

Minutes for the Called ***Carolina Core Meeting***

August 10, 2016, 9:00-10:30 pm

Thomas Cooper Library, Room 204

Members Present:

Helen Doeringhaus (Administrative Co-Chair), Chris Holcomb (Faculty Co-Chair), Joseph Askins, Susan Beverung, Ron Cox, Rob Dedmon, Kris Finnigan (ex-officio), Daniel Freedman, Brian Habing, Mackenzie King, Cliff Leaman, Manton Matthews, Douglas Meade, Alfred Moore, Ginger Nickles-Osborne, Claire Robinson (ex-officio), Ed Munn Sanchez, Jennifer Tilford (ex-officio)

Members Absent:

Pam Bowers, Sara Corwin, James Cutsinger, Andy Gillentine, Augie Grant (ex-officio), Kathleen Kirasic (ex-officio), Gene Luna, Chris Nesmith, Andrea Tanner, Kathy Snediker (ex-officio)

Specialty Team Chairs Present:

(Joseph Askins), Mindy Fenske, (Chris Holcomb), Jeff Wilson

Specialty Team Chairs Absent:

David Hitchcock, Judy Kalb, George Khushf, Mary Robinson, Adam Schor, Shelley Smith

Guests:

Sabrina Andrews

Welcome and Introductions (Chris Holcomb)

Chris Holcomb welcomed everyone and went over the agenda. Introductions were made around the room.

Bulletin Changes (Rob Dedmon)

We've been discussing transfer equivalency since spring and voted to approve direct equivalency. Rob provided a handout on Bulletin edits for fall of 2017, showing a comparison of the current wording in the Bulletin and that proposed. The proposed wording would remove the note that restricts full transfer of the course. Rob prepared a justification (included in the handout) for the Bulletin changes, with help from Cliff Leaman. Kris Finnigan described the approval process of the Bulletin changes through the APPS system, which requires that the department for each course in the proposal submit approval through the system. The justification language can be the same for all courses affected by the direct equivalency decision.

Rob went through the justification for full transfer equivalency of Carolina Core courses, including overlay components. Kris suggested that someone take on the task of starting the process for all of the affected departments, instead of asking an individual from each department to do it. Doug Meade added that one person could enter all of the requests, but with notification to the departments before actually submitting the changes for the Bulletin. It was suggested to inform the departments with a short meeting. Helen reiterated that there is a short deadline for the approvals, in order for them to go to Faculty Senate for approval for the 2017-2018 Bulletin. Doug and Kris agreed to work on setting up a short meeting with the representatives from the various departments by the end of August to inform them of the changes in transfer equivalency for Carolina Core courses.

Doug made two suggestions regarding the wording of the justification for the Bulletin changes: 1) Replace "overlay" with "overlay eligible" in the justification and in the "Note" for each of the courses," and 2) include an explanation of the phrase "transfer equivalency" to facilitate better understanding. It was brought up that departments may have questions about this transfer equivalency policy, but the comparisons and research that was done by the Carolina Core Committee will support the decision to accept the transfer courses as direct equivalencies.

The question was also raised about the Carolina Core applicability of transfer courses that do not have direct equivalencies. The understanding was that courses evaluated during the transfer review process as not being a direct equivalent and assigned the 001T designation would not fulfill Carolina Core requirements, but that those making the degree-granting decisions in the various colleges could make the determination of whether or not to accept the course as fulfilling a Carolina Core requirement. This was countered as being contrary to the goal of transparency, but understood that the ability to make degree-granting decisions cannot be taken away from the colleges. Rob explained that he was in agreement to maintain transparency, but that the new transfer review process is much more transparent, as it allows for the specific departments to make the determination of transfer equivalency for courses within their own content area. In the case of a course that is assigned the 001T

designation, the course would not be applicable to the Carolina Core. However, examples were shared of courses that are assigned the 001T designation, but also have been assigned as fulfilling specific Carolina Core requirements during the transfer review process. Example: A World Civilization course from Central Piedmont Community College was given the designation of HIST 001T, but on the Registrar's transfer page, it showed as fulfilling the GHS requirement. Example: A Humanities course in composition from Wofford was showing on the Registrar's transfer page as "HUMA 001T or ENGL 101," but there was no Carolina Core equivalency.

Chris reminded the Committee that we had not yet approved the minutes from the previous meeting. The vote was to approve the minutes with an amendment to the attendance of a few members' names missing.

Update on INF transfer equivalency (Chris)

Chris and Joe reviewed 17 of the top transfer institutions and found that 12 of the 17 satisfy the INF requirement, including 4 of the top 5, but AP and IB courses did not satisfy the INF requirement. Aaron Marterer has been working on collecting more information on how many students receive INF credit from AP and IB exams, but his data analytics team did not have enough time to put together a report before this meeting and are still working on it. Also, at the last meeting, we discussed exploring courses where INF may already be covered. It was proposed to invite Speech 140 to submit a proposal for an INF designation. Joe and Chris are planning to meet with Jonathan Edwards in the next few weeks to discuss this possibility. Business is also looking at approving MGMT 250 to include INF. Mackenzie King doesn't think that it will be able to be included for the 2017-2018 Bulletin because the curriculum is being redone this year. Helen suggests that the department talk with Joe now to get it approved for this year, as it may be easier to incorporate it as they redo the curriculum, instead of changing it later.

Update on POLI 201

Helen shared that George and Ed are doing a study similar to that for the INF transfer equivalency and that the team feels that the VSR component is met. Ed added that they also looked at AP and IB curriculum and feel that the VSR component is satisfied.

Assessment

Helen gave an overview of the SACSCOC (our accrediting organization) review process and reminded the committee that this year is the fifth year (mid-level) review. SACS has been really interested in general education assessment at USC. Fifteen years ago, when SACS evaluated USC, we were in the process of reviewing and updating the general education curriculum. Eight or nine years ago, we redid the curriculum and now have an assessment component. SACS has been pleased with our progress. We need to be prepared this year for the review. Faculty participation in assessment is an important part of this review process because OIRAA will need 15-25 faculty for each assessment. The Office of Institutional Review for Assessment and Analytics (OIRAA) is responsible for general education assessment. Donald Miles is going to be the new director (replacing Nicole Spensley) that covers assessment. Sabrina Andrews is the new director of OIRAA.

Sabrina provided a handout on the proposed Carolina Core Assessment Schedule. Sabrina and Donald would like to set up meetings for the specialty team chairs to review the schedule, go over the rubric and make sure that everyone understands how we are going to gather the information needed during the review process.

Review phase: In Fall 2016, the data collected in Spring 2016 (SCI, VSR, and CMS) will be reviewed. Raters need to be identified immediately for each area to go through the artifacts. Artifacts are the assignments that are identified at the beginning of the collection phase that faculty collect from their students during the semester through Blackboard. The designated raters will review the "artifacts" that were identified and uploaded into Blackboard. Prior to reviewing the artifacts, there is a calibration meeting, in which raters look at the rubric, the selected artifacts up for review, and through Blackboard, select a random sample of assignments. Those assignments are parsed out to the raters to go through, using the rubric to rate the assignment accordingly. Currently, we need to: 1) identify raters, and 2) set up calibration or training sessions for raters. The commitment for the review process is about 15 artifacts per rater and can take a day or so to complete. Graduate students are encouraged to participate. Sabrina will put together an information sheet.

Collection phase: For fall 2016, artifacts will be collected for ARP, AIU, CMW, and GHS. These areas were sent an informational email in the spring notifying them of the data collection phase during the fall semester. OIRAA plans to contact the different areas again to remind them of the process and make sure they know how to use Blackboard outcomes for this

Comment [TJ1]: I changed this after reviewing the posted minutes of the July 27th meeting.

process and how to set up collection of items. Sabrina and Donald will include Ginger and Doug on any communications and meetings with the various department chairs or specialty team chairs, as the CAS is currently in administrative transition. In spring 2017, we will review what was collected in fall and have a new set of programs collect data, as shown in the schedule on the handout. Chris added that Nicole had previously provided a very helpful guide to connect an assignment to Blackboard outcomes. He will send that out to everyone.

Helen brought up that in our committee meetings this year we need to discuss the results of the assessment and plan for changes after the review is complete. This will include deciding to whom results are given, so that instructors are provided the information they need to implement changes that will improve future results. We may need to set a benchmark and will have to find a way to make this process meaningful by reviewing the actions taken by departments and subsequent results. A general report goes to the Dean, but course and instructor information isn't included. However, being able to separate the results by department or course would be most useful for identifying specific areas that need improvement. Donald will be responsible for putting together a strategy to disseminate results, and Helen recommended that he create a sheet with steps to review and another sheet with the principles of assessment, making it easier to share the information. We also need to ensure that the assessment tool that we're using is working.

The question was raised about how overlay assessment works. It is reviewed within each component, as scheduled by OIRAA. It was also asked if SACS expects us to be looking at multiple learning outcomes each year. Chris Holcomb shared that a few learning outcomes are usually chosen and that CMW is going to do three learning outcomes this fall for the third time, but it may vary from area to area how many outcomes are assessed in one review period. Sabrina will send out the current assessment rubric and any previously-collected data before meeting with the specialty team chairs. It might be useful for those not on the specialty teams to receive and share the information collected. Currently there is a Blackboard site where this information could be viewed and shared, but we may need to look at doing something more current.

Susan provided insight into the role of the Carolina Core committee during this process as ensuring that results are used to make improvement, for which we must have a plan in place. Manton added that some of the professional schools, such as the College of Pharmacy, may be able to provide recommendations based upon the results of the review process, as their students should demonstrate the Core competencies by the time that they begin taking major-specific courses. The assessment of integrative courses, when that time comes, will give each college the opportunity to see if students in their programs demonstrate the competencies expected from the foundational courses. Our goal is to work to improve, and SACS is looking for evidence of a process for improvement. Providing examples on the information sheets that Donald creates, such as the CMW results, may be helpful during the review process and also show SACS that we're making progress. Many times, departments and colleges are already collecting information and using it to make improvements, but are not documenting it. We could use the expertise of the members on the Committee and faculty members in departments that have experience in the accreditation process to bring out what we are already doing and demonstrate how we are improving.

Conclusion (Helen)

Next meeting is August 24th.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Tilford.