

COMMITTEE ON INSTRUCTIONAL DEVELOPMENT (INDEV) ANNUAL REPORT, 2021-2022

Submitted by Rebecca Stern, Chair

I. COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Elected

[Ramy Harik](#), Fall 2021 Chair, Mechanical Engineering (2022)

[Darin Freeburg](#), Sch Of Library & Info Sci (2023)

[John Gerdes](#), Integrated Information Tech (2023)

[Mark Minett](#), English (2024)

[Wanda Fenimore](#), Smt Palmetto College (2024)

[Valerie Lookingbill](#), Research Instruction Reference (2024)

[Annie Bourbonnais](#), Sch Of Earth, Ocean, & Envmt (2024)

[Allan Pangburn](#), Lan Palmetto College (2023)

Appointed

[Haylee Mercado](#), College Of Hrsm - Spte (2023)

[Trena Houpp](#), ex officio, Distributed Learning Supp Ser (2022)

[Murray Mitchell](#), ex officio, Graduate School (2021)

[Bryan Jenkins](#), ex officio, Audio Visual Engineering (2021)

[Aisha Haynes](#), ex officio, Center For Teaching Excellence (2022)

[Leslie Lovelace](#), Chemistry & Biochemistry (2023)

[Karthik Rangavajhula](#), Undergraduate Representative, Undergraduate Student (2022)

[Rebecca Stern](#), Spring 2022 Chair, English (2024)

Vacant, Graduate Representative

Ramy Harik departed the committee at the end of 2021, after serving as committee Chair in Fall 2021. In Spring 2022, Wanda Fenimore resigned from the committee due to scheduling conflicts. Chair Stern is resigning due to in-person meeting requirements, and Mark Minett will be on sabbatical this Fall. Hence, the committee enters the 2022-23 year with five unfilled positions, including that of Chair.

The committee met twice weekly throughout the Fall of 2021, and weekly/alternate weeks throughout Spring 2022.

II. CAROLINA ONLINE PROGRAM APPROVAL PROCESS

The Senate's Resolution to Ensure Excellence in Carolina Online asked InDev to develop a procedure for granting Senate approval for proposed online degree programs. In Fall 2021, John Gerdes, Wanda Fenimore, Allan Pangburn, Haylee Mercado, and Rebecca Stern (subcommittee chair) worked with Stacy Winchester of C&C, Trena Houpp, Aisha Haynes,

La Trice Ratcliffe, and Senate Chair Korsgaard to develop a process that was acceptable to both the Senate and the Provost's Office. The process, attached, was approved by the Senate in December 2021.

III. CAROLINA CORE REVIEW AND REVISION PROCESS

In April 2021, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee directed InDev to consider "whether we should discuss revisions to Carolina Core, and, if so, by what process" (7 April 2021). In June 2021, InDev reported to the Senate that it had determined that the Carolina Core should be revised, presented its reasons, and began work. Throughout Fall 2021, the InDev Carolina Core subcommittee, chaired by Leslie Lovelace, drafted process proposals, including options for different committee structures. In December 2021, InDev Chair Ramy Harik asked the Senate to provide feedback on three potential committee configurations via an online survey.

During and following the December meeting, Senators requested clarification of the rationale for revising the Core. Recognizing the sensitivity of this endeavor, InDev paused process and committee discussions to illustrate more fully the motivations for our efforts. The current InDev committee reviewed faculty evaluations of the Core and heard from representatives from Advising and the Provost's office. While InDev did not have consensus about wholesale revision to the Core, we did concur that 1. there are issues requiring attention, and 2. we need a process by which to address them. On February 18, the full InDev committee unanimously endorsed the subcommittee's approach of proposing a committee to review and suggest adjustments to the Carolina Core.

In March 2022, InDev presented the Senate illustrations of its rationales for revising the Carolina Core. Of particular note were internal and external transfer obstacles. Students transferring from other institutions struggle to satisfy some of our Core requirements. Internally, while the University has a common set of learning outcomes, each college has its own required Core classes, as do most programs. As a result, changing majors, even early on, can add substantial time to an undergraduate degree.

In drafting a procedure for reviewing, making adjustments to, or otherwise revising the Carolina Core, InDev sought to constitute a process for addressing problems as they arise, as well as initiating a policy where the University has not had one.

InDev collected feedback from Senators on Core Review Committee structures and welcomed questions, suggestions, and feedback on the process. The document beginning on page 9 of this report has been accepted by the Senate Chair.

Approval Process for Adding Online Modality to Existing Degree Programs
APPROVED BY INDEV 11/12/2021

Approval levels:

1. Pre-Authorization – Provost’s office – (see proposed additions/revisions pp. 2-3)
2. Academic Unit Head
3. College/School Representative
4. C&C review (proposed APPs/CIM additions p. 4 and C&C evaluation form, pp. 5-6)
5. Faculty Senate
6. Provost’s Office
7. Board of Trustees (BOT AESEC and Full BOT)
8. CHE notification (Submitted by the Office of Academic Programs)
9. SACSCOC Notification (Submitted by the Office of Academic Programs/OIRAA)

Current Pre-Auth for Program Modifications

Date of Request*

Name of Program or Unit*

Contact Person*

First Name

Last Name

Email*

Phone Number

Academic Program Liaison*

First Name

Last Name

APL Letter of Support*

Please paste in a letter from your APL supporting this action.

College/School Dean*

First Name

Last Name

Dean Letter of Support*

Please paste in a letter from your college or school dean supporting this action.

Attach a completed budget and enrollment file (MS Excel file). * No File Chosen

Download the **PROGRAM MODIFICATION BUDGET & ENROLLMENT TEMPLATE** [xlsx].

Why this change to the Program/Unit and why now?

- Why is this change to the program/unit critical to advancing the University's mission?
- What existing programs/units provide related content? Could the proposed revised program/unit be more effectively mounted in collaboration with these programs/units?
- Why is it essential that this program/unit be revised at this point in time?

Please explain why now: *

Demand for Change to Program/Unit

~~• What documentation can you provide of the demand for the program/unit?~~

- Where are there competing programs/units in the state/Southeast?

Please explain the demand for the change: *

Proposed Revs/Add for Online Modality

- [REPLACE] Explain the demand for the addition of online modality at this point in time. Provide supporting documentation, including considerations regarding market demand, student demand, external contracts, etc.

Impact on USC Reputation

- In what ways will this change to the program/unit make a difference in the institution's academic reputation?
- What evidence is there that the change to the program/unit will allow sufficient intellectual rigor, and currency with theories and practices in the discipline to be maintained?

Please explain the impact on USC's reputation: *

Resource Requirements

- ~~What previously approved programs does USC offer that are closely related to the new program and how are they related?*~~
- Will significant additional equipment or facilities be needed? If so, please explain.*
- Will significant additional financial resources be needed? If so, please explain.*
- Will a significant number of new courses be required? If so, please explain.*
- Will a significant number of new faculty be required? If so, please explain.*
- Will a significant number of additional library/learning resources be required? If so, please explain.*

- REPLACE What previously approved online programs does UofSC offer that are closely related to the new program and how are they related? * Highlight any similar online programs (or programs that may be perceived as similar) offered by other UofSC campuses including Palmetto College; articulate clearly the differences between the proposed program and those already approved; and provide a detailed rationale for initiating the proposed modality.
- ADD Will our existing online support services be adequate (including orientation, advising, career counseling, etc.)? Please explain additional needs and resources necessary to deliver them.

Return on Investment

- In what ways will the change to the program/unit return USC's investment of resources in it?
- How long will it take for this change to show a return on USC's investment?

Please explain the return on investment: *

Sustainability

- Does the change to the program/unit require new financial resources from the Provost's office? New faculty lines?
- How sustainable would the changed program/unit be if no new resources are forthcoming from the Provost's office, but if funds are reallocated within your unit or college?
- How long will it take before the program/unit as revised is self-sustaining?

Please explain the sustainability: *

Proposed APPs/CIM questions for Adding Online Modality

Date Pre-Authorization was approved by Provost:

Program Impact

Impact on Carolina Core Students:

For adding online modality, provide an assured fully online pathway through the Core. List each class and identify which college(s) or school(s) has committed to offer fully online sections on a regular basis (i.e., at least once a year).

Letters of Concurrence from impacted college representatives :

Letters required from all colleges/units offering the above Carolina Core classes

Impact on Other Units or Palmetto College Campuses:

For adding online modality, Provide an assured fully online pathway through all remaining degree requirements, including College Requirements, Program Requirements, and Electives. List each class and identify which college(s) or school(s) has committed to offer fully online sections on a regular basis (i.e., at least once a year).

Letters of concurrence from the relevant units and Palmetto College

Letters required from all colleges/units offering the above classes

Impact on face-to-face program within the major

How will the addition of online modality impact the face-to-face program. For instance, is it expected that staffing for the online program will draw from staffing for the face-to-face program, and to what extent? Is it expected that the online program will draw students away from the face-to-face program, and to what extent? What measures will be taken to ensure the sustainability of both programs?

What previously approved online programs does UofSC offer that are closely related to the proposed program and how are they related?

Highlight any similar programs (or programs that may be perceived as similar) offered by other UofSC campuses including Palmetto College; articulate clearly the differences between the proposed program and those already approved; and provide a detailed rationale for initiating the proposed program online.

Assessment plans

Will the proposed assessment measures, targets for acceptable performance, and/or program oversight for collecting and responding to assessment results remain the same as those for the existing face to face program?

Online Program Checklist for C&C - draft

Curricula and Courses Proposal Evaluation Form – Program Proposals

1. Is this a proposal for a course or a program?
2. Reviewer Name
3. Program Name
4. Is this a proposal to terminate a program?
5. Does the program termination affect other units?
6. Have letters of concurrence been submitted for each affected department?
7. Is this proposal for a new program or a change to an existing program?
8. Does the program follow the Program of Study Format? (1. Carolina Core; 2. College Requirements; 3. Program Requirements-Supporting Courses, Cognate/Minor, Electives; 4. Major Requirements-Major Courses, Major Electives)
9. If there are prescribed courses for any of the Carolina Core components, are the prescribed courses approved for that Carolina Core component? (e.g. MATH 111 prescribed as the course for the Carolina Core Analytical Reasoning and Problem Solving (ARP) component. MATH 111 is not an approved course to meet the ARP component and should not be allowed as a prescribed course in the proposal).
<https://academicbulletins.sc.edu/undergraduate/carolina-core-courses/>
10. Are letters of concurrence present for any courses added or removed that are from a different unit than the program in the proposal?
11. Do any courses removed from the program affect other required courses in the program? (e.g. If Biological Sciences, BS were to remove BIOL 302 from the degree requirements, then a course proposal would be needed for BIOL 425, also a degree requirement, to remove BIOL 302 as a prerequisite. There are several courses in Biological Sciences, BS that require BIOL 302 as a prerequisite, so they would all need to remove 302 as a prerequisite if it were removed from the program.)
12. Are prerequisites for required courses included in the program? (e.g. STAT 509 is included in the program and has a prerequisite of MATH 142. Therefore, MATH 142 should also be included in the program.) Note: MATH 111/111i/112/115/116 are exceptions to this and should not be included in the program.
13. Are the concentration requirements within the major described? (e.g. Is it stated that selection of a concentration is required or optional? Are the concentration hours in addition to the base major requirements or in place of the base major or certain requirements of the base major –major electives?)
14. Is an integrative course required (not just an option) in the base major or in each concentration so that all students will complete an integrative course in order to graduate? <https://academicbulletins.sc.edu/undergraduate/carolina-core-courses/#integrativecoursestext>

15. Are there any ambiguous degree requirements or requirements that are missing a list of course options? (e.g. 3 hours of biological anthropology; 2 business courses; 6 hours of natural science)
16. Do the degree requirements equal the total degree hours? (Electives hours depend upon how students fulfill other degree requirements, including the Carolina Core, College Requirements, Supporting Courses, Cognate/Minor selection, and Major Requirements.)
17. For addition of online modality, is Pre-Authorization complete?
18. For addition of online modality, are letters of concurrence present for any listed competing online curricular offerings?
19. For addition of online modality, does the program proposal include an assured fully online pathway through all degree requirements, including Carolina Core requirements, College Requirements, Program Requirements, and Electives]?
20. For addition of online modality, do letters of concurrence from all affected units commit to deliver requisite online classes consistently (every/every other semester) to ensure progress within the program?
21. For addition of online modality, are all required courses approved for online delivery?
22. For addition of online modality, has the proponent explained the impact of distance learning on the face-to-face program?
23. Does the program proposal depend on the approval of any course proposals? (e.g. 1. Number of hours for various courses are being changed. The proposals for those courses must be approved before the program is changed to ensure that hours in the program are accurate. 2. New courses need to be created. The new courses need to be approved first to ensure that degree requirements or course options are accurate in the program being changed.)

InDev Proposed Process for Review and Revision of the Carolina Core

Spring 2022 – Fall 2025

Background Justification

In April 2021, the Faculty Senate Steering Committee directed InDev to consider “whether we should discuss revisions to Carolina Core, and, if so, by what process” (7 April 2021). In June 2021, InDev reported to the Senate that it had determined the Carolina Core should be revised because the current core “is complicated and not transfer friendly from other institutions as well as internally (as some colleges place restrictions),” because “the impact of the Carolina Core on the time to graduation needs to be assessed,” and “the timing is right, after 10 years and the SACS visit” (2 June 2021).

In March 2022, InDev presented illustrations of current issues with the Carolina Core along with the rationale for forming a committee and a process for reviewing and revising the Core (see Appendix B). These included illustrations of internal and external transfer obstacles. For example, students transferring from other institutions struggle to satisfy some of our Core requirements. Internally, while the University has a common set of learning outcomes, each college has its own required Core classes, as do most programs. As a result, changing majors, even early on, can add substantial time to an undergraduate student’s degree. Furthermore, inconsistencies in applying overlay requirements, difficulties in assessing some learning outcomes, and limitations of software programs add confusion and difficulty for students navigating our general education requirements.

Perhaps the most persuasive reason to develop a process for Core revision is the fact that *we presently have no established procedure for making adjustments to or otherwise revising the Carolina Core*. We have no process for addressing problems as they arise, and we have no policy by which to propose larger changes when we decide the time is right.

InDev presents the Senate with the following proposed process for consideration.

Guiding Principles

- Primary focus should be on educational excellence
- Enhancing the student experience, where consistent with the primary aim of delivering educational excellence, should also be a goal (e.g., allowing flexible pathways for meeting requirements)
- Budget should not be a motivating factor
- Committee recommendations should be informed by consideration of best practices, peer and peer aspirant institutions’ approaches to general education, and extensive consultation with stakeholders on campus

- Transparency and communication are paramount
- Evidentiary burden should correspond to scale of proposed changes

Process Steps

1. Formation of the Carolina Core Review and Revision Committee
2. Data Collection and Review
3. Report to Faculty Senate and stakeholders
4. Proposals for Revision
5. Faculty senate vote on proposal(s). If not approved, CCRRC returns to step 4
6. Implementation

1. Formation of Carolina Core Review & Revision Committee (CCRRC)

The Senate will convene an ad hoc committee—the Carolina Core Review and Revision Committee (CCRRC)— charged with reviewing and suggesting revisions for the Core. Voting membership of the committee will consist entirely of faculty. Representatives of key administrative units will serve in an ex officio non-voting capacity.

InDev’s survey of 171 Faculty Senators (Dec 2021-March 2022) yielded 39 distinct responses with a clear preference for the Hybrid Faculty Senate and UG Program Enrollment Model (Option C). Thus the committee representation shall be:

College/School	# Faculty Reps.	% Committee
College of Arts and Sciences	5	27.78
Darla Moore School of Business	2	11.11
College of Engr. & Computing	2	11.11
Arnold School of Public Health	1	5.56
Information & Communications	1	5.56
College of Nursing	1	5.56
College of Pharmacy	1	5.56
College of Education	1	5.56
School of Music	1	5.56
College of Social Work	1	5.56
Palmetto College	1	5.56
Total faculty representation	18	100
Office of the Provost (ex-officio)	1	
University Advising Center (ex-officio)	1	
University Libraries (ex-officio)	1	
Total members including ex-officio	21	

All college/school representatives shall be tenure or professional track faculty nominated by their respective units/colleges. Each college/school shall be allowed to determine their own internal process for election. The slate of representatives will then be presented to the Faculty Senate for approval.

Approval of the Committee and Selection of the Committee Chair: Faculty Senate will vote to approve the slate of CCRRC members. Responses to InDev's survey indicated a preference (22-14) for the Senate to select the Chair of the CCRRC. All CCRRC members, except Ad Hoc/Ex Officio members and those who withdraw from consideration, are eligible for the role of Chair.

Once constituted, the committee will advance proposals for the Carolina Core on the basis of a **super-majority** (2/3 of the committee) voting in favor.

(See Appendix A for the Faculty Senate survey and results)

2. CCRRC Data Collection and Review

In evaluating the current status of the Carolina Core, the committee will consider the following:

a. Review – global

- ▪ •Peer/Peer Aspirant institution information on General Education
- ▪ •Relevant accrediting body requirements, (including SACSCOC and CHE)
- ▪ •“Robust benchmarking research,” including best practices for general education; consideration of diversity, equity and inclusion; staffing; teaching and learning

b. Review - local

- Current Carolina Core Assessment reports
- Infrastructure and internal practices, including software (DegreeWorks, e.g.), advising practices, major map structures, specifying program/major courses as Core courses, course approval practices, online offerings and potential; etc.
- Reported issues with Carolina Core
- Transfer difficulties (both internal and external)
- Assessment issues
- Accreditation issues
- Overlay issues
- Inconsistent practices between programs (e.g., using the Core to satisfy program/major requirements)

c. Engage with stakeholders in relation to reported issues, new issues, pros and cons of current Core, etc.

The CCRRC will develop a robust stakeholder engagement plan that solicits and responds to input from a diverse set of stakeholders, including and especially those stakeholders from units and offices not represented on the committee as voting or ex officio members.

▪ **Required stakeholders:**

- Faculty at the program and department level and through general faculty town halls
- Deans (Council)
- Academic Programs/APLs
- Academic Advisors
- Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion
- Current students
- Palmetto College Campuses
- OIRAA
- Libraries
- President's office

• **Suggested Stakeholders:**

- Alumni
- Graduate students (GTA's) who teach in the core (instructor of record)
- Business partners/Industry

3. Report to Faculty Senate and other stakeholders, summarizing CCRRC findings in Step 2, above.

4. Develop and present proposals for improving the core and/or addressing problems
The committee will advance proposals for the Carolina Core on the basis of a **super-majority** (2/3 of the committee) voting in favor.

Proposals should be developed, debated, and modified in consultation with—at a minimum: the Provost; Deans; Academic Program Liaisons; Advising; Diversity Equity and Inclusion; the Office of Institutional Research Assessment, and Analytics; and Faculty Senate. The CCRRC will keep all interested parties updated throughout the process, soliciting and responding to the thoughts, ideas, and concerns from broad and diverse sets of stakeholders.

Proposals may include a range of adjustments, from small changes that can be accomplished quickly, to larger shifts in our approaches to General Education. In addition to other considerations, the committee may wish to contemplate the utility of a truly common core among our many colleges.

5. Faculty Senate Approval

CCRRC will prepare and present their proposal(s) to Faculty Senate for approval, with distribution at least 2 weeks prior to the Faculty Senate presentation.

To ensure Senators have ample time to consult with their colleagues, the Faculty Senate vote will come no sooner than the Senate meeting following the presentation.

6. Implementation process begins (if suggested revisions approved and accepted).

The Faculty Senate Committee on Curricula and Courses will develop a process for implementation in consultation with the Office of Academic Programs and the Registrar, to be submitted to the Faculty Senate for approval.

Approved by InDev April 1, 2022

APPENDIX A

[Unit data and options presented for CCRC composition - Faculty Senate.pdf](#)
[Results of Faculty Senate Survey on the Composition.pdf](#)
[2022-04-06 InDev Senate Report.pdf](#)

APPENDIX B Recommended Sources, useful materials, etc.

SACSCOC Guidelines
CHE Guidelines
OIRAA materials
Faculty Impressions of the Core General education