

Minutes for the **Carolina Core Committee Meeting**

August 13, 2013, 12:30 – 2:00 pm

Thomas Cooper Library, Room 204

**Members Present:**

Mary Ann Byrnes, Helen Doerpinghaus (Administrative Co-Chair), Kris Finnigan (ex-officio), Andy Gillentine, Kimberly Glenn, Allison Jacques, Carolyn Jones, Donald Miles (ex-officio), Chris Nesmith, Kimberly Simmons, Jerry Wallulis, Virginia Weathers

**Members Absent:**

Pam Bowers (ex-officio), John Bowles, Kenneth Campbell, Sara Corwin, Ron Cox, Brian Habing (ex-officio), Stuart Hunter, James Kellogg, Gene Luna, Susan Parlier, Joe Rackers (Faculty Co-Chair)

**Specialty Team Chairs Present:**

Alexander Beecroft, Saskia Coenen-Snyder, Sam Hastings, George Khushf, Camelia Knapp, Douglas Meade

**Specialty Team Chairs Absent:**

Erik Doxtader, Chris Holcomb, Shelley Smith

Helen Doerpinghaus called the meeting to order. She welcomed new members Andy Gillentine from HRSM, Kimberly Simmons from the SC Honors College, and announced that Shelley Smith (Sociology) had agreed to chair the GSS Specialty Team Chair (and she will be in attendance next month).

The ARP Specialty Team completed the student learning rubric. Doug Meade shared the document and discussed the changes that they had made and answered questions about the rubric. The rating system reflects the preference of the team and allows finer rating of student achievement. The Committee thanked the Team for their work on this over the summer.

Helen gave an update on Carolina Core activity over the summer. Continued conversations with faculty on Carolina Core program review indicates confusion and apprehension about how review of student work will be implemented, how it will be used vis-à-vis faculty performance, and how it will improve student learning. There are concerns about whether program review will compromise faculty autonomy and be unduly time-consuming. Discussion ensued on how to address faculty questions and concerns about reviewing student work in the Core. Several Carolina Core committee members had suggested over the summer that a “town hall meeting” might be a good way to share information about program review and build faculty trust in the process.

The Committee looked at a draft agenda for a Town Hall Meeting on Carolina Core Program Review for September 20, 2013, from 9:00 a.m. – 12:45 p.m. in Russell House Ballroom. Unit heads of departments with a course in the Carolina Core would be encouraged to attend, and all faculty members and professional staff working with the Core would be welcome. The Provost would speak; the keynote presenter would be Dr. Kim Woodrum, Chemistry Professor from the University of Kentucky who has participated in a very similar general education revision and review process there. Committee members suggested time for faculty questions and discussion both before and after the keynote presentation. Carolina Core committee members and Specialty Team chairs will participate in the table discussions, and ideally someone with assessment expertise will be at each table, too. (The revised agenda is attached.)

The Committee then discussed the principles and process for conducting the Carolina Core review. A draft document outlining the values and approaches for the review was distributed and discussed. Committee members suggested changes to the document that would better reflect the purpose of the review: to strengthen student learning. The importance of making sure that the review process is not used in faculty annual reviews or in the tenure and promotion process was emphasized. The section of the document on “principles” was moved to the forefront, followed by “process” points. Jerry Wallulis kindly offered to assist with editing the draft. (The revised document is attached.)

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Submitted by H. Doerpinghaus

Attachment 1

**USC Town Hall Meeting: *Carolina Core* Program Review**

Friday, September 20, 2013

9:00 a.m. – 12:45 p.m.

Russell House Ballroom

**All chairs of departments with courses in the Carolina Core should plan to attend.**

**All other faculty members are welcome to attend.**

**Please RSVP <http://www.sc.edu/provost/rsvp/ccoretownhall.php>**

9:00 – 9:20 a.m.	Town Hall Welcome	Provost Amiridis
9:20 – 9:40	Table Discussions: “Identifying the Questions”	
Faculty at each table discuss concerns that they have about the general education review process. Written questions are submitted for the large group “Q&A” session following the keynote address.		
9:40 – 9:45	Introduction of the Speaker	Dr. Helen Doerpinghaus
9:45 – 10:45	“Renewing General Education at the Research University”	Dr. Kim Woodrum
Dr. Kim Woodrum has taught Chemistry at the University of Kentucky for over 20 years. She has received the UK Alumni Association Great Teacher award (2007), the Provost's Outstanding Teaching Award (2013) and the A&S Outstanding Teaching Award (2013). She has worked extensively in the area of general education, developing a “UKCore” course called “Molecular Science for Citizens.” She has been a pioneer in the use of technology in the classroom, in giving online tutorials and in developing custom teaching software.		
10:45 – 11:00	Break	
11:00 – 11:30	“Q&A” Session	All Attendees
11:30 – 12:00	Carolina Core Assessment Pilots	USC Faculty
12 Noon	Buffet Lunch	
12:30	Moving Forward Together	Dr. Helen Doerpinghaus
12:45	Adjournment	

## Attachment 2      **Principles and Process of Carolina Core Student Learning Review**

August 30, 2013

### **I.      The Principles**

The objective of any review of student learning in a specific *Carolina Core* area is to facilitate improvement in student achievement regarding the learning outcomes for that *Core* area. Feedback from the *Core* area review may result in improved communication with students about learning goals, the implementation of more effective pedagogical methods, refinement in learning outcomes, or other changes aimed at bringing about improvement.

Each *Carolina Core* area is reviewed through a faculty-driven process directed solely at assessing and improving student learning of that competency. Since such improvement is the only focus in any assessment process regarding the *Carolina Core*, the identities of the students and the instructors are anonymous. Whenever possible, data on student performance is aggregated across particular courses and sections. Moreover, information obtained in the review process is to be used neither in individual performance reviews and applications for tenure and promotion nor in performance reviews for departments and other academic units. The review of each specific competency will be scheduled in a three-year cycle of assessment for the *Core* as a whole.

### **II.      Faculty-Driven Process**

#### **Specialty Team Responsibility:**

Faculty members on the Specialty Teams develop rubrics for reviewing student learning.

#### **Instructor Responsibility:**

Faculty members teaching a *Carolina Core* course identify student assignments in their particular course that show student achievement specific to *Carolina Core* learning goals.

Faculty members require students to upload selected assignments to Blackboard Outcomes. (Tests questions may demonstrate student learning and uploading procedures will be adapted as needed.)

#### **Student Responsibility:**

Students upload selected assignments to Blackboard Outcomes.

#### **Carolina Core Committee Responsibility:**

Reviewers are identified to review work samples. The size and composition of the reviewer group is developed in discussion with *Core* area department heads.

Faculty reviewers meet for training to prepare for rating work samples. Training is conducted by the Dean of Undergraduate Studies with assistance.

Faculty reviewers electronically review work samples randomly selected by Blackboard Outcomes to determine whether students satisfactorily master learning goals.

Results are provided to the *Carolina Core* Committee on student learning mastery. The Committee then relays feedback to deans of colleges with responsibility for teaching courses in the *Core* area. Deans relay findings to unit heads and instructors teaching in the *Core* area.

Findings from *Carolina Core* review are used to continuously improve learning.