

Minutes for the Called *Carolina Core Meeting*

April 13, 2017, 12:30-2:00 pm

Thomas Cooper Library, Room 204

Members Present:

Joseph Askins, Susan Beverung, Pam Bowers, Sara Corwin, Tena Crews (ex-officio), Daniel Freedman, Andy Gillentine, Chris Holcomb (Faculty Co-Chair), Sandra Kelly (Administrative Co-Chair), Mackenzie King (for Nancy Buchan), Kathleen Kirasic (ex-officio), Douglas Meade, Alfred Moore, Ginger Nickles-Osborne, Ed Munn Sanchez, Jennifer Tilford (ex-officio)

Members Absent:

Brittany Ashley (ex-officio), Ron Cox, James Cutsinger, Rob Dedmon, August Grant (ex-officio), Brian Habing, Cliff Leaman, Gene Luna, Manton Matthews, Donald Miles (ex-officio), Chris Nesmith, Claire Robinson (ex-officio), Andrea Tanner

Specialty Team Chairs Present:

(Chris Holcomb), David Hitchcock, George Khushf, Shelley Smith

Specialty Team Chairs Absent:

Mindy Fenske, Judith Kalb, David Lankes, Sarah Williams, Jeff Wilson

Guests:

David Cardenas

Handouts (double click to open):



Assessment Cycle &
Major Players.pdf



Assessment Rules 3
31.pdf



Carolina Core GHS
Fall 2015 Report 3.1



CC Assessment
Roles.pdf



CMS Report
Final.pdf



VSR Report
Final.pdf

Welcome and Introductions

David Cardenas will be replacing Andy Gillentine as the committee member from HRSM.

Announcements (Sandra Kelly)

A new faculty co-chair for the Carolina Core Committee is needed. Sandra may be look into reorganizing the committee and would like to hear from the committee members regarding commitment for next year. Next year the format may include smaller meetings and then one large meeting per semester or year. There is currently no Specialty Team Chair for GHS.

Approval of February Minutes

Minutes approved from February meeting.

New Assessment Reports (Sandra Kelly)

Brittney Ashley edited the assessment reports to have the same template and include more in-depth information. Sandra would like the Carolina Core Committee to look at the reports and discuss what type of information may be missing and what may need to be changed.

Assessment Process (Sandra Kelly)

It has been decided that if a course is taught by only one instructor, then that course will not be evaluated to keep from singling out a specific instructor. It is Sandra's intent to meet with chairs to discuss the assessment reports. Sandra introduced a new plan for the assessment cycle (handout) on a four-semester rotation:

1st semester: Gather Evidence

2nd semester: Evidence preparation, rater recruitment, and artifact review

3rd semester: Analysis and Reporting and Specialty Teams review of the report

4th semester: Recommendations shared and implementation of recommendations

The discussion on the assessment cycle and process included the following observations, recommendations and concerns:

- A 4-semester cycle won't allow for artifact collection during both spring and fall semesters.
- Instructors should have input on the report.
- This committee shouldn't be making recommendations on the learning outcomes. That should be done by the specialty teams. Specialty teams will work with the faculty to come up with recommendations.
- An agenda for discussion of assessment results to structure the conversation.
- More input and feedback on the rubric is recommended as part of the discussion.
- Share the specialty team report with instructors before creating the agenda for discussion.
- It was suggested to add another semester to allow time for redoing syllabi and course content. Sandra would prefer not to extend the assessment cycle.
- Pam shared that SACS doesn't require proof of change for general education assessment.
- It was asked if the cycle for assessment must be standard for every component, or if it can vary for those areas that have more work to do to implement changes. Sandra responded that different teams will be at different stages and may have different actions and types of discussions included in the cycle.
- Perfection is not expected, but discussion of learning outcomes and the core is part of the intent of assessment.
- The longitudinal data section of the reports is lacking in information currently, but will allow for better comparisons in the future.
- It may be possible in the future to have multiple-choice artifacts collected that could be rated automatically to make the process easier. Sandra responded that it can't be typical multiple choice with one answer right or wrong, but would need to show different levels of comprehension. It might be possible to create such artifacts in the future and may be easier in some disciplines than in others.
- It was recommended to have more detailed rubrics and specific rubrics for each artifact.
- Transition and turnover is a concern for the culture and consistency of this process.

Sandra went over the "6 Rules of Good Carolina Core Assessment" (handout) and the interacting pieces of the assessment process with the Key Groups and Important Tasks handout. Sandra would like the role of the specialty teams to expand. OIRAA should not have to recruit raters. It should be understood that those who teach core courses need to be involved in the process of collecting artifacts. We are trying to change the culture and get instructors engaged in the assessment process.

Information Literacy/Media Literacy/Integrative Courses (Chris Holcomb)

Last Friday, a small group of interested faculty got together to discuss Information and Media Literacy. Chris gave a summary of the meeting and focused on two points for discussion:

1. Including INF content in other courses across the curriculum.
2. Addressing media literacy in our courses.

The new transfer equivalency policy created the possibility that students are moving through our ranks without getting specific INF instruction. This started the conversation in how we can include INF content in other areas of the curriculum. Chris explained the difference between information literacy—knowing how to access, evaluate, document and disseminate information—and media literacy—applying literacy skills to media and technology messages. Due to changing contexts and forms through which information is accessed and disseminated, it has become more important to teach both types of literacy to students. The library can be a center for information literacy, including the creation of modules tailored to different disciplines that would be available to those looking to include more information and media literacy in their courses.

It was also mentioned that it may be necessary to look again at the learning outcomes for INF and possibly changing the name of the learning outcome to incorporate media literacy. Joe Askins shared that it is important that information literacy be taught in the context of the various disciplines and not as a silo. He suggested that INF be embedded in the curriculum of courses within the disciplines, which may require more training for instructors. It has also been previously discussed to embed INF in the integrative courses at a higher level that makes it more meaningful to students' particular disciplines. It may be good to have further such meetings to continue discussion on information literacy and media literacy.

Conclusion

Next meeting will be in the fall semester. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Jennifer Tilford.