Called to order at 9:35 a.m.
Present: G. Adams (Chair), M. Bay, S. Keller, G. Kowalczyk, James Thorson, P. Sessler-Branden

I. New Business

A. Notification of 3 special topic sections were presented and logged.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Transcript Title</th>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Times taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HIS 298</td>
<td>Ancient Military History</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS 398</td>
<td>Amer. Presidential Elections</td>
<td>Fall 2012</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Description of logged courses with full titles

HIS 298 – Ancient Military History

This course is a survey of the history of warfare in the ancient Mediterranean world from the Sumerians (3100 BCE) to the Romans of the Fourth Century CE. Major themes include the influence of warfare on ancient society, the development of military technology, battlefield dynamics, and the impact of war as a catalyst for social and political change.

HIS 398 – American Presidential Elections

This course investigates an array of significant presidential elections in American history. Students examine historically major issues, political parties and candidates; impact on American values, society and government; and innovations in campaigning and in the electoral process. Elections include 1800 (Jefferson), 1840 (Harrison), 1860 (Lincoln), 1876 (Hayes), 1912 (Wilson), 1932 (Roosevelt), 1960 (Kennedy), 1980 (Reagan), 2000 (G.W. Bush). Attention to the election of 2012 is anticipated. 9 credits of history required.

B. NPIC Reviewed the Application for a new Advanced Certificate in Accounting
   a. NPIC Recommends the approval of the Advanced Certificate in Accounting program, attached.

C. NPIC began the review of the new procedures for the approval of new programs per the new BoR document of January 20, 2012, with an eye toward the review and/or revision of our own procedures.

Meeting adjourned at 10:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Gregory Adams
1. In attendance: Kim Lacey (chair of WACC and interim director of WAC Program), Marie B. McDaniel, Maria Diamantis, Karen Burke, Astrid Eich-Krohm, Steven J. Corbett (ex-officio) Elena Schmidt, Sanja Grubacic, Dorothy Vasquez-Levy
2. Electronic participation: Thomas Ferrucci, Patrick McBrine
3. Approval of January 19, 2012 minutes
   a. Minutes approved
4. Chair/Interim Director Update: K. Lacey
   a. Discussion about policy for revalidation of W-courses for the purposes of assessment
      i. Issue will be tabled until the Writing Across the Curriculum Program has a new director
      ii. The committee agreed that a re-validation process should have clear guidelines and outcomes
5. Discussion about the chair position
   a. The committee’s ideas regarding increasing the term of the WACC membership to 4 years were not approved at the UCF Steering Committee.
   b. The committee agreed that a new chair will be elected during the Spring semester in which the active chair will be finishing their term. This will allow for mentoring of the incoming chair. The committee members strongly believe that this is essential to the integrity of the committee and the program. Bylaws will be updated to reflect this.
   c. Two committee members expressed interest in running for chair and both can serve for one year
6. Assessment with guest Debby Carroll
   a. The Writing Across the Curriculum Director is responsible for the assessment of the program.
   b. Debby explained to the committee the history of the program’s assessment project
   c. One result of the assessment was that poor student outcome was connected to poor assignment descriptions by faculty
   d. Faculty responded very positively to workshops offered on the topic
   e. Another result showed that 100/200 level assignments show different goals and strategies than assignments for the 300/400 level courses
   f. Debby announced a conference at Quinnipiac University March 3 and asks for participation of committee members
   g. Discussion regarding the lack of a permanent director of WAC. Concerns of those involved with the current assessment of the program as well as committee members were discussed. Greatest concern is that assessment will be lacking and without assessment, outside funding opportunities will be lost. K. Lacey will discuss with Interim Provost Kennedy.
7. Writing Contest
   a. The committee agreed that this year’s contest will be dedicated to Nancy Marano to recognize her work on campus and on the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee
8. Proposal Review
   - Course: HIS-307 W: Nineteenth Century Europe
     Faculty: Polly Beals
     Decision: Approved (8-0-0)
   - Course: PSY 431 W: Test and Measurements
     Faculty: Traci G. Hodes
     Decision: Remains tabled. Faculty member has been contacted because of missing paperwork
9. Adjournment 10:45
Respectfully submitted by Astrid Eich-Krohm

Motion to UCF to approve the following course as Writing Intensive:

Course: HIS-307 W: Nineteenth Century Europe
Faculty: Polly Beals
Southern Connecticut State University  
Writing Across the Curriculum Committee  
Meeting Minutes  
February 16, 2012

Present: Kim Lacey (Interim Director of WAC; Chair WACC); Karen Burke; Steven Corbett (ex-officio); Maria Diamantis, Thom Ferrucci (ex-officio), Dorothy Vasquez-Levy, Patrick McBrine

Electronic participation: Marie McDaniels; Astrid Eich-Krohm; Sanja Grubacic; Elena Schmidt

1. Call to order 9:35 a.m.
2. Approval of February 2, 2012 minutes
3. Chair/Interim Director Update: K. Lacey
   a. Provost Kennedy has been contacted regarding the status of the search for a Director of WAC Program as well as continued 3 credit release time for WACC chairperson
4. Writing Center Update: T. Ferrucci
   a. Fall 2011 589 students (15% [n=91] in W courses)
      i. 50 W sections and 20 departments represented
   b. Spring 2012 – this semester students are coming in earlier. Thom has encouraged faculty that are requiring students to visit the writing center ask students to do so early in semester. Many times they come at the end when the center is very busy and as a result they cannot get the time that they need.
   c. One vacancy for a student worker is available – paid $12-$15 hour – depending on experience and ability cannot be in another paid position at SCSU – prefer junior or senior – plan to announce at UCF.
5. Practical Pedagogy: S. Corbett/K. Lacey
   a. Wednesday February 29th 1:05-1:50 p.m. Focus: Open discussion regarding assignment design for W-courses and use of our rubric to improve assignments
6. Writing Contest: Guidelines finalized. Papers are due on March 16th. First round review is due on 4/5 and finalists will be chosen on 4/19
   a. Winners will be announced on 4/26 during UCF Meeting
7. Chairperson: Karen Burke was unanimously elected as incoming Chairperson beginning Fall 2012. Kim Lacey, current Chairperson will mentor her this semester.

8. Proposal Review:

   COM 258: Cinematic Technique  
   Faculty: Michael Bay  
   Recommendation: Approve  
   Vote: 9-0-0

   COM 258: Cinematic Technique  
   Faculty: Joseph Ullian  
   Recommendation: Approve  
   Vote: 9-0-0

   ENG 317: Cross-Cultural Literatures  
   Faculty: Sean Allen  
   Recommendation: Approve  
   Vote: 9-0-0

9. Adjournment: 10:20 a.m.
Motion to UCF to approve the following Writing Intensive Sections:

    COM 258: Cinematic Technique
    Faculty: Michael Bay

    COM 258: Cinematic Technique
    Faculty: Joseph Ullian

    ENG 317: Cross-Cultural Literatures
    Faculty: Sean Allen

Respectfully Submitted,

Kim Lacey, Interim Director of WAC; Chairperson WACC
PRAC draft minutes
Meeting 2/16/2012

Present: S. Clerc (chair), M. Davidson, C. Dellinger-Pate, M. Enjalran, P. Kahlbaugh, T. Lin, T. Radice, R. Zipoli

Absent: M. Fede, C. O’Sullivan

Meeting convened: 9:40 a.m.

Following a review of the Anthropology Department’s self-study, the committee met with faculty members Dr. Kenneth McGill and Dr. Joseph Manzella to discuss recommended changes to the report. The majority of the recommendations concern reorganization of content and the inclusion of data the Department might already possess.

The report revision should be sent to S. Clerc by February 28, 2012 for discussion at the March 1 PRAC meeting.

PRAC suggests the following changes to the report:

Standard 1. Remove the chart on p. 5. Move the history of the department to the executive summary.

Standard 2. Retain the current faculty-centered department goals and repeat the student goals currently in Standard 3.

Standard 3. Retain the current list of student goals and objectives but add material from standard 17 describing how the Department plans to assess whether the objectives have been met; what direct and indirect measures are planned to assess student learning outcomes? These measures might also include the portfolios and exams currently discussed in Standard 4. The chart on p. 12 could also go here.

Standard 4: Discuss how you’ll use the data gathered in the plan described above. Will you meet to discuss it every month, how might you react to positive or negative results, etc.

Standard 5a. Use examples from the included syllabi or other courses to illustrate the connection between course-level outcomes and class assignments.

Standard 5b. Move the current contents to Standard 5a. In this standard, discuss how data gathered by the means described in Standard 3 might be used to change teaching—what’s the plan?

Standard 6. Excellent chart! Is it possible to replace the one in the appendix with a clearer copy? Repeat whatever it was Joe said in the meeting and how the department determines student goals and conceptualizes courses.

Standard 7. No recommendations.

Standard 8. No recommendations.

Standard 9. Include data from the Office of Management Information and Research regarding graduation rates, courses cancelled, enrollment, etc. Discuss any revelations.

Standard 10. You guys are awesome! Including the number of students involved in these projects would make this section even better.
Standard 11. Seriously, you’re totally awesome! Adding more detail about awards, recognition outside of Southern, and so on would strengthen this section even more. Brag! Also, include advisers for the student honors theses and brief summaries of faculty research interests.

Standard 12. No recommendations.

Standard 13. Please provide more specifics about the issues listed. Summarize problems in Standard 16. Make the case for why these shortcomings negatively impact your students and department.

Standard 14a. Repeat some of the information from Standard 3 about what you plan to do to gather and use data.

Standard 14b. No recommendations.

Standard 14c. No recommendations.

Standard 15. Has your awesomeness been mentioned? Including an idea of how many faculty and students benefit from these activities would be great.

Standard 16. Everything mentioned as a problem or cause for celebration should be repeated here. It’s both a summary of what’s come before and the platform for the vision and action plan in Standard 17, and can be used to build the argument for why you need better facilities, more faculty, and so on.

Standard 17. Repeat, refer back to, or elaborate on the plan which you’ve moved to Standard 3 and discuss possible changes you’ve already considered: how they will, or might be, implemented. A timeline would be helpful, too. What resources do you need to implement the plan?

Meeting adjourned 11:10 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Clerc
University-Wide Impact Committee
Minutes 2/16/12

Present

Absent

I. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order at 9:40 am.

II. Old Business
The standing committee continued discussion over the Honors College offering of HON 270 (Language of the Arts) as a summer A term course, opening it to students not in the honors program using the criteria they use for other semesters, and to also have the course satisfy the Tier 2 Cultural Expressions requirement.

The standing committee approved the following motion:

When the situation arises that LEP credit needs to be assigned to students enrolled in honors courses, determination will be made through consultation between the directors of the LEP and the Honors college based upon the LEP document.

Motion to approve: K. Gatzke, seconded D. Weiss
Motion passed 9-0-0

III. New Business
The standing committee then discussed the Board of Regents course transfer draft and various house measures pending in the state legislature as they related to UWIC.

LEP COURSE PROPOSALS

    ART 106 Critical Thinking in the Visual Arts (T1 CT)
    (Tabled)

    HIS 367 The Twentieth Century World (T3)
    (Tabled)

IV. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 10:50 am

Minutes prepared by Byron Nakamura
Liberal Education Program Committee Meeting
Wednesday, February 8, 2012
3:25 – 4:45pm – ASC 308
Meeting Minutes

Attending: Armen Marsoobian, Nicole Henderson, Wendy Hardenberg (recording), Kim Laing, Liz Keenan, Deborah Weiss (chair), Rich Kustin, Polly Beals, John DaPonte, Joe Fields, Jim Tait

- Meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.
- Minutes of 2/1/12 meeting were approved.
- Committee and Ad Hoc reports
  - Armen Marsoobian – CT update
    - A draft of an assessment rubric was created with the help of Michael Ben-Avie during the early part of the spring semester. The Critical Thinking group will meet on Friday to start reading a sample of 24 student essays, with the hope that each department involved in CT will contribute a volunteer. Participation is technically mandatory, but that ideal has not yet been reached. Only the 4th key element (synthesis) will be assessed at this time, but they are working towards assessment of all the key elements. Not all CT instructors have submitted syllabi to the CT Coordinator, so perhaps the LEPC could assist with insisting on collection of material to facilitate assessment.
    - The purpose of the current assessment is to analyze a random sampling of student work in order to assign one of four levels of rating: fully met, partially met, barely met, failed to meet. This is so as to gather information that will help faculty improve the CT courses or rethink the learning outcomes. The assessment will also serve as a guide to develop the eventual competency demonstration.
    - The CT group is currently assessing essays, but the assignment could be anything that presents an argument. The common rubric is similar to what Technological Fluency has been doing, but having an outside group do the grading is different. However, that has nothing to do with the students’ grades. All CT assessment is blind and random.
    - Nicole Henderson noted that there can be a lot of fear about handing over syllabi and papers in a brand new course, especially for adjunct and non-tenured faculty. Unless they know why and how the assessment is occurring and that they won’t be judged, instructors tend to disappear and hide. A sense of safety is important.
    - A lot of time was spent over the summer discussing assessment, and the current effort seemed to be the path of least resistance because it didn’t require a special tool or objective exam and was also cost-free.
  - BoR Plan
    - Polly told the committee that the whole impetus was coming from the governor. The only faculty involvement is via the Board of Regents faculty advisory committee, and our representative is Ilene Crawford. The drive is not for a common curriculum, but rather different menus of courses at different schools. There will, however, be an ironclad commitment to transferability of courses amongst the schools. This does not mean the end of the LEP.
    - Armen expressed concern about curriculum no longer being the prerogative of the faculty, which could violate the collective bargaining agreement.
• After some further discussion, Liz asserted that more information is necessary—who is articulating the details? Whom do we contact? Who spells out what the 36 credits are? What the common curriculum is?
• Nicole agreed that right now we should ask what the steps are, not about the specifics of the resolution. A system-level transfer bank was discussed before and never materialized, so how is it going to happen this time?
• Deb reminded the committee that we need to be careful about not jumping too quickly and making sure that control of curriculum stays in faculty hands. UCF needs to consider this and make decisions. Should it go to UWIC? To a new ad hoc committee? Clarification is essential. Perhaps UCF should come up with a statement to send to the Board of Regents prior to their March meeting. What kind of push-back do we need to engage in right now?
• John suggested that UCF should supply Ilene with a list of questions and concerns, such as exactly which Community College programs are they talking about.
• Armen told the committee that the Faculty Leadership Council met today and proposed that the new SCSU president take the lead for a summit with all concerned campuses. We have a program that fits well with what’s being proposed, so we can take the initiative.
• After further discussion, Joe pointed out that the imposition is from the governor, but the Board of Regents is made of people acting in good faith who are circulating a draft for input. They expect a constructive response. We need to make an economic argument, namely that this will cost money. Is the expense of the new program worth it?
• Deb will pass all our discussion on to Marty.

  o Old Business
  • Request by nursing department
    • The committee discussed various ways of addressing Nursing’s request, including turning a required NUR course into a Tier 2 Mind & Body course, simply saying no so as to avoid the precedent, exempting nursing majors temporarily while a Tier 2 course is created, and asking Nursing to meet with us in person. Nicole pointed out that it might not be such a bad thing to have credit-heavy departments articulate how they’re meeting key elements in order to get exempted from bits of the LEP. Rich then asked if we were okay with that becoming a pattern.

  o Meeting adjourned 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendy Hardenberg
Liberal Education Program Committee Meeting  
Wednesday, February 15, 2012  
3:25 – 4:45pm – ASC 308  
Meeting Minutes

Attending: Elliott Horch, Polly Beals, John DaPonte, Elsie Okobi, Wes O’Brien, Liz Keenan, Deb Weiss (chair), Armen Marsoobian, Wendy Hardenberg (recording), Joe Fields

- Meeting was called to order at 3:33 p.m.

- Minutes of 2/8/12 were approved with one correction.

- Announcements
  - President Papazian is holding open meeting regarding the transfer/articulation policy recommendations proposed by the ConnSCU System Office next Tuesday, February 21st, at 3:30 p.m. in EN C112.

- Old Business
  - Request by Nursing Department for an exemption from the LEP Mind and Body requirement
    - It was felt by LEPC members that solutions other than granting an exemption, namely encouraging the Psychology Dept. to offer PSY219 as a Mind and Body course or finding another department to offer an equivalent course should be sought. Polly and Deb will meet with the Psychology Chairperson. If this is not fruitful, the second option will be pursued. In light of this discussion, the following motion was made and passed unanimously:
      - Motion: Granting a Tier 2 Mind and Body exemption to the Nursing Department is premature at this time until other options have been explored. The LEPC will assist Nursing in exploring these other options.
  
  - Transfer students
    - Transfer credits – discussion regarding limits on number of Tier 2 courses that may receive credit (“waived”)
      - Requirement of at least two Tier 2 courses plus Tier 3 capstone was determined to be reasonable at a previous meeting and no changes are recommended.
      - Deb asked the Committee whether (given the current situation in which the BOR as well as the state legislature are discussing a number of initiatives regarding the transfer of credits within the state’s higher educational system) it is worthwhile to spend time tackling these issue now, or whether we should wait until they have been clarified. The Committee agreed to put this discussion on hold until a later date.

        - Interim Provost Kennedy has requested that Polly Beals, Bruce Kalk and Frank LaDore meet with advisors at the Community Colleges as a good will gesture. It is expected that additional questions for the Committee will come forward after these meetings.

- New Business
• Transfer courses that do not reasonably align to any SCSU course fulfilling the LEP category (per request by Lauren Doninger)
  o At our retreat meeting in December, it was decided that if a course transfers in as equivalent to an SCSU course, it will receive LEP credit only if the equivalent SCSU course is an LEP course.
  o The new issue at hand is the acceptance of transfer courses (for which there is no equivalent SCSU course) that do meet the LEP key elements.
    ▪ The Committee decided favorably on this issue and began to work on a motion presented in draft form below:
    ▪ Proposed Motion: The LEPC moves that transfer courses that do not reasonably align with any SCSU course, but fulfill an LEP category, be accepted as satisfying the LEP requirement.
  o Further discussion that needs to take place in order to complete the motion:
    ▪ Who would make the decision as to transferability of the courses? Perhaps the LEP director in consultation with LEP coordinators?
    ▪ Should shell courses be created for this purpose?

  o Meeting adjourned at 4:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

~Wendy Hardenberg
Present: Cindy Simoneau (Chair), Laura Bower-Phipps, Jen Cooper, Corey Hannah, Sobeira Latorre, Derek Taylor, Sophia Myers (UCF Secretary)

Absent: Margaret Das, Sean Grace (Alt), Erin Larkin (Alt), Jingjing Liu, Nuncia Moniello, Elizabeth Rodriguez-Reyes

Meeting called to order at 9:35am

Old Business

NMC ByLaws – no action

New Business

Revised Course Proposals
CHE 101 – Chemistry in Contemporary Issues
Motion to approve:
Motion: C. Hannah; D. Taylor;
Motion passed: 7-0-0

CHE 103 – Crime Scene Chemistry
Motion to approve:
Motion: L. Bower-Phipps; C. Hannah
Motion passed: 7-0-0

CHE 260 – Organic Chemistry I
Motion to approve:
Motion: D. Taylor; S. Latorre
Motion passed: 7-0-0

CHE 261 – Organic Chemistry II
Motion to approve:
Motion: J. Cooper; C. Hannah
Motion passed: 7-0-0

CHE 262 – Organic Chemistry I: Lecture Only
Motion to approve: TABLED - pending clarification
Motion:
Motion passed:

CHE 263 – Organic Chemistry II: Lecture Only
Motion to approve: TABLED - pending clarification
Motion:
Motion passed:
CHE 370 – Physical Chemistry I
Motion to approve:
Motion: D. Taylor; C. Hannah
Motion passed: 7-0-0

CHE 371 – Physical Chemistry II
Motion to approve:
Motion: S. Latorre; J. Liu
Motion passed: 7-0-0

CHE 372 – Physical Chemistry Laboratory I
Motion to approve:
Motion: L. Bower-Phipps; C. Hannah
Motion passed: 7-0-0

CHE 373 – Physical Chemistry Laboratory II
Motion to approve:
Motion: C. Hannah; D. Taylor
Motion passed: 7-0-0

CHE 450 – Biochemistry I
Motion to approve:
Motion: L. Bower-Phipps; C. Hannah
Motion passed: 7-0-0

CHE 451 – Biochemistry II
Motion to approve:
Motion: D. Taylor; C. Hannah
Motion passed: 7-0-0

Revised Program Proposals
BS Chemistry
BS Chemistry/Concentration: Biochemistry
Motion to approve:
Motion: C. Hannah; D. Taylor
Motion passed: 7-0-0

BS Chemistry (7-12)
Motion to approve:
Motion: C. Hannah; J. Liu
Motion passed: 7-0-0

BA Chemistry
BA Chemistry/Concentration: Biochemistry
Motion to approve:
Motion: L. Bower-Phipps; D. Taylor
Motion passed: 7-0-0
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revised Course Proposal
CHE 262 – Organic Chemistry I: Lecture Only
Motion to approve:
Motion: C. Hannah; D. Taylor
Motion passed: 6-0-2

CHE 263 – Organic Chemistry II: Lecture Only
Motion to approve:
Motion: J. Liu; E. Rodriguez-Keyes
Motion passed: 6-0-2
# Undergraduate Curriculum Forum
## New Program Proposal - Signature Sheet

Please complete the appropriate sections, and include with New Program Proposal. Submit 15 copies of the proposal to the Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF) office, EN-C216. When submitting a revision of this proposal, use the original form indicating the date of the revision in the space below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Accounting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Title</td>
<td>Advanced Certificate In Accounting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Dr. Janet Phillips</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Accounting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>203 392 5698</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Phillips1@southernct.edu">Phillips1@southernct.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Address</td>
<td>SEA 212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Complete the following before submitting the proposal to UCF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Votes:</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Abstain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson, Department</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Chairperson, Dept. Curriculum Comm.</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Chairperson, School Curriculum Comm. | Date |

### The following section will be completed when the proposal is approved by UCF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chairperson, Subcommittee</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson, UCF</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Academic Vice President | Date |

## Date of Revised Proposal

Date of 1st revised proposal _____  
Date of 2nd revised proposal _____
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL - SUMMARY FORM

Date 9/23/11

DIRECTIONS: Please complete this form and submit with: 1) UCF Signature Sheet, 2) Required Materials form, and 3) any additional required materials as described in Directions for Preparing a Revised Course Proposal.

Please check that you have addressed the following, and complete the appropriate sections for each on this form and in the Rationale.

☑ LIST OF REQUIRED COURSES
☑ CATALOG /PROGRAM DESCRIPTION
☐ IDENTIFY SPECIALIZATION(S)/CONCENTRATION(S)
☑ PROFESSIONAL/CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS
☐ DEGREEE STATUS
☑ MINOR PROGRAM (Please attach Minor in a Program addendum)
☐ OTHER (Please specify)

ARE OTHER DEPARTMENTS <<AFFECTED>> BY THIS PROPOSAL? If so, list those departments and include letter(s) of acknowledgment from Chair(s) of Department(s) with this proposal and/or include the signature(s) on the signature form.
No other departments are affected by this proposal.

LIST OF REQUIRED COURSES
List courses that are included as part of this New Program Proposal; include Department, course number, and title:

List of Courses:
Students should choose any four of the following classes from the menu of options for a total of twelve credits:

Menu of course options to fulfill Advanced Certificate:

Undergraduate:
ACC 370 Accounting Information Systems
ACC 351 Advanced Studies in Taxation
ACC 380 Forensic Accounting
ACC 401 Not-for-Profit and Governmental Accounting
ACC 424 International Accounting
ACC 497 Internship

Graduate*
(a maximum of two graduate courses with the "MBA" designation are allowed):
MBA 575 Financial Statement Analysis
MBA 576 Advanced Income Tax
MBA 577 Tax Planning and Research
MBA 578 Not-for-Profit and Governmental Accounting
MBA 579 Advanced Auditing
MBA 580 International Accounting Standards: Use & Interpretation
MBA 581 Contemporary Accounting Issues

* Students choosing courses with the "MBA" designation must first comply with MBA admissions requirements which include a 3.0 overall GPA in an undergraduate program or completion of the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT).
**CATALOG/PROGRAM DESCRIPTION**

*Please provide the New Program description. This information is used for preparing the catalog. Please attach additional sheets if needed.*

**DEPARTMENT**

Accounting

**SPECIALIZATION(S) (IF APPLICABLE)**

**CATALOG DESCRIPTION**

The Advanced Certificate in Accounting Program is designed for individuals currently holding a Bachelor's degree from a regionally accredited college in a discipline other than accounting who have completed the Introductory and Intermediate Certificate in Accounting Programs (or equivalent courses).

The Advanced Certificate in Accounting Program also offers an avenue for students with an undergraduate accounting degree to earn the additional credits necessary to be certified as a CPA in Connecticut.

A maximum of one course may be transferred in from another university towards the advanced certificate. All credits earned in the advanced certificate may be applied towards a Bachelor's degree in Business Administration or a Master's Degree in Business Administration.

The Advanced Certificate in Accounting requires students take four elective courses for a total of twelve credits. Together with the 24 credits earned in the Introductory and Intermediate Certificate Program, these courses complete the thirty-six semester hours of accounting required to be certified as a CPA in Connecticut. (In addition to these accounting hours, please note Connecticut also requires, thirty general business and sixty general education credits to be certified.)

Suggested plan for completing the Introductory, Intermediate and Advanced Certificate Programs in two years:

**YEAR 1:**

**Introductory (11 credits):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer A</th>
<th>Summer B</th>
<th>Summer C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC 200 (4)</td>
<td>ACC 310 (4)</td>
<td>ACC 220 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intermediate (13 credits):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC 311 (4)</td>
<td>ACC 461 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC 350 (3)</td>
<td>ACC 410 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YEAR 2:**

**Advanced (12 credits):**

*since students may choose any 4 from the electives shown above, this is just a hypothetical solution*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summer A</th>
<th>Summer B</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elective I (3)</td>
<td>Elective II (3)</td>
<td>Elective III (3)</td>
<td>Elective IV (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM
NEW PROGRAM PROPOSAL – REQUIRED MATERIALS

DIRECTIONS: Please address the following and submit along with:

1) UCF Signature Sheet
2) Summary Form
3) Any additional required materials as described in Directions for Preparing a New Program Proposal.

☐ Submit 15 copies of the proposal to the Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF) office, EN-C216.

WHAT IS THE <<RATIONALE>> FOR PROPOSING THIS PROGRAM?

The Advanced Certificate In Accounting Program is proposed in response to tremendous interest in accounting careers by individuals who currently hold a bachelor's degree in another discipline. The Advanced Certificate in Accounting Program also offers an avenue for students with an undergraduate accounting degree to earn the additional credits necessary to be certificed as a CPA in Connecticut. The certificate provides a credential to recognize accounting courses taken in order to be eligible to sit for the CPA exam.

WHAT ARE THE <<LEARNING OBJECTIVES>> FOR THIS PROGRAM?

The Advanced Certificate In Accounting Program is designed to provide a comprehensive, high quality instructional program in Accounting which is current, practical and prepares students for careers in business, governmental and not-for-profit sectors of economy by emphasizing critical thinking, problem solving and teamwork skills in a technologically and globally rapidly changing environment. The focus of the certificate program is specifically on increasingly complex accounting topics. Students in the program are expected to be experienced and enthusiastic learners since admission requires an earned undergraduate degree.

Graduates of the Certificate of Accounting Program should possess:

•conceptual understanding and current technical accounting knowledge necessary for entry-level accounting positions.
•technical accounting knowledge in the areas of Financial Accounting, Managerial Accounting, Taxation and Audit necessary to be successful in professional exams.
•strong business writing skills.
•strong skills in using relevant accounting and business related technology.
•strong oral communication skills.
•the ability to identify and understand the importance of ethical business conduct.
•the proficiency to accept leadership roles in organizations.
•excellent critical thinking and problem-solving skills.
•strong team-work skills.
WHAT METHODS WILL BE EMPLOYED FOR <<EVALUATING STUDENTS>>?

The conceptual understanding of technical accounting knowledge is measured by the use of examinations and quizzes that directly test the level of the students' mastery of the subject matters of various accounting topics and courses covered. Writing skills are measured by writing projects that form the grades for many of the courses in the department and oral communication skills are evaluated with grades depending on participation in class and in teamwork. Finally, technology skills are measured by students’ success in courses that require use of technology to research and answer questions using IT tools such as Microsoft excel, Quickbooks, SAP, XBRL and tax preparation software.

PLEASE SPECIFY IF THERE ARE ANY ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS BEYOND THE STATED CURRICULAR REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS PROGRAM.

None

ARE THERE <<RESOURCES>> NEEDED FOR THIS PROGRAM? PLEASE ELABORATE.

Courses required to earn the Certificates in Accounting are currently open to undergraduate students and will be taught by existing accounting department faculty. Administrative resources will be required to coordinate the admission, advisement and assignment of certificates upon completion of the Certificate of Accounting program for graduation. The admission function will be handled by university admissions, advising by existing accounting faculty and assignment of certificates by the Business Student Resource Center which was recently established in the School of Business.

Depending on the growth of the programs, it may be necessary to expand accounting department faculty and administrative resources to accommodate the Certificate in Accounting Programs.
We are faculty members at Southern Connecticut State University and elected members of Southern’s University Curriculum Forum Steering Committee, which guides and oversees the undergraduate curriculum on our campus.

We agree with the spirit of HB 5029 that would institute a high school college readiness assessment in the sophomore year and subsequent remediation plans (if needed) for students planning to go on to college in the remaining two years of high school. We also know that should this bill be passed, it will be several years before colleges and universities see the fruits of these efforts.

Because of this time lag, we are not in support of SB 40, which seeks to prohibit requiring students to take remedial courses in college.

A common misunderstanding is that low Bachelors Degree completion rates are due to student enrollment in college remedial courses (Adelman, 2006; Bettinger & Long, 2005). In fact, low graduation rates are linked to a lack of preparation at the secondary school level (Attewell et al., 2006). In other words, there is either a misalignment between what is expected of high school graduates compared with what is expected of college freshmen, or a lack of adequate preparation to achieve those standards prior to high school graduation. Until this problem is solved, remedial instruction is critical in helping underprepared students gain access to higher education. Some facts to support this appear below:

1. The best predictor of student success in college is secondary school preparation.
   - In examining the records of 17,499 Colorado students, it was clear that if students were not proficient on the state assessment as early as the sixth grade, they were likely to require remediation in their first year of college (Lefly, Lovell & O’Brien, 2011).
   - A rigorous high school curriculum is a strong predictor of college readiness (Adelman, 2006). Students who take challenging coursework, such as four years of college-preparatory English and three years each of college-preparatory mathematics, science, and social studies, are less likely to need remedial courses than students who don’t take such a rigorous curriculum (Abraham & Creech, 2002).

2. If a student is not college-ready by the time s/he reaches that level, remediation is important in order to increase the chances of success.
In a study conducted on outcomes of remedial students at public colleges in Ohio (the fifth largest public higher education system in the U.S.), it was found that students who received remediation in math and in English were over 15% and 9% more likely to complete a college degree in four years respectively.

3. Providing access to college classes by students who do not meet minimum proficiencies does a disservice to them and may result in:

- Higher failure rates in college-level courses
- Longer graduation times as students re-take courses
- Lack of retention as students become demoralized and prematurely drop out
- Loss of financial aid due to students not meeting GPA requirements to continue to receive financial aid, and/or reach the end of time or funds available to pay for their higher education

We want to support a successful and timely completion of students’ degree programs at our colleges and universities. We think that adequate preparation is the key, and that students should be able to demonstrate college ready competencies prior to beginning any college degree program. We also think that remediation is best done in high schools and local school districts to keep the cost of high education within a reasonable range.

Until Connecticut high school graduates can demonstrate such competencies and high school remediation programs are in place, however, colleges and universities can best support student success by continuing to require them to take remedial courses when they are warranted.

Thank you for your time and consideration of these important issues affecting all of us in the State of Connecticut. Please contact us if you need additional information.

Martin Hartog, Ph.D., Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Forum
Deborah Weiss, Ph.D., Chair, Liberal Education Program Committee
Gregory Adams, Ph.D., Chair, New Programs and Innovations Committee
Elizabeth King Keenan, Ph.D., Chair, University-Wide Impact Committee

Southern Connecticut State University
501 Crescent Street
New Haven, CT 06515
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