

## Departmental Meeting

November 15, 2011

*In attendance: Anderson, K. (left at 1:45), Baxter, Beattie (left at 1:47), Browder, Brown, Campbell-Whitley, Conway (for Dane Hughes) (arrived at 1:20; left at 1:32), Correa, Cooke, Flynn, Jordan, Lamorey, Lara-Cinisomo, Lo, Matthews, Rebich, O'Brien, Sherry, Shue, Smith, Spooner, Wakeman, C. Wood, and W. Wood (left at 1:45)*

1. **Call to Order:** Dr. Sherry called the meeting to order at 12:50. He began by thanking Ms. Murphy and Drs. Lara-Cinisomo and Flynn for our lunch today.
  - a. **Approval of Minutes (10/18/11):** Prior to today's meeting, Dr. Sherry emailed the October 18<sup>th</sup> minutes to faculty members for their review. Dr. Correa made a motion to approve the minutes; Dr. Campbell-Whitley seconded the motion. The minutes were approved as presented.
2. **Information Items**
  - a. **SPCD Ph.D. Program Updates and Revisions (Dr. Browder):** Prior to today's meeting, Dr. Browder forwarded faculty members seven documents for their review: (1) *Procedures for Primary Instructor College Teaching by Ph.D. Students*; (2) *SACS SLO 2: Disposition for Ph.D. Students*; (3) *SPED Ph.D. Form 7.2 – Portfolio One Scoring Rubric*; (4) *SPED Ph.D. Form 8.2 – Portfolio Two Scoring Rubric*; (5) *Feedback for Effectiveness on Research Team*; (6) *I Value Your Opinion*; and (7) *SPED Ph.D. Online Portfolio Submissions*.

Based on the materials sent, there are three items to be discussed:

- Procedures for College Teaching: Instructor of Record
- SACS Student Learning Outcomes: Proposed Changes to Portfolio Rubrics/Evaluation Process
- Portfolio Online Submissions

*SACS Student Learning Outcomes: Proposed Changes to Portfolio Rubrics/Evaluation Process:*

Dr. Browder began the discussion by briefly reviewing the SACS Student Learning Outcome (SLO) document and the rubrics that are linked to the SLOs; Forms 7.2 and 8.2. She noted that the existing rubrics have been edited to be consistent with SACS expectations. Faculty members also reviewed the two feedback forms (*Feedback for Effectiveness on Research Team* and *I Value Your Opinion*): Dr. Correa noted that, in general, it appears as though these forms are very “school-related.” They don't seem to be worded to include agencies or non-student research. Dr. Browder stated that the word “school” could be replaced. The faculty discussed the use of the word “student.” and decided “child/student/family” would be better wording to be more encompassing of early childhood services. Dr. Browder requested that faculty members provide her with other wording recommendations to improve the forms.

Based on the discussion and on faculty recommendations, Diane moved; Fred seconded that each of the three documents: {(2) *SACS SLO 2: Disposition for Ph.D. Students*; (3) *SPED Ph.D. Form 7.2 – Portfolio One Scoring Rubric*; (4) *SPED Ph.D. Form 8.2 – Portfolio Two Scoring Rubric*} for the SACS Student Learning Outcomes: Proposed Changes to Portfolio Rubrics/Evaluation Process, be approved. There was no additional discussion. The motion was unanimously approved.

*Portfolio Online Submissions:*

Next Dr. Browder discussed the Ph.D. Program Portfolio Online Submissions. She stated that she met with Dane Hughes about the best way to do this and they decided that; the Moodle Project Folder would meet program needs. Students would submit all portfolio entries through the Project Folder. They would have access for one month (for example, from March 1<sup>st</sup> to April 1<sup>st</sup>). Within one week after the deadline, the site would be opened for faculty review. The basic difference for faculty members is that instead reviewing a hardcopy notebook, they would review all student products directly on Moodle. She also noted that the faculty would not be able to request hard copy documents from students – all will be submitted and reviewed online. Faculty members discussed their options in using the Moodle site.

*Procedures for College Teaching: Instructor of Record:*

Dr. Browder quickly reviewed the document entitled *Procedures for College Teaching: Instructor of Record*. She reminded faculty members that the doctoral student doing the college teaching gets the grade; the faculty member of record supervises the student and gets the pay. She made a motion, that the document be approved; Dr. Spooner seconded. There was considerable discussion about some specifics. Faculty members discussed how the instructor of

record is chosen (Diane noted that the Doctoral Coordinator recruits a supervising faculty member in the following priority order: (a) faculty who teach the course on a regular basis, (b) other faculty who have expertise in the course content, and (c) adjunct faculty who teach the course. The faculty then reviewed the procedures which were listed on the handout... Dr. Browder reminded the faculty that the supervising faculty would attend between 25-50% of the class sessions. She also pointed the faculty to the section on “asynchronous courses” on the handout. Because asynchronous courses depend almost entirely on prior preparation, these will not be approved for doctoral student college teaching. Dr. Matthews wondered if an exception could be made if the student assists in developing the asynchronous course (if the student provides documentation as to how they helped to develop the course). (The handout states that any exceptions must be approved by the PhD Program Committee and include documentation of how the student will make a substantial contribution to creating the course materials.) Dr. Browder, however, thinks we should not approve asynchronously delivered courses for college teaching.

Dr. Anderson noted that that the faculty member of record should be in attendance for at least 50% of the the class time because of potential liability and accountability to the students who have paid for the class). Dr. O’Brien stated that the students may feel like it’s a lack of trust if the faculty are there too much. Dr. Anderson feels that the faculty are more likely to be there should problems arise if they attend at least 50% of the classes. Dr. Sherry added that the student needs to let the faculty member of record know if there are any disposition problems so that the faculty member can be of assistance when needed. Dr. Lo stated that she is more comfortable with 50%. Dr. O’Brien feels that we might word it “a target of 50% of classes, but no less than 25%.” Dr. Sherry recommended that this item be returned to the PhD. Program Committee for further discussion to clarify some of the questions and issues raised today Faculty members may consider it again at the January meeting.

- b. Ph.D. Program Portfolio Online Submissions: IT Procedures Using Moodle** (*Ed Conway for Dane Hughes*): Faculty members had numerous questions for Ed regarding (1) how the students would upload their work and (2) how submissions will be organized (e.g., pre-named folders? student named folders?). Faculty discussed possible options, while Ed explained the limitations of the site. The faculty also discussed feedback options (if the students were not able to get into Moodle at that point, would they send feedback via email? hardcopy?). Dr. Sherry noted that that there were many unanswered questions at this time. However, he thought that we can approve the “concept” of online submission and work out the details for discussion at the PhD. Program Committee Meeting. Based on the discussion of the online submission procedure, Dr. Browder moved and Dr. Wood (Wendy) seconded that the Online Submission Process be approved. Additional clarification of the details of submission and review of Portfolios will be completed in Committee.
- c. College of Education Winter Holiday Social Progressive Lunch/Reading Day 12/8/11** (*Dr. O’Brien*): Dr. O’Brien reported that everyone has signed up for the annual progressive luncheon.
- d. University Budget Update** (*Dr. Sherry*): Dr. Sherry stated because of the short time left in the meeting, he will add this topic to the next meeting’s agenda. He did say, however, the university may be facing a rescission of 2% for 2011-2012. If that figure goes higher than 3% then colleges and departments may be asked to give funds back. Nothing is known for sure at this time, but be aware that budget issues may surface again.
- e. Brief Update: SACS Student Learning Outcomes Reports** (*Dr. Sherry*): Dr. Sherry told the group that Christine Robinson’s reviews were constructive and helpful; he said, too, that her recommended changes are not extensive.
- f. NCATE Standard #4 – Diversity: Faculty Input** (*Dr. Anderson*): Prior to today’s meeting, the members of the faculty were emailed a handout entitled, “*College of Education – A/CI Standard IV – Diversity Committee.*” However, given that Dr. Anderson left the meeting to meet her class, this discussion will have to wait. Dr. Lamorey suggested that input can be solicited electronically.
- g. Holiday Gathering – Saturday, December 10** (*Dr. Sherry*): Dr. Sherry noted that an Evite has gone out for the 5<sup>th</sup> Annual Holiday Gathering on December 10<sup>th</sup> and that he hopes everyone will be able to join in on the fun.

### **3. Action Items:**

- a. **Ph.D. Program Revisions:** See above.

### **4. Open Agenda:**

- 5. **Adjourn:** There being no further business; the meeting was adjourned at 1:52.