

## Minutes for the Called *Carolina Core Meeting*

July 13, 2016, 9:00-10:30 pm

Thomas Cooper Library, Room 204

### Members Present:

Joseph Askins, Susan Beverung, Sara Corwin, Rob Dedmon, Helen Doerpinghaus (Administrative Co-Chair), Kris Finnigan (ex-officio), Daniel Freedman, Chris Holcomb (Faculty Co-Chair), Mackenzie King, Gene Luna, Manton Matthews, Ginger Nickles-Osborne (for Jim Cutsinger), Ed Munn Sanchez, Kathy Snediker (ex-officio), Nicole Spensley (ex-officio), Andrea Tanner, Jennifer Tilford (ex-officio)

### Members Absent:

Pam Bowers, Ron Cox, James Cutsinger, , Andy Gillentine, Augie Grant (ex-officio), Brian Habing, Kathleen Kirasic (ex-officio), Cliff Leaman, Douglas Meade, Alfred Moore, Chris Nesmith, Claire Robinson

### Specialty Team Chairs Present:

(Joseph Askins), (Chris Holcomb), Judy Kalb, George Khushf, Shelley Smith

### Specialty Team Chairs Absent:

David Hitchcock, Mary Robinson, Adam Schor, Jeff Wilson, Mindy Fenske

### Guests:

### Introductions and Committee Overview

Helen Doerpinghaus welcomed everyone and introduced Jennifer Tilford as ex-officio to observe and take minutes. Helen then gave an overview of the Carolina Core Committee makeup: one voting member for every college, three voting members for the CAS, and 10 specialty team chairs (1 for each component). Lacy Ford (the new CAS dean) has asked that CAS have 4 representatives due to Mary Ann Byrnes stepping away. The Dean of Undergraduate Studies is the Co-Chair of the committee, and Helen is no longer in that role. Helen will continue on the committee until there is a new Dean hired. After introductions, Helen added that Nicole Spensley is in charge of assessment, and that SACSCOC requires assessment of all 10 competencies of our general education program.

### Review of Electronic Vote (Helen)

There was a straw vote at the previous CCC meeting, along with discussion of transfer equivalency credit, specifically ENGL 102 as an overlay course for CMW and INF. Chris Holcomb said that the national trend is to include information literacy in ENGL 101 and 102 courses. Aaron Marterer collected ENGL 101 and 102 syllabi from our top 10 transfer-in institutions. The information was reviewed and there was an electronic vote about a week later. The electronic vote duplicated the straw vote and the Committee is therefore, recommending that ENGL 102 transfer credit cover both the CMW and the INF components. In response to that decision, George Khushf (chair of VSR Specialty Team) asked that the committee also consider the transfer application of POLI 201, as it is another major transfer-in course. Aaron is collecting data on POLI 201.

### Task (Helen)

Our task this summer is to make sure that our transfer students receive the full Core experience, with the recommendation that transfer credit (including AP and IB) addresses all approved competencies.

### Report on INF findings on ENGL 101 and 102 syllabi (Chris Holcomb & Joe Askins)

Attachment: ENGL 102 Transfer-in Syllabi review

Chris and Joe reviewed syllabi of 17 of the 20 most frequently transferred ENGL 102 equivalents and documentation related to AP and IB. They found that 12 of the 17 courses succeeded in addressing information literacy under the 80/20 rule, and 5 do not. Aaron has been asked to find out what percentage of ENGL 102 transfers come from these 17 institutions. College courses are, for the most part, covering INF, but the two AP and two IB tests do not satisfactorily address INF. Chris stated that unless we look at the syllabi for every single AP and IB course, there is no way to know how much INF is covered.

### Proposals (Group discussion)

Chris posed the questions: 1) Do we allow AP and IB credit to also cover INF? 2) What do we do about the institutions that do not cover INF? Chris requested input from the committee and the following ideas were proposed:

1. Helen: Advisors could offer students LIBR 101 as an option to take. Joe can meet with colleges and see where in upper division courses INF information could be covered.

2. Joe: Create an environment in which students will encounter INF in their discipline, but how does that fit in with the current Carolina Core structure?
3. Gene: Can we nudge the transfer-in colleges to include more INF curriculum? Recommended that we invite other institution representatives to visit us and learn about how we teach INF.
4. Chris: invite 1<sup>st</sup> year English directors from other institutions to visit as well.
5. Helen: Met with technical college provosts and told them what we are doing regarding INF inclusion in ENGL 102 curriculum. She wondered if her meeting encouraged INF to be covered in more ENGL 102 courses. Agreed with Gene about visiting or writing to the five schools in the review that didn't meet INF.
6. Sarah: Recommended including INF as an outcome in each integrative course, and as it is in Public Health majors. Can we apply an attribute to some of the CC courses that are already approved that would signify INF? Let's look at where else we can ramp up the INF skills. Why reinvent when we can just work with the already approved CC courses and implement INF within the current curriculum?

Questions raised in response to including INF in other courses:

1. Judith: Does it make sense to include INF universally for all approved CC courses? Several members responded that it doesn't make sense for every course, but could be easily included in many.
2. Nicole: It may not be safe to assume that students would already have an understanding of INF by the time they take the integrative course.
3. Manton: INF is a CC requirement. We still need to address the students who bring in transfer, AP, or IB credit. Chris responded that we still need data on how many students this includes.
5. Are Carolina Core components requirements or outcomes and is it important that the 10 core areas be covered equally in upper division courses? Helen responded that they are outcomes to be mastered by students during their time at USC. The Carolina Core is a lower division curriculum and each department may pick which components are threaded through into the integrative course.
6. Sara added that it is the role of the committee and Specialty Teams to monitor and assess core components. Why not have the specialty teams explore whether the competencies cover overlaps? Nicole agreed to work with the Specialty Teams on integrating overlay curriculum. The question of, "Who would collect the syllabi?" remains to be decided.
7. Susan asked about an evaluation tool to allow those who include some INF material in the curriculum to see what might be missing. Chris responded that there is a rubric that is posted online at: <http://www.sc.edu/provost/forms/CarolinaCoreAppendix.pdf>.
8. Some doubted the claim that there were many courses likely to contain INF components, and were pessimistic about the amount of work retrofitting the INF component into integrative courses. Given that this is the first year that all CC competencies are being assessed, the departments could be asked to review current course content, including evaluation of any CC components that are taught or could be added.
9. Rob asked how our current direction fit with what was discussed at the last meeting. Helen responded that CCC is recommending that we fully accept transfer credits, AP, and IB. The national perspective is that if a student brings in credit for ENGL 102, then the competencies are met. **What we are looking at today is offering other opportunities for INF to be learned.**
10. Ed felt this did not resolve the conundrum of two sets of requirements, one for those who come in with credits and one for those that don't. If we talk about a common core, it needs to be shared by all students. Responses:
  - a. Chris: Sara is suggesting that we look at where INF is already covered to try to resolve the issue that some students may be missing some competencies of INF.
  - b. Gene: It's not just USC, across the country, students are graduating without full understanding of INF and other general education components. Eventually we will have to begin doing complete post-graduation assessments.
  - c. Rob: Students who bring in ENGL 102 credit, check the box for graduation requirement met. How do we ensure student INF competency in areas outside of ENGL 102?
    - i. Susan: We need to ensure that students are getting INF in lower division so that they are prepared and can meet expectations for upper division courses.
    - ii. Ed: How do we get to these outcomes and how do we demonstrate it?
    - iii. Chris: We hope to have numbers next time about the numbers of students who come in with ENGL 102 AP and IB credit.
  - d. Cathy Sneideiker, Chair of Faculty Senate Committee on Scholastic Standards and Petitions, proposed that a lab could be added to some courses, and could be optional or mandatory.

1. Ed: Students are not going to take an extra course that they don't need to graduate.
2. Cathy: Departments could make it mandatory or students may see that those taking the lab are performing better.

Proposal to look at transfer-in syllabi for VSR and POLI 201 (George Khushf)

Significant changes have needed to be made to those courses seeking overlay status. In many cases, courses were completely revamped. POLI 201, American Government, was the one big exception. It is a course for which many students bring in credit, and in which the VSR competencies are very often covered. George warned about the impact of articulating overlay courses as direct equivalencies on how Specialty Teams approve overlay courses. George's team will look at any POLI 201 course that is transferred in to make sure that it covers the VSR competency before it gets articulated. There are several courses, such as BIOL 208, to which it makes no sense to articulate exact equivalencies because of the amount of work that was required in designing them to include competencies from two components.

1. Chris: Where is the bar for AP courses? Is it different for POLI 201 vs. ENGL 102? Is that determined by CHE? Kris—yes.
2. Next meeting: Aaron Marterer will have numbers on students who transfer in credit.

Conclusion (Helen)

Next meeting in two weeks. The meeting was adjourned at 10:34 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Tilford.