

Committee on Instructional Development  
Report to the Faculty Senate  
March 2, 2022

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, led 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.

As Sandra Kelly reported to InDev in February 2022, revision “doesn’t necessarily mean throwing out the whole Core and starting from scratch. It could well be modifications ... rather than a wholesale revision.” In short, Core revisions include minor adjustments, tweaks that make small but impactful changes for our undergraduate students.

In its June 2021 report to the Faculty Senate, InDev provided the following list of rationales for revising the Carolina Core:

- The Carolina Core is complicated and not transfer friendly from other institutions as well as internally (as some colleges place restrictions).
- The Carolina Core did not consider advising in its current status and is not student friendly.
- Syllabi for Carolina Core courses are problematic, especially with respect to outcomes and their assessment.
- The impact of the Carolina Core on the time to graduation needs to be assessed.
- The timing is right, after 10 years and the SACS visit. (2 June 2021)

Terms like “not transfer friendly” and “not student friendly” refer primarily to internal and external transfer obstacles. Students transferring from other institutions struggle to satisfy some of our Core requirements – for example, UofSC is the only university in the SEC with an information literacy requirement. 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. There are other issues — inconsistencies in applying overlay requirements, for example, and difficulties in assessing some learning outcomes — but 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.

Proposals for Core revisions will not come through InDev itself, but rather through a committee and a process informed by Senate feedback and approved by a Senate vote. The feedback portal for proposed Core Review Committee structures will remain open until Friday, March 18<sup>th</sup> (<https://live.sharepoint.sc.edu/sites/provost/committees/cc>). The link requires signing in and is restricted to Senators, but Senators can download the documents and share them with constituents before completing the survey.

InDev welcome questions, suggestions, and feedback at any point.