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

August 27, 2020, 2:00-3:00 pm

Teams Virtual Meeting

(URL to meeting recording: <https://emailsc-my.sharepoint.com/personal/tilfordj_mailbox_sc_edu/Documents/Microsoft%20Teams%20Chat%20Files/2020-8-27%20CCC%20Meeting.mp4>)

Members Present:

Sabrina Andrews (ex-officio), Jan Bass, Claudia Benitez-Nelson, Marianne Bickle (ex-officio), Pam Bowers, David Cardenas, Mark Cooper (ex-officio), Ron Cox, Rob Dedmon, Trena Houp (ex-officio), Sandra Kelly (Administrative Co-Chair), Kristi Kinslow, Doug Meade, Donald Miles (ex-officio), LaTrice Ratcliff-Small (ex-officio), Claire Robinson (ex-officio), Andrea Tanner, Jenn Tilford (ex-officio), Elliot Vittes, Ernest Wiggins, Karen Worthy

Members Absent: Sara Corwin, Brian Habing, Tina Milhorn Stallard, Matt Thatcher

Specialty Team Chairs Present:

Karen Brown, David Darmafol, Jonathan Edwards, Nicole Fisk, John Grego (for David Hitchcock), Judy Kalb, Matthew Kisner, Thomas Lekan, Sarah Williams, Jeff Wilson

Specialty Team Chairs Absent:

Guests: Karen Edwards, Tom Terez, Ramy Harik, Aaron Marterer

**Handouts (double click to open):**

**** **** **** ****

Background and Update on the Carolina Core (Sandra Kelly)

The Carolina Core process was approved in 2013. Courses needed to be approved to meet the ten learning objectives. So, faculty submitted many proposals. Specialty teams were formed to review the proposals and were also tasked with assessment and organizing faculty to review artifacts. More recently, they have been involved in writing up findings and discussing them and closing the loop by bringing faculty in to discuss the findings. The teams have Provost office oversight and work with faculty governance. However, it is difficult to keep track of 10 committees.

Lean Process in Courses and Curricula (Marianne Bickle and Karen Edwards)

There was a Lean process over the summer of 2020, involving individuals from various departments on campus: lecturers, faculty, people who were seasoned proponents, and those who were not seasoned proponents, and also the Office of Distributed Learning. The team started with an assessment of the Carolina Core and Instructional Development (InDev) Committee processes. The Lean team also conducted three focus group interviews with people throughout campus who provided feedback. From this process, the team came up with 12 improvements for the curriculum approval process. The purpose is to streamline and make the curriculum approval process clearer. Examples of the improvements include: a one-stop website for resources and information, two lanes for proposals, tutorials and training, and changing the InDev Committee.

Currently, two separate layers of approval are required for courses delivered instruction—Curricula and Courses and InDev. With more and more courses being taught online and in person, this bifurcated process no longer makes sense. Curricula and Courses Committee will now review all courses, including those for online instruction, which will require a bit of coaching for the committee. Then, InDev will focus on guiding the university’s policies related to teaching and learning, serving as a catalyst for innovation, and advising relevant offices on faculty development needs regarding curriculum.

This Lean group was formed because there have been inefficiencies in the curriculum approval process. The university is about to implement CourseLeaf, a new system to manage the curriculum approval process. This is the perfect time to rethink our process.

Proposed Change to the Carolina Core Specialty Teams approval process and assessment process (Sandra Kelly)

Because we are through the initial implementation of Carolina Core, there are much fewer courses going through each year for approval. So, the workload is much less onerous than before. Each specialty team may have only 5-6 courses per year going through the approval process.

Currently, the specialty teams are not only responsible for review of courses, but also for assessment. The goal is to have a more streamlined approach to assessment. Since we are in good shape going into the SACSCOC review this year, now is the time to think about changing our process. There are 10 learning outcomes in our Carolina Core, but typically there are only 3-5 learning outcomes for general education. The plan is to separate the approval and assessment pieces into two committees, instead of 10.

Charge for the Carolina Core Approval Committee (Sandra)

We have a charge (see attachment) from Faculty Senate for a Carolina Core Approval Committee. The committee would approve courses and the courses would still go through Curricula and Courses Committee. Instead of 10 separate committees, faculty from each learning outcome would all work together on one committee to review the proposals. The new committee would also include the chair of Curricula and Courses and representatives from the Office of the University Registrar and the University Advising Center as ex-officio members. The Committee would make sure any courses meet the learning outcomes, evaluate whether the academic unit proposing the course is appropriate to offer the course and indicate any potential conflicts with other course offerings. They would also review assessment results and propose any changes to learning outcomes. Courses and changes to learning outcomes would still go through Courses and Curricula Committee, as well as Faculty Senate.

Summary of Discussion on the Charge for the changes to the Carolina Core Specialty Teams approval and assessment processes:

* Members of the Carolina Core Approval Committee would be appointed by Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Studies.
* Current Specialty Teams would be disbanded and replaced by the Carolina Core Approval Committee but would hopefully include some of the current chairs. There would still be 10 members representing the 10 learning outcomes.
* The Carolina Core Committee would be disbanded as well.
* The Carolina Core Approval Committee would review all courses from all learning outcomes, about 15 per year.
* The Carolina Core Approval Committee would not be responsible for assessment as well. Faculty volunteers would be sought out for the assessment piece to work in the summer (with OIRAA) and be compensated.
* OIRAA and Palmetto College will have ex-officio members on the Carolina Core Approval Committee.
* The implementation of the Carolina Core Approval Committee and disbanding of previous committees will be in place by the end of the semester and advertised in Faculty Senate, as well as other places.
* It is important that we train people and document the process to have continuity through the transition.
* The Lean group will include a flowchart of the approval process that shows points of decision, assessment, and approval.
* This new approval process will be implemented along with CourseLeaf in the next year.

Teaching of the Founding Documents Reach Act (See S.35 REACH Act, Executive Summary, and Proposal to meet the Reach Act)

In 1924 there was a law that the founding documents had to be taught over the course of a year. The university has never been in compliance with it and neither was any other institution in the state. Recently this has become more evident. They are working on a new or modified law called the REACH Act. Sandra convened an ad-hoc committee to come up with a plan and proposal. The plan has been well-received. Fifteen courses have been identified that could easily be modified to teach the founding documents. The REACH Act was almost passed last spring, but then the pandemic happened. They are working on it now. Lancaster and the Citadel have already changed their curriculum to meet the new law. AP and IB courses count. There would be a process to get courses approved to meet the founding documents requirement and they would be tagged in the bulletin.

Summary of Discussion on the REACH Act and the UofSC Founding Documents Requirement Implementation:

* Additional courses could be added/approved to the meet the requirement.
* Some higher-level courses may be modified to meet the Carolina Core.
* The plan is to put the Founding Documents Requirement into place, even if the REACH Act isn’t yet approved. If it isn’t approved, then it will just be removed from the bulletin going forward.
* There will be concerns about how enrollment in courses not approved for this requirement will be affected when students can take one of the courses to fulfill Carolina Core and the Founding Documents Requirement at the same time.
* Only 35% of our students are not currently meeting the Founding Documents Requirement.
* All sections of the approved course would have to include the Founding Documents Requirement.
* Sandra is pushing that the 2-year and technical colleges include the founding documents in their courses.
* This will only apply to the incoming students.
* There will be a process designed to get these courses quickly approved.
* Because this is a general requirement, it can’t come from a college and will probably be discussed by Curricula and Courses Committee.
* This will not increase the hours required of students. The course can count at any point in the program.
* Sandra will come to a future Courses and Curricula Committee meeting to present information on the Founding Documents Requirement.

Carolina Core Revision or Modification

Discussions on the charge for Carolina Core Approval Committee drifted to conversations on how to change the Carolina Core. The Core has been in place for 10 years and has grown unwieldy and confusing. It is not transfer friendly and students are graduating with numerous hours in excess. Pretty much every college has altered the Core to fit their curriculum. It is time to start talking about how we might modify the Carolina Core.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:09 p.m.

Submitted by Jenn Tilford.