

Minutes for the ***Carolina Core* Committee Meeting**  
September 10, 2013, 12:30 – 2:00 pm  
Thomas Cooper Library, Room 204

**Members Present:**

Pam Bowers (ex-officio), Duncan Buell, Mary Ann Byrnes, Ron Cox, Helen Doerpinghaus (Administrative Co-Chair), Kris Finnigan (ex-officio), Andy Gillentine, Kimberly Glenn, Brian Habing (ex-officio), Stuart Hunter, Allison Jacques, Carolyn Jones, James Kellogg, Chris Nesmith, Joe Rackers (Faculty Co-Chair), Kimberly Simmons, Virginia Weathers

**Members Absent:**

Kenneth Campbell, Sara Corwin, James Knapp (ex-officio), Gene Luna, Donald Miles, Susan Parlier, Jerry Wallulis

**Specialty Team Chairs Present:**

Alexander Beecroft, Saskia Coenen-Snyder, Sam Hastings, Chris Holcomb, George Khushf, Camelia Knapp, Douglas Meade, Mary Robinson, Shelley Smith

**Specialty Team Chairs Absent:**

Erik Doxtader

Joe Rackers called the meeting to order. He introduced new members: Mary Robinson (AIU Specialty Team Chair) and Duncan Buell (College of Engineering and Computing). The August minutes were approved unanimously.

Helen Doerpinghaus went over the agenda (attached) for the September 20 Town Hall on Carolina Core program review. The Provost will provide the opening address. Dr. Kim Woodrum from the University of Kentucky is the keynote speaker, and will talk about the general education revision there, as well as the implementation and assessment of the new curriculum. The Carolina Core Information Literacy faculty (Sam Hastings, Chris Holcomb, Karen Brown, and Maureen Petewich) will make a presentation on the pilot INF review taking place this fall. All unit heads with courses in the Carolina Core have been invited to attend the Town Hall along with any other interested faculty. About 75 faculty are registered to attend.

Sam Hastings provided an update on the Information Literacy pilot review of student learning. All courses meeting this competency are included: LIBR 101, SLIS 202, ENGL 102, and STAT 112. The “Principles and Process of *Carolina Core* Student Learning Review” (attached) which were developed in August by the Carolina Core committee are being closely followed. She explained that faculty members identify the assignment to be assessed and not all INF learning goals will be included in the review this fall. Students will upload the assignment into Blackboard Learn and the trained review team then looks at the student work to determine whether the learning

goals are demonstrated. She indicated that the pilot team was taking great care to do this well, with the focus on improving student learning, not being punitive to instructors or departments.

Chris Holcomb emphasized that the process of reviewing student learning is completely faculty-driven. He discussed that the pilot simply looks at student learning in the Core, and other kinds of evaluations of pedagogy will continue as they exist now (e.g., peer teaching observations, student evaluations, departmental syllabus review). The pilot review team will continue to keep the Carolina Core Committee informed as the review process unfolds.

Discussion ensued on how best to share information about the program review (i.e., assessment) process with faculty. The Committee recommends developing FAQs from the Town Hall meeting and posting these to the website to help address faculty questions and concerns. There was agreement that we need the website to have a section on the program review process that begins with the "Principles..", includes FAQs from the Town Hall, an example of how the process works, rubrics, etc.

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.