Members Present:
Brittany Ashley (ex-officio), Joseph Askins, Susan Beverung, Ron Cox, Tena Crews (ex-officio), Daniel Freedman, Chris Holcomb (Faculty Co-Chair), Sandra Kelly (Administrative Co-Chair), Mackenzie King (for Nancy Buchan), Kathleen Kirasic (ex-officio), Cliff Leaman, Manton Matthews, Douglas Meade, Donald Miles (ex-officio), Alfred Moore, Chris Nesmith, Ginger Nickles-Osborne, Claire Robinson (ex-officio), Ed Munn Sanchez, Andrea Tanner, Jennifer Tilford (ex-officio)

Members Absent:
Pam Bowers, Sara Corwin, James Cutsinger, Rob Dedmon, Andy Gillentine, August Grant (ex-officio), Brian Habing, Gene Luna

Specialty Team Chairs Present:
Mindy Fenske, Kent Germany, (Chris Holcomb), David Hitchcock, George Khushf, Judith Kalb, Sarah Williams, Jeff Wilson

Specialty Team Chairs Absent:
David Lankes, Shelley Smith

Guests:
Sabrina Andrews

Handouts (double click to open):

| Assessment Handout | CAS Assessment Response | Sample Size |

Welcome and Introductions
Introductions of new specialty team chairs Kent Germany and Sarah Williams, as well as ex-officio Brittany Ashley with OIRAA.

Approval of November Minutes
Kathy Snediker is not on committee should be removed from previous meeting attendance and committee list. Minutes approved with correction.

Carolina Core Committee Faculty Co-Chair (Chris Holcomb)
Chris Holcomb will be stepping down as director of first-year English and from the position of faculty Co-chair for the Carolina Core Committee, but would like to remain as chair for CMW.

Discussion of Sharing of Assessment Results (Sandra Kelly)
Sandra attended the SACS-COC meeting in December and made some observations. She shared that SACS-COC is looking for institutions to show continuous improvement, not perfection, as it allows no room for improvement. She is concerned that we are not closing the loop in the assessment process. Sandra provided a handout on Assessment of the Carolina Core at USC. The handout includes her observations from the SACS-COC meeting and the purpose, stakeholders, benefits and costs of assessment. The purpose of assessing is two prong: 1) for the purpose of improvement, and 2) to create accountability. Improvement should foster innovation and experimentation, but accountability can create a feeling of being punitive.

Because the Carolina Core components mainly pertain to the College of Arts and Sciences, Sandra contacted Lacy Ford (Dean) to provide feedback on the assessment reports. The CAS report includes feedback and improvement suggestions for the assessment process. One of the suggestions was to include students from each approved course for a learning outcome. Brittany Ashley (OIRAA) provided a sample size report on the numbers that would be needed for the AIU and GSS components. The sample size is quite large and not feasible. Another observation from the CAS report included that many of the current Learning Outcomes are very broad and not easily applied to specific artifacts from specific courses. It was mentioned that assessment on the course level may create a feeling of being punitive, even though it would allow for identification of specific courses that need improvement. Sandra asked that we focus more on improvement and less on accountability to foster a more positive assessment environment at USC.

<u>Proposal for process for continuous improvement</u>
Sandra asked the committee to provide input on how we can better close the loop with assessment. She expressed the importance of sharing the assessment reports to create a sense of responsibility within departments. She also suggested implementing terms of service for specialty team members (possibly 3 years to encompass two assessment cycles).

The following issues with the current assessment process were expressed:
- Lack of usefulness of assessment when it is across disciplines
- Difficulty for raters in assessing other disciplines due to a lack of understanding discipline-specific language and content
- Difficulty in recruiting raters
- Inter-rater reliability
- Need for more actionable items
- Balancing the necessity for quality data and creating reports that generalize the data.

Discussion included:
- departments assessing their own courses would not provide unbiased results
- more specific learning outcomes would help raters
- recruiting raters may be easier if the raters can see the results as they pertain to their department
- more specific assessment data (at the course level) may not be representative due to a lack of a high number of artifacts in that specific course
- starting backwards with closing the loop may lead us to a better assessment process
- the level of detail needed for the data may differ, depending on the needs of the specialty team
- many institutions have a culture that is positive and engages the best faculty for the assessment process
- assessment results at USC have not been useful because the data has not been shared with faculty
- Sharing assessment results with those at the top and those at the teaching level avoids the feeling of assessment being punitive

The next step is to get specialty teams together with instructors, program directors, former assessment team members and discuss what we are looking for as far as the level of data and with whom the results are shared.

<u>Discussion of Media Literacy in the Core</u> (Chris Holcomb & Joe Askins)
Joe shared there is a lack of understanding among students about how news is reported and disseminated. Media literacy is addressed within the INF component and the library has been reaching out to faculty to see if they would like to work together in integrating media literacy into curriculum.

Chris added that ENGL 102 is responding to students' lack of knowledge regarding news by including assignments that include INF competencies. Students are asked about credibility, bias, context, and date and timeliness.

Andrea spoke about what SJMC is doing to cover media literacy and that they have courses that already include it. Doug brought up that no JOUR courses are approved for Carolina Core, but suggested that some be added.

<u>Specialty Teams: Membership & Review of New Courses</u> (Sandra)
Terms of service were mentioned once again to encourage members to make a commitment. Sandra also shared that there is a public link with access to the APPS system to view items in progress. It is important that proponents of new courses and specialty team chairs be proactive in following up with the progress of courses through the approval process.

<u>Conclusion</u>
Next meeting in April 13, 2017. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Tilford.