenure-track faculty primarily at USC-Aiken, and all are performance based. The AECT sets standards that the programs follow, but they are actually accredited by the state. The articulation of their curriculum requires students to be successful. Across the key assessments, students consistently perform at the Target and Acceptable levels.

Dr. Grant then discussed student review and progress procedures. At least twice per semester, faculty meet to discuss the program and students. They review student progress, student by student. Because of the nature of the field, the courses change rapidly. They make course corrections frequently to update technologies or delivery/engagement methods, and one change in a course directly affects the others. Many of these changes are recorded in the Course Change

form for USC Columbia faculty. Even when they don't specifically teach a technology, they may require students to use a technology. Dr. Grant added that the Masters Portfolio defense is online and attended by all faculty with revisions required. Typically, close to 100% of their majors have full-time jobs already.

Dr. Grant then discussed the overall strengths and challenges of the programs.

M.Ed. in Education Technology Strengths:

- Been a successful & low-resource-intensive program to sustain
- Highly collaborative
- Well respected by alumni
- Our students are successful & are often promoted with additional responsibilities

Ed.D. in Curriculum & Instruction –Ed Tech Concentration Strengths:

- Competitive applications
- Leverages best practices on blended & online learning
- Reflects high quality distance education & rigorous
- Premature to make other claims

M.Ed. in Education Technology Challenges:

- Flown under the radar
- 1 faculty member at Columbia until this fall
- Columbia's historical role
- No institutional memory; no assignment of advisor
- 4/5 untenured faculty; 3/5 new faculty
- Marketing: Leveraging AP; gradonline; other markets
- Program in transition

Ed.D. in Curriculum & Instruction –Ed Tech Concentration Challenges:

- Bound by a curriculum Dr. Grant didn't design entirely
- Collaborative >> independent
- No 800-level courses; no extra Ed Tech courses
- Program administration is significant

Dr. Wragg asked how they keep track of graduates. Dr. Grant replied that they use Google Plus Committee, Facebook, and Twitter accounts regularly which helps tremendously in keeping up with students. Often alumni come to them to keep on track. It is a very loose means of keeping track of students and Dr. Grant does not know previous students before his arrival.

Dr. Grant shared opportunities for growth. For the MEd, they plan to target other populations with focus on adult learning and integrate graduate certificate programs. With the Ed.D., growth and sustainability are double-edged swords. They do plan expansion of course offerings for Ed Tech alumni. Looking ahead for the M.Ed., they plan for significant curriculum revisions/updates, increased rigor and more specific experiences with ID models, increased experiences with development tools/tech, and more external relationships. With the Ed.D., the program has increased expectations for the comprehensive exam, defense & candidacy and may

reduce cohort admissions. They are also exploring options to establish full-time Ph.D. within 3 to 5 years as a collaboration or joint program with Educational Psychology & Research.

Mr. Wheatley then asked who they market the programs towards. Dr. Grant replied that this is mainly two different populations: K-12 teachers and instructional designers/developers such as eLearning developers.

Dr. Wragg asked if the program collects data on years of experience, racial ethnicity, etc. and since they do target two populations, how does your program choose to diversify these candidates? Dr. Grant replied that this is part of the data that the program area collects, but it is not published. For the doctoral degree, they are very strategic in ensuring that there is a diverse cohort...not only gender and ethnicity are considered, but work experience and location as well.

IV. Committee Consensus on Program

Strengths of the programs were noted and include:

The programs have exceptional leadership in Dr. Michael Grant who is passionate about the success and growth of these programs. He and his colleagues have a willingness to continuously welcome new opportunities, such as Dr. Grant's recent decision to become a new Professional Development School liaison in the midst of numerous other responsibilities and being in a transition period. The programs have competitive applications, and almost 100% of graduates are successful and promoted with additional responsibilities. Technology crosses into all areas of their programs and other programs would benefit from Dr. Michael Grant and his colleagues' expertise. The programs are marketed towards multiple populations, P-12 teachers included. The selection process ensures that there are diverse cohorts with not only gender and ethnicity considered, but work experience and location as well.

Areas for Improvement were noted and include:

As is the case with other online programs, some students may have issues with selecting meaningful practicums. The programs have flown under the college's radar for several years, and Dr. Grant has been put in a position of taking on most of the program's administrative tasks along with teaching courses. Although he has done an exceptional job, additional resources would be beneficial. With only five faculty, additional support and/or an addition of faculty would better allow for growth.

Recommendations:

The Office of Clinical Experiences is in transition and is aware of the challenges of placements for online courses. This office could assist with field placements and discuss the various experiences of current students and how to progress. An increase in faculty/staff would allow for less burden on the program coordinator and allow the program to be in a better position of creating the full time PhD program. Create a formal, strategic way of tracking candidates into the field since now it is mostly the alumni that is seeking out contact. This is a unit-wide issue for many program areas, and the Office of Assessment and Accreditation can assist you in working through this.

V. Review of Career Development Facilitator Certificate (CDFC) – Kathy Evans (2:15)

Dr. Evans started by giving a brief overview of the CDFC program. There was a need for Career Development Facilitators to work in schools to fulfill the Education and Economic Development Act (EEDA) requirements. It was originally designed to recruit undecided undergraduates to the fields of counseling and education, and was designed so that graduates of the program would have a head start in the Counselor Education Ed.S. Program. The EEDA funds were cut and schools stopped hiring individuals with a CDFC only. Schools began to encourage counselors to obtain the CDFC instead. Students in the Ed.S. School Counseling program were able to increase their marketability by obtaining the CDFC.

The program requires a Bachelor's degree in any major and admission to the graduate school. It is a total of 18 credit hours and takes one to two years to complete. It also fulfills the educational requirements for the Global Career Development Facilitator Credential. Dr. Stevick then asked if the program had data on the number of students that go on to receive the Global Career Development Facilitator Credential and if there is value in this credential. Dr. Evans replied that they do not keep track of this data, but that it would be helpful. The certificate is valuable because students can take it with them anywhere they may go outside of SC. There are approximately 12 concurrently enrolled Counselor Education Ed.S. students, two concurrently enrolled High Education Student Affairs Students, and two certificate only students. Currently four faculty members and two doctoral students teach courses for the CDFC. Only one faculty member is assigned a course that is required for the CDFC only. Students can apply for admission any semester, and the culminating course is a Career Practicum.

Dr. Evans then discussed rubrics and credentialing. The CDFC was developed by the National Career Development Association (NCDA), and USC's program exceeds those requirements set by the NCDA. The rubrics for the four Ed.S. courses meet CACREP requirements and also exceed the NCDA/CCE requirements. Data are collected on these four courses that students take as part of the Ed.S. program, but not on the other courses. Dr. Evans said that they will begin to collect data on the other courses this semester. They will also collect graduation data and follow-up data on the CDFC only graduates this year since this has not been done in the past.

Dr. Evans then discussed the overall strengths, areas for growth, and future of the program.

Strengths:

- The CDFC program is very popular among school counseling students. Almost all students co-enroll in the CDF program.
- The CDFC program is gaining popularity among the HESA students. In the past year, they have had three HESA students come through the program.
- The CDFC has enhanced school counseling students' ability to work effectively in middle and high school settings.

Areas for Growth:

- More intentional data collection.
- More faculty need training to certify students in the program.
- Better promotion of the program to HESA and related graduate programs.
- Better connections with potential employers since the school pipeline has dried up.

Future of the Program:

- Increase in the number of concurrently enrolled students in Counselor Education, HESA and other programs.
- Greater connections with future employers of CDFC only applicants.
- Greater connections with the USC Career Center employees and programs. (Possibly have future practicums in this setting.)

Mr. Wheatley commented that this area is valued highly in school districts, Lexington One especially, and this is something that he finds wonderful for their schools.

Dr. Wragg asked if there were ever opportunities for faculty to discuss the CDFC program to review and make changes. Dr. Evans replied that they do review the Ed.S. students, but have not been doing so for the CDFC students specifically, but this is a practice that they plan to begin. She then said that typically most students co-enroll—some students in the counseling program want to take the Certificate program courses, but do not necessarily want to take additional coursework.

Dr. Stevick then asked Dr. Evans where she sees the program in the next five years. She replied that she hopes there will be paraprofessionals back in schools, but is afraid that they are going to continue what they are doing to save money. For undergraduates that are not entering the program or were not accepted, this could also be an option for them. Dr. Meade then asked if undergraduates take this under the accelerated program. The accelerated program is the new version of senior privilege where students can take courses as part of both their undergraduate and graduate programs. Dr. Evans replied that this would be valuable to students since there are two courses that students can take and transfer in as undergraduates, but they would have to get the word out about the accelerated program.

VI. Committee Consensus on Program

Strengths of the programs were noted and include:

The program coordinator is sensitive to the needs of policy and the needs of the P-12 community in evolving this program. She does an exceptional job of navigating the shifting situations in the field. The certificate program is very popular among School Counseling students and gaining popularity among Higher Education and Student Affairs (HESA) students for co-enrollment. School Counseling students that have obtained this certificate have an enhanced ability to work effectively in middle and high school settings. The rubrics for the key assessments in the program exceed the National Career Development Association (NCDA)'s requirements and technology is integrated throughout these assessments.

Areas for Improvement were noted and include:

The program has not been capturing assessment, diversity, or employment data on students that are not concurrently enrolled in other Counseling programs. Although faculty does meet to discuss students that are enrolled in the Ed.S., there is not data to show growth or to inform necessary program changes based on the performance of these students that are enrolled in solely the certificate program.

Recommendations:

Begin to track assessment, progression, diversity, and employment data on all students enrolled in the certificate program, including those that are not concurrently enrolled in other Counseling programs. Since the program is gaining popularity with the HESA program, you could strengthen this relationship and better promote to HESA and other related graduate programs to increase enrollment. Forming a relationship with the Career Center could also allow for better promotion of the program and more meaningful practicums for CDFC students.

VII. Office Rubric Discussion

Due to time constraints, this agenda item was moved to the November meeting. Ms. Peterson will send these documents out to the committee for review prior to the next meeting.

VIII. Schedule for Future Meetings

- Dance Education (BA) – November 2016
- Theatre Education (MAT) – November 2016
- Office of Clinical Experiences – December 2016
- Foreign Language Education (BA/MAT) – January 2017
- Office of Program Evaluation / Policy Center / School Improvement Council – January 2017
- SC Geographic Alliance / SC Middle School Association / 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

IX. Adjournment

Dr. Stevick adjourned the meeting at 3:30 pm.