Undergraduate Curriculum Forum

AGENDA
Adanti Student Center 301
Thursday, February 23, 2017

I. Call to order

II. Announcements

III. Approval of UCF minutes of January 26, 2017

IV. Standing Committee Reports
   a. NMC – Notifications Management Committee
   b. WACC – Writing Across the Curriculum Committee
   c. UWIC – University Wide Impact Committee
      i. Motion – approval of New Certification Program form and directions
   d. Ad hoc Assessment Committee
   e. LEPC – Liberal Education Program Committee - motion through SC under New Business
   f. Ad hoc Transfer Committee – motion through SC under New Business
   g. Special Topics courses
      CMD 198– Fundamentals of Social Communication, Weiss, Cook
      BIO 298 – Plant Ecology - Alling
      BIO 298 – DNA and Society, Wojiski
      BIO 298 – Cell Biology - Jeffrey
      BIO 398 – Epigenetics, Wojiski

V. TAP Transfer Degrees under review – http://www.ct.edu/initiatives/tap#pathways
   • Early Childhood Teaching Credential Studies (ECTC) has been approved by Education and by Interdisciplinary Studies and is recommended for approval by the UCF.
   • Theatre – still awaiting recommendation by Theatre Department
   • Arts – recommended with commentary to the TAP FIRC regarding number of credits awarded for studio arts courses as well as minor corrections to document
   Proposal from TAP Co-Managers committee regarding 6 credits of LEP (Global Knowledge and Creativity)

VI. Updates from LEP co-directors – defer to next meeting

VII. Unfinished business - none
VIII. New Business

a. Motions from UCF Steering Committee
   i. UCF Flow of Proposals
   ii. Motion on addition of TAP approved categories for Global Knowledge and Creativity (descriptive forms in packet)
   iii. Motion from SC (approved by AHTC and LEPC) on WLL exemptions for transfer students as follows:

   **Transfer students with 60 or more transfer credits at time of transfer are waived from the Multilingual Communication T1 requirement.**

   **Transfer students with 30-59 transfer credits at time of transfer are waived from the Multilingual Communication T1 requirement with completion of Level 3 high school or Level 2 college foreign language.**

   All native speakers and heritage learners of languages other than English who are transfer students and have not taken a world language in high school or college are encouraged to waive the requirement by taking a waiver examination (STAMP test, ACTFL exam or CLEP test) or by presenting a transcript from a foreign high school to the Chair of the World Languages and Literatures Department. *

   Transfer students must take LEP courses required for the major that are not yet completed.

   * unchanged from current requirement

b. Motions from LEPC (see minutes of 2/2/17).

IX. Adjournment

Absent: J. Sullivan, M. Hartog, R. Ranucci, B. Faracas, E. Rhoades

I. Call to order
Called to order at 9:37 am. A quorum (50% + 1) was reached at 9:37 am

II. Announcements
a. Marketing (Randye Spina) – Announced the student marketing team placed in semi-finals during an international marketing competition
b. Introduction of new members to UCF

III. Approval of UCF minutes of 12-8-16
Minutes approved

IV. Standing Committee Reports
A. NMC – Notifications Management Committee
   1. Motion to approve Revised Course Proposals

   PHI 490 – Philosophy Seminar
   REC 202 – Methods & Materials to REC 202 – Methods & Materials: Birth to Five
   REC 396 – Student Activities in Colleges and Universities to REC 396 - Student Activities and Leadership Development in Higher Education
   SMT 356 – Sport and Tourism Marketing and Sales to REC 356 – Sport Marketing
   SMT 455 – Organization & Administration of Sport Management to SMT 388 – Organization & Administration of Sport Management
   MKT 440 – E-Marketing to MKT 341 – Digital Marketing
   PHI 301 - History of Jewish Thought
   PHI 302 - History of Christian Thought
   PHI 303 - History of Islamic Thought
   PHI 309 - Women and Religion
   PHI 310 - Women and Philosophy
Motions approved unanimously

2. Motion to approve New Course Proposals
   BIO 470 – Methods of Biology Teaching
   EDU 331 – Positive Guidance and Culturally Responsive Pedagogy
   EDU 352 – Early Childhood Integrated Curriculum and Assessment
   EDU 416 – Leadership, Policy, and Professionalism in ECE
   EDU 456 – Early Childhood Practicum and Seminar
   REC 312 – Therapeutic Play
   REC 365 – Event Planning & Production
   REC 366 – Hospitality Service Management
   REC 368 – Risk Management in Tourism Hospitality and Event Management
   SMT 295 – Evolution of Fantasy Sports & Sports Gaming
   SMT 354 – Sport Communication & Promotion
SMT 454 – International Sport Management & Governance
SMT 456 – Sport Finance
SMT 465 – Sport Analytics
HIS 259 – Digital New Haven
MKT 396 – Marketing Case Study
MKT 397 – Current Topics in Marketing
SED 205 - Intermediate American Sign Language I (T1-MC)

Motions approved unanimously

3. **Motion to Approve Departmental Minor Revision Proposals**
   Biology

Motion approved unanimously

4. **Motion to approve Revised Program Proposals**
   BS Business_CONC_Accounting
   BS Business_CONC_Management/MIS
   BS Business_CONC_Marketing
   BS Business_CONC_ECO/FIN
   BA Biology
   BS Biology
   BA IDS_CONC_Early Childhood Curriculum and Pedagogy
   BA IDS_CONC_Child, Family and Community Studies
   BS Recreation and Leisure Studies_CONC_Child Life Specialist
   BS Sport Management
   BS Business Administration_CONC_Marketing
   BS REC_CONC_Tourism, Hospitality & Event Management (THEM)
   BS ART_CONC_Painting-Drawing
   BS Exercise Science_CONC_PE K-12
   BS Exercise Sciences_CONC_Human Performance
   BS Chemistry_CONC_Biochemistry
   BS Chemistry_CONC_Biochemistry (374 to 370)

Motions approved unanimously

5. **Motion to approve Expedited Proposals for MCMC**
   History
   • 367
   • 409
   • 410
   • 438
Motion approved unanimously

Minutes of December 15, 2016, January 19, 2017 and January 23, 2017 were received

B. LEPC – Liberal Education Program Committee

Discussion – Committee is in the process of discussing some considerations for the LEP
1. Similar to current practice in the Honor’s College of exempting students from the Tier 3 requirement based upon completion of a thesis, can a student who is not in the Honor’s College, but completing a thesis, substitute the thesis for the Tier 3 requirement?
2. Semester long study abroad – are there ways to utilize courses from this experience for the LEP, e.g., exemption from 2 to 3 LEP courses or exemption from a portion of LEP?
3. Karen Cummings will meet with the LEPC on a regular basis.
4. International Office will be involved in discussion with LEPC

See minutes for full discussion.

Minutes of January 19, 2017 were received.

C. UWIC – University-Wide Impact Committee

Motion to approve new Program Proposal Form for UWIC (presented at December Meeting)

Motion approved unanimously

No meeting in January

D. Ad Hoc Assessment Committee

1. Vote for committee chair: Rebecca Silady
2. LEP assessment plan to survey all who are currently teaching in the LEP. Focus will be on:
   a. Key elements of what they are teaching; and
   b. Are they already doing an assessment and if so, what kind of assessment?
3. Plan to conduct LEP course assessments on an 18-month basis
4. Current protocol is that LEP data be collected every semester and reviewed every four years; recommendation would be to review every semester so that changes would be more timely.
5. The committee will meet with each affinity group throughout the semester.

Minutes of January 19, 2017 were received.

E. WACC – Writing Across the Curriculum Committee

Motion to approve new W course proposals

COM 225 Interpersonal Communication (Parzyck)
PHI 375 Philosophies of Social and Political Change (Cavallero)

Motion approved unanimously

Continued discussion of WAC proposal with Elizabeth Kalbfeisch

Discussed adding an option for W course proposals for department or faculty member to propose course. Currently, only faculty member can do this.

Minutes of January 19, 2017 were received.

F. AHTC - Ad Hoc Transfer Committee

1. Joan Krieger, Respiratory Therapy Program, provided information regarding the program in response to the proposal submitted by Joan and Lisa Rebeschi, NUR to waive Tier 1 and Tier 2 courses for RSP and RN to BSN students. Identified some questions regarding RSP degree requirements. Liz Keenan will meet with Joan to review the degree requirements. Wes O’Brien will forward to the committee the pathway analysis he did with NCC as additional information for review. Will review that information at next meeting.

2. Engaged in discussion regarding possibilities for how transfer credits are applied to LEP requirements for LEP Appendix A revisions. Terri Bennett provided updates regarding recent experiences bringing in new transfer students for Spring 2017.

Minutes of January 19, 2017 were received.

V. TAP Faculty Implementation Review Committee

The most current versions of the Pathways can be found at: http://www.ct.edu/initiatives/tap#pathways.

TAP Transfer Degrees under review – http://www.ct.edu/initiatives/tap#pathways
• Exercise Science Pathway – EXS recommended approval
Motion to approve unanimously

• approval of Early Childhood Training Certificate (ECTC), Theatre, and Arts pending approval by these three departments. Will come forward on February 9, 2017

VI. Special Topics Courses

i. JRN 298 – Broadcast Sports Performance, J. Dunklee
ii. ANT 398 – Poulton Archaeology Field School, Skoczen
UCF Chair has logged these courses

VII. Old Business

none

VIII. New Business

a. Update from Terri Bennett (Director for LEP Advisement and Policy) (now housed in Engelman B115)

Discussion:
  ▪ The goal in establishing an accessible office is to have a location available for transfer students to have their questions about the LEP answered and avoid the situation in which they have to go to the various departments on their own. This does not take the place of department approval for department requirements but hopefully will improve the process for transfer students for the LEP.
  ▪ A major area of focus currently is implementation of the 6/7 Tier 2 changes that were approved for the LEP. These changes need to be incorporated into the degree evaluation; each program has its own degree evaluation.
  ▪ Transfer bank is not up to date and needs work.
  ▪ Consider an LEP website for students to improve access.
  ▪ The ultimate goal is helping transfer students be successful here at SCSU

b. Update from Dr. Ilene Crawford, Interim Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean Stephen Hegedus, School of Education on US DOE and Title IV issues

As noted last fall, SCSU is on provisional status from the USDoE due to Title IV issues, which have to do with the award and dispersing of financial aid funds. This provisional status stems, in part, from a history of inconsistent attendance reporting requirements. USDoE now requires all new programs at SCSU to be reviewed at the federal level and it is a slow year-long process. It impacts SCSU’s ability to develop new programs based on changing demographics and students’
needs. Other areas of concern that have come to light are the gainful employment regulations and the Education Preparation (EP) certification programs (Currently, financial aid is being awarded at graduate vs. undergraduate rates for these post-baccalaureate programs).

The administration has been discussing the problem regarding our certification programs and has created a work plan and one year review process (planning for implementation fall of 2018). This means that the plan has be submitted to the USDoE by June 2017. It also means that review process for internal approval needs to happen by March 2017 and then submitted to the BoR for their approval prior to the end of the academic year in order to meet June 2017 deadline.

The VP and Dean are engaging with the UCF, first and foremost to have a collaborative dialogue and come up with solutions that meet the USDoE regulations, NCATE accreditation, and what is best for our students. The UCF will need approve the new certification programs. A discussion will also need to take place on how to align any changes with assessment.

One positive outcome for students is that if they have remaining funds, they can use undergraduate financial aid for the certificate programs.

IX.  Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 am.

Respectfully Submitted:

Cheryl Resha
UCF Meeting Minutes
February 9, 2017

UCF did not meet due to inclement weather and closure of university.
Notifications Management Committee  
February 2, 2017  
MINUTES

Present: Meredith Sinclair (Co-Chair); Braxton Carrigan (Co-Chair); MaryJo Archambault, David Chevan, Russell Engel, Michael Fisher, Rich Glinka, Marty Hartog, Md Shafaeat Hossain, Jen Ruggiero, Jessica Powell, Sang Yoon,

Absent: Cathy Berei, Jeremy Chandler, Steven Hoffler, Sophia Myers (UCF secretary)

Call to Order: 9:30am  

New Course Proposals
ART 201: Visual Art and the Studio Experience (Tier 2 CD)  
Motion to Revise/Resubmit: (M. Hartog, 2nd M. Fisher)  
Vote: 10-0-0

ANT 305: Archaeology Field School  
Motion to approve: (M. Fisher, 2nd R. Engel)  
Vote: 10-0-1

ART 155: Art & Technology in the Classroom (Tier I TF)  
Motion to Reject: (B. Carrigan, 2nd J. Ruggiero)  
Vote: 12-0-0

ART 335: Student Teaching I  
ART 435: Student Teaching II  
Motion to approve pending clarification: (M. Fisher, 2nd R. Engel)  
Vote: 12-0-0

ART 412: Professional Topics in Art Education  
Motion to approve pending clarification: (M. Sinclair, 2nd J. Ruggiero)  
Vote: 12-0-0

ART 414: Socially Engaged Art Education (Tier III)  
Motion to approve pending clarification: (B. Carrigan, 2nd J. Ruggiero)  
Vote: 12-0-0

PCH 371: Food Systems and Food Justice (Tier III) - this is a resubmitted course  
Motion to reject: (D. Chevan, 2nd J. Ruggiero)  
Vote: 11-0-0

Revised Program Proposals
BS Art Education  
Motion to approve pending clarification: (B. Carrigan, 2nd M. Fisher)  
Vote: 11-0-0
Revised Course Proposals
ART 370: Art Education (Elementary School)
ART 371: Art Education (Secondary)
  Motion to approve: (J. Ruggiero, 2nd M. Fisher)
  Vote: 11-0-0

IDS 470 -> RDG 470 Literacy in the Content Areas
IDS 471 -> EDU 471 Supporting English Language Learners for School Success
  Motion to approve: (Md Shafaeat Hossain, 2nd J. Ruggiero)
  Vote: 11-0-0

I. Adjournment

** Classified as LEP courses
Electronic Vote for re-submitted ART 201 proposal - 2/14

Approve

- B. Carrigan
- J. Chandler
- C. Berei
- MD Hossain
- J. Powell
- S. Yoon
- J. Ruggiero
- R. Engel

Abstain

- M. Archambault
- M. Hartog
- R. Glinka
- M. Fisher
- M. Sinclair

No

- D. Chevan
To address the immediate concern of transitioning Graduate Certification Programs to Post Baccalaureate Certification Programs, NMC and UWIC held a program proposal writing workshop on February 16th. The outcome established common language and structure for these programs to be included into the Undergraduate catalog for Fall 2018.
Present: Marie McDaniels, Sarah Wojiski, Matt Miller, Elena Schmitt, Liz Kalbfleisch.

The committee discussed the idea of revising the current W-course proposal form to add the following items:

Please, check here if this course is designated as “W” only for the applicant.
Please, check here if this course is designated as “W” for any appropriate professor teaching the course.
Please, check if the class is restricted to majors.

For the existing W courses, the department may request to re-certify the approved W-course or courses for all eligible instructors through an email to the chair of WACC.

WACC will notify UCF that it will work on the revisions of the W application form.

We want to make it clear to UCF that this is a Band-Aid to help with the classes in the current W program. When the new program comes out, it will most likely have a different form and different requirements.

The committee discussed ANT 211. Marie moved to approve, Sarah seconded. The course was unanimously approved.
Minutes WACC Meeting on February 16, 2017

Present: Marie McDaniels, Matt Miller, Elena Schmitt, Liz Kalbfleisch, Greg McVerry

The committee discussed the WACC Data Analysis of W Program 2010 and 2016 prepared by Matt Miller to make sense of how many W classes our students take in the major and how many take general W classes that are not major-related.

A discussion of the goals of W program in view of the budget cut took place.

Members discussed possible assessments for W program success and specific skills that students achieve as a result of taking W courses.

Members discussed a possibility of revising the W program to include a class in general academic writing and a class in disciplinary writing. The committee proposes to examine the learning outcomes of Eng 112 and will build sample learning outcomes and assessments for general academic writing courses.

Members could not make any firm decisions on how to proceed due to lack of the majority. The committee strongly encourages all its members to attend the next WACC meeting so that decisions could be make and the work can move forward.

Respectfully submitted,
Elena Schmitt
UWIC February 2, 2017


I. Call to order ~9:50

II. New Business

   a. Motion to accept the Post-Baccalaureate Certification Program Proposal form.

      E West motion, D Fairchild second. Motion passed 16-0-0

   b. Motion to accept the Post-Baccalaureate Certification Program Proposal directions.

      A Marsoobian motion, T Ryder second. Motion passed 16-0-0

III. Meeting adjourned 10:10

      Minutes submitted by K. Stiver
To address the immediate concern of transitioning Graduate Certification Programs to Post Baccalaureate Certification Programs, NMC and UWIC held a program proposal writing workshop on February 16th. The outcome established common language and structure for these programs to be included into the Undergraduate catalog for Fall 2018.
Ad Hoc Assessment Committee Minutes

February 2, 2017

Present: Costel Calin, Karen Cummings, Jesse Gleason, Yan Liu, Rebecca Silady (chair), and Jeff Webb

Absent: Charlie Dillinger-Pate, Marybeth Fede, Tricia Lin, and Anthony Richardson

Guests: Jodie Gill, Mark Kuss, Linda Sampson, and Winnie Yu

Meeting began at 9:45am

New Business

1. Discussion with Tech Fluency Affinity Group members regarding assessment
   a. Rubric has already been created
   b. Assessment data has been collected and analyzed for many semesters
   c. Instructors use multiple diverse assignments in their classes to assess the different learning goals within each key element on the rubric. This allows for very diverse classes to use the same rubric.

Meeting adjourned 11:00am
Ad Hoc Assessment Committee Minutes  
February 16, 2017

Present: Costel Calin, Karen Cummings, Charlie Dillinger-Pate, Marybeth Fede, Jesse Gleason, Tricia Lin, Yan Liu, Anthony Richardson, and Rebecca Silady (chair)
Absent: Jeff Webb
Guests: Cynthia Coron and Sarah Wojiski
Meeting began at 9:45am

New Business
1. Discussion with Natural World representatives regarding assessment
   a. Karen reviewed her plans for LEP Assessment
   b. Karen talked about how she assesses her NW courses
      i. Multiple choice pre-test during the first lab with questions in three areas
         1. Scientific reasoning
         2. Specific course content
         3. Views about science
      ii. Exact same test is administered on the last day of the class
      iii. Neither test factors into the course grade or is shared with the student
   c. Cynthia talked about assessment in Earth Science NW courses
      i. Questions are embedded in exams that align with the key elements
   d. Discussion about coordinating between different instructors who teach sections of the same course
      i. Sections of a given course should use the same assessment tool every semester
      ii. Different courses within NW can use different assessment tools
   e. Discussion regarding the scope of assessment
      i. Instructors in NW should agree on at least 1 key element that all NW instructors assess
      ii. Instructors in NW should assess at least 1-2 additional key elements of their choice
   f. Discussion regarding which key element all NW instructors should assess
      i. “Key Element #1: Scientific Inquiry - Understanding the nature of scientific inquiry in general and the use of the scientific method as a basic inquiry tool.’’
      ii. Key Element #1 is most likely to be similar among most of the NW classes and could be assessed with a pre/post multiple choice test
iii. Each NW instructor could embed questions in their exams that address “Key Element #2: Body of Scientific Principles - Learning a coherent body of scientific knowledge.”

g. NW Instructors should meet to work on developing a very short pre/post multiple choice test to assess Key Element #1.

Meeting adjourned 10:50am
Liberal Education Program Committee  
Thursday, Feb. 2, 2017—ASC 308  
Meeting Minutes

Present: Cindy Simoneau (chair), Mary Pat Lamberti, Wendy Hardenberg (recording), Helen Marx, Resha Cardone, Jim Tait, Polly Beals.

GUESTS: Erin Heidkamp, Director Office of International Education; Julia Irwin, University Honors Thesis Committee Chair

1. Call to Order: 9:41 a.m.
2. Announcements
   a. None
3. Old Business
   A. Continued edits of LEPC document
      a. To be addressed next time
4. New Business
   A. Study Abroad Tier 2 course waiver (Guest: Erin Heidkamp)
      a. Proposed Motion: All students who study abroad for the span of a semester or year shall have the opportunity to waive two of their successfully completed courses for Tier 2 requirements. Students, however, may not waive departmental degree requirements, unless authorized by the department, nor may they waive both of the Natural World science requirements.
         i. Motion made by Cindy, seconded by Helen
      b. About 130-140 students study abroad through faculty-led programs, about 75 more do semester- or year-long programs
      c. Good tool to support students who need to justify study abroad through satisfaction of requirements
      d. Students may still make direct course substitutions based on equivalency, but they also would get the blanket waiver of two Tier 2 courses
      e. Erin could handle the waiver workflow, rather than having another item for the LEP director to do.
      f. Approved 4-2-2
   B. Honors thesis Tier 3 course substitution (Guest: Julia Irwin)
      a. Julia, as chair, trains students and faculty to go through Honors thesis process, and teaches HON 350 Honors Thesis how-to course
      b. Proposed Motion: Students who complete an Honors thesis, and are not members of the Honors College, may substitute HON 495 for their Tier 3 capstone requirement. This substitution cannot override a departmental requirement unless the department is willing to approve the substitution.
i. Motion made by Cindy, seconded by Helen

c. Number of students varies from year to year, probably an average of 35-40 per year

d. Julia would be comfortable with a Tier 3 check box on the Honors Thesis paperwork and signing off

e. Motion approved 7-0-1

C. Change of wording to LEP document allowing students to take sign language instead of WLL

a. To be addressed at future meeting

4. **Adjournment:** 10:54 a.m.
Liberal Education Program Committee Meeting
February 16, 2017
ASC 308
Minutes

Present: Cindy Simoneau (chair), Nicole Henderson, Polly Beals, Resha Cardone, Wendy Hardenberg (recording), David Pettigrew, Mike Shea, Helen Marx, Mary Pat Lamberti, Terri Bennett, Robert Page, Jim Tait

Call to Order: 9:38 a.m.

Announcements:
- Meeting with the provost about LEP.

New Business:
- Motion regarding World Language Requirement for transfer students:

The LEPC moves to approve the proposal of the Department of World Languages and Literatures as follows:

- Transfer students with 60 or more transfer credits are waived from the Multilingual Communication T1 requirement.

- Transfer students with 30-59 transfer credits are waived from the Multilingual Communication T1 requirement with completion of Level 3 high school or Level 2 college foreign language.

All native speakers and heritage learners of languages other than English who are transfer students and have not taken a world language in high school or college are encouraged to waive the requirement by taking a waiver examination (STAMP test, ACTFL exam or CLEP test) or by presenting a transcript from a foreign high school to the Chair of the World Languages and Literatures Department.

- WLL wanted to address the transfer student issues while not diminishing the LEP experience for native students
  - Transfer students are not really getting a Southern education, so not making them do all the LEP requirements does not contradict our values
  - Not certain that the Multilingual requirement is what turns transfer students away, but it is something that just keeps coming up
- Some concern that this doesn't address the issue of people misperceiving the LEP, and may also encourage students not to go to Southern as native students
- Not really any hard data about transfer students and Multilingual, but the students who come in with 60+ credits tend to be non-traditional with multiple transcripts
  - waiving this requirement for these students could make a big difference
- could also help students using the TAP transfer framework
- almost none of these students meet the multilingual requirement coming in
  • Ideally, the multilingual requirement will also be marketed in a positive light (as a marketable skill) for native students in conjunction with this
  - Maybe there could be a commercial on TV selling the idea of the LEP, or people going out into communities to give presentations
  • A department that particularly valued the multilingual requirement for their students could restrict it in order to have transfer students take the requirement regardless
  • This is a high level of compromise on the part of WLL, and they want to lay this issue to rest so they can work on other initiatives
  • Many of our issues are less with the students and more with the high school and community college counselors, so this change would assist our relationship with them

• Cindy Simoneau makes the motion, Mike Shea seconds
  • Approved unanimously

Adjournment: 10:50 a.m.
Ad Hoc Transfer Committee Meeting

Minutes 2-2-17

Present: Carol Stewart, Vern Williams, Wes O'Brien, Lisa Lancor, Barbara Cook, Trish Regan, Terri Bennett (ex officio), Deborah Weiss (UCF Chair, guest chair)
Absent: Heidi Lockwood, Barbara Cook, Liz Keenan

1. Per conversation with Lisa Rebeschi, NSG does not wish to pursue the proposal submitted in concert with Respiratory Therapy. They feel that the articulations that exist with the community colleges and other programs are sufficient without creating exemptions at this time.

2. The discussion, therefore centered on the Respiratory Therapy Program, in response to the proposal submitted by Joan Krieger to waive Tier 1 and Tier 2 courses for RSP students. Although there did not appear to be broad committee support for waiving the LEP, one idea the committee discussed was for students who have completed an AA degree in RSP from one of the three community colleges that offer programs in the state, Norwalk, Naugatuck, and Manchester, to be able to fulfill the remainder of their credit requirements upon transfer (in addition to the major requirements), in the LEP Tiers 2 and 3 (with the exception of science courses since the CC RSP degrees are very science-heavy) until they reach a total of 120 credits. Deb will discuss this with Joan Krieger to see if this would be a helpful measure and report back to Liz Keenan.

3. A motion was made and approved unanimously to accept the freestanding TAP 30 credit framework for CC transfer students who do not compete the entire pathway. The Framework is outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAP Framework</th>
<th>SCSU Liberal Education Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAP Competency Areas</strong></td>
<td><strong>TAP Credits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written Communication</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative reasoning</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific reasoning, knowledge, understanding</td>
<td>6-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical knowledge &amp; understanding</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Phenomena</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic Dimensions</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B Course I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section B Course II</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ad hoc Transfer Committee Meeting
Minutes 2-16-17

Absent: Heidi Lockwood
Guest: Terri Bennett

1. AHTC met with LEPC for the first 30 minutes of the meeting to ask questions about the proposal from the Department of World Languages and Literatures:

- **Transfer students with 60 or more transfer credits are waived from the Multilingual Communication T1 requirement.**

- **Transfer students with 30-59 transfer credits are waived from the Multilingual Communication T1 requirement with completion of Level 3 high school or Level 2 college foreign language.**

All native speakers and heritage learners of languages other than English who are transfer students and have not taken a world language in high school or college are encouraged to waive the requirement by taking a waiver examination (STAMP test, ACTFL exam or CLEP test) or by presenting a transcript from a foreign high school to the Chair of the World Languages and Literatures Department.*

* unchanged from current requirement

AHTC then adjourned for deliberations on the proposal. Two amendments were proposed for clarification: 1) “at time of transfer” to ensure that students transferring in fewer credits would not take additional transfer credits to meet the thresholds below; and 2) “Must take LEP courses required for the major that are not yet completed” to allow for a department to require students in their major to take the Multilingual Communication requirement by restricting it in their major.

The ad hoc Transfer Committee moves to approve the proposal of the Department of World Languages and Literatures as amended:

- **Transfer students with 60 or more transfer credits at time of transfer are waived from the Multilingual Communication T1 requirement.**

- **Transfer students with 30-59 transfer credits at time of transfer are waived from the Multilingual Communication T1 requirement with completion of Level 3 high school or Level 2 college foreign language.**

All native speakers and heritage learners of languages other than English who are transfer students and have not taken a world language in high school or college are encouraged to
waive the requirement by taking a waiver examination (STAMP test, ACTFL exam or CLEP test) or by presenting a transcript from a foreign high school to the Chair of the World Languages and Literatures Department. *

**Transfer students must take LEP courses required for the major that are not yet completed.**

* unchanged from current requirement

**Vote: unanimously passed**

2. Draft motion for transfer students with 60+ credits

Began discussion on a draft motion that would waive some LEP requirements for those students who transfer in a specific number of courses in the humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences.

Adjourned: 10:50am
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New and Revised Courses
(including LEP and MDC Courses)
and Expedited Proposals for Minor Changes to Multiple Courses

- The following procedures are designed for all new and revised courses (including Liberal Education Program (LEP) and Multidisciplinary Courses (MDC) courses) and expedited proposals for minor changes to multiple courses.

- Liberal Education Program (LEP) Courses: New and existing courses may be submitted for approval as a Liberal Education Program (LEP) course. LEP proposals are submitted with the new or revised course proposal.

- Multidisciplinary (MDC) Courses: MDC courses address a question or problem so broad/complex that it cannot be adequately explored through a single discipline or field. MDC courses are those that encompass multiple disciplines in terms of the application or topic focus, and the method of inquiry. A new course proposal for an MDC course includes a rationale for why such a course is not cross-listed or listed as a major coded course. MDC courses will follow the existing approval pathway for new course proposals (including Department Curriculum Committee (DCC) of proposer). The Notifications Management Committee (NMC) will determine if all necessary notifications have been done. NMC may also request approval from another department if it is deemed necessary (in consultation with the original proposer).

- Proposals for course revisions are expected to receive careful review by their Departments. All subsequent reviews by the Notifications Management Committee (NMC) and the Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF) are expected to be routine and expedient.

- Minor changes to multiple courses shall be reviewed using the Expedited Proposal for Minor Changes to Multiple Courses form. Examples of minor changes include: changes made to a Revised Course Proposal (submitted separately) that affect the listing of pre-requisites and catalog descriptions of multiple courses; changes made via a Revised Program Proposal that subsequently affect the listings/descriptions for multiple courses; or a request for a minor change of catalog description language affecting multiple courses.

I. Departments generate proposals using the designated forms. Forms and directions may be obtained from the UCF website: http://www.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/ucf/forms-directions.html

A thorough review is conducted at the Department level. Upon successful review, one copy of the proposal is sent as an email attachment to the UCF office for logging by the UCF Secretary and distribution to the NMC and the appropriate Dean. The signature page only, properly executed, must be delivered to the UCF office. At the option request of the Department, counsel may be sought from the NMC during the development of any proposal.
II. Notifications Management Committee (NMC)
   A. Upon receipt and review of a proposal, the NMC shall take one of the following four actions. Each of these actions stops and resets the clock with regard to the pocket-approval\(^1\) for the NMC.
      1. Approve the proposal as is.
      2. Approve with minor (e.g. syntax) changes. These changes may be made by the committee, with the consent of the Department.
      3. Return with substantive concerns that need to be addressed. For process purposes, this should be considered a rejection. The following procedures may be followed if the Department does not consider the objections to be valid.
         a. The contact person may meet with the NMC. If the committee is persuaded, the proposal is approved and moves on.
         b. If the NMC stands by its evaluation, the Department may choose to make the suggested changes or appeal to the UCF. The UCF either approves or rejects the proposal.
         c. If the proposal is rejected, the Department may either modify it according to the UCF’s recommendations or withdraw it.
      4. Proposal is rejected outright. Reasons for rejection must be provided. Appeal process follows the procedure listed in #3.
   B. If no action has been taken in four academic weeks, the proposal is considered pocket-approved. The contact person notifies the UCF Chair.
   C. When the volume of LEP proposals exceeds the NMC’s capacity for timely review, the UCF Chair shall constitute an ad hoc committee to review LEP proposals.

III. Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF)
   A. Recommendations from the NMC shall be considered as actions of the UCF unless they are challenged at the UCF meeting. Approved proposals shall be recommended for acceptance to the Provost of the University or his/her designee.
   B. If challenged, the proposal is put before the UCF for thorough review. The UCF shall take one of the following four actions:
      1. Approve the proposal and recommend acceptance to the Provost of the University or his/her designee.
      2. Propose modifications to the proposal.

---
\(^1\) Pocket-approval refers to the process by which a proposal is moved to the next level of approval without action at the previous level. A proposal is pocket-approved if no action has been taken on the proposal for a period of four academic weeks. It then moves on to the next committee level.
a. If the modifications are acceptable to the Department, the UCF approves the proposal and recommends acceptance to the Provost of the University or his/her designee.
b. If, after discussions between the UCF and the Department, the Department deems the modifications unacceptable, the UCF may reject the proposal.
3. Return the proposal to the Department at the Department’s request.
4. Reject the proposal.
Revised Programs, and Revised Minor Programs, and Certification Programs

- The following procedures are designed for all revised programs, and revised minor programs, and revised certification programs.

- Proposals for program revisions are expected to receive careful review by their Departments. Proposals for program revisions require a second level of careful review. This review shall normally be conducted by an SCC. Subsequent review by the NMC and the UCF are expected to be routine and expedient.

I. Departments generate proposals using the designated forms. Forms and directions may be obtained from the UCF website:
http://www.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/ucf/forms-directions.html
A thorough review is conducted at the Department level. Upon successful review, one copy of the proposal is sent as an email attachment to the UCF office for logging by the UCF Secretary and distribution to the SCC and the appropriate Dean. The signature page only, properly executed, must be delivered to the UCF office. At the option request of the Department, counsel may be sought from the NMC during the development of any proposal.

II. School Curriculum Committee (SCC)

A. Upon receipt and review of a proposal, the SCC shall take one of the following four actions. Each of these actions stops the clock with regard to pocket-approval for the SCC.

1. Approve the proposal as is.
2. Approve with minor (e.g., syntax) changes. These changes may be made by the committee, with the consent of the Department.
3. Return with substantive concerns that need to be addressed. For process purposes, this should be considered a rejection. The following procedures may be followed if the Department does not consider the evaluation to be valid.
   a. The contact person may meet with the SCC. If the committee is persuaded, the proposal is approved and moves on.
   b. If the SCC stands by its evaluation, the Department may choose to make the suggested changes or appeal to the NMC. The SCC and the Department have the option of sending a representative to the meeting at which the NMC considers and votes on the proposal.
   c. The NMC either approves or rejects the proposal. If the proposal is rejected, the Department may either modify it according to the NMC’s recommendations or withdraw it.

---

2 Pocket-approval refers to the process by which a proposal is moved to the next level of approval without action at the previous level. A proposal is pocket-approved if no action has been taken on the proposal for a period of four academic weeks. It then moves on to the next committee level.
4. Proposal is rejected outright. Reasons for rejection must be provided. Appeal process follows the procedure listed in #3.

B. If no action has been taken in four academic weeks, the proposal is considered pocket-approved. The contact person notifies the UCF Chair.

C. Upon approval of the proposal by the SCC, the proposal shall be forwarded electronically with any changes incorporated into the document to the UCF office to be logged by the UCF secretary and distributed to the NMC.

III. Notifications Management Committee (NMC)
A. Upon receipt and review of a proposal, the NMC shall take one of the following four actions. Each of these actions stops and resets the clock with regard to the pocket-approval for the NMC.

1. Approve the proposal as is.
2. Approve with minor (e.g. syntax) changes. These changes may be made by the committee, with the consent of the Department.
3. Return with substantive concerns that need to be addressed. For process purposes, this should be considered a rejection. The following procedures may be followed if the Department does not consider the objections to be valid.
   a. The contact person may meet with the NMC. If the committee is persuaded, the proposal is approved and moves on.
   b. If the NMC stands by its evaluation, the Department may choose to make the suggested changes or appeal to the UCF. The UCF either approves or rejects the proposal.
   c. If the proposal is rejected, the Department may either modify it according to the UCF’s recommendations or withdraw it.
4. Proposal is rejected outright. Reasons for rejection must be provided. Appeal process follows the procedure listed in #3.

B. If no action has been taken in four academic weeks, the proposal is considered pocket-approved. The contact person notifies the UCF Chair.

IV. Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF)
A. Recommendations from the NMC shall be considered as actions of the UCF unless they are challenged at the UCF meeting. Approved proposals shall be recommended for acceptance to the Provost of the University or his/her designee.

B. If challenged, the proposal is put before the UCF for thorough review. The UCF shall take one of the following four actions:
   1. Approve the proposal and recommend acceptance to the Provost of the University or his/her designee.
   2. Propose modifications to the proposal.
a. If the modifications are acceptable to the Department, the UCF approves the proposal and recommends acceptance to the Provost of the University or his/her designee.
b. If, after discussions between the UCF and the Department, the Department deems the modifications unacceptable, the UCF may reject the proposal.
3. Return the proposal to the Department at the Department’s request.
4. Reject the proposal.
New Major and Minor Programs, and Certification Programs

- The following procedures are designed for all new major program proposals, minor program proposals, and certification and new program proposals.

- Proposals for new programs require a second and third level of careful review. These reviews shall normally be conducted by a SCC and the UWIC.

- Proposals for new 18 credit minor programs require a second and third level of careful review. These reviews shall normally be conducted by an SCC and the University Wide Impact Committee (UWIC).

- Proposals for new major programs require a second and third level of careful review. These reviews shall normally be conducted by an SCC, the UWIC.

- Proposals for new certification programs require a second and third level of careful review. These reviews shall normally be conducted by the School of Education School Curriculum Committee (SoE SCC) and the UWIC.

- Following UCF approval, any new major programs and minor programs that exceed 18 credits must be approved by external agencies. It is recommended that the proposer contact the chairperson of UWIC for consultation.

- Note that pocket-approval is not utilized in the new minor and new program proposal approval process.

I. Departments generate proposals using the designated form. Forms and directions may be obtained from the UCF website: http://www.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/ucf/forms-directions.html

A thorough review is conducted at the Department level. Upon successful review, one copy of the proposal is sent as an email attachment to the UCF office for logging by the UCF Secretary and distribution to the SCC and the appropriate Dean. The signature page only, properly executed, must be delivered to the UCF office. At the option request of the Department, counsel may be sought from the UWIC during the development of any proposal.

II. School Curriculum Committee (SCC)

A. Upon receipt and review of the proposal, the SCC shall take one of the following four actions.
   1. Approve the proposal as is.
   2. Approve with minor (e.g. syntax) changes. These changes may be made by the committee, with the consent of the Department.
   3. Return with substantive concerns that need to be addressed. For process purposes, this should be considered a rejection. The following procedures...
may be followed if the Department does not consider the objections to be valid.

a. The contact person may meet with the SCC. If the committee is persuaded, the proposal is approved and moves on.

b. If the SCC stands by its evaluation, the Department may choose to make the suggested changes or appeal to the UWIC. The SCC has the option of sending a representative to the meeting at which the UWIC considers and votes on the proposal. The UWIC either approves or rejects the proposal.

c. If the proposal is rejected, the Department may either modify it according to the UWIC’s recommendations or withdraw it.

4. Proposal is rejected outright. Reasons for rejection must be provided. Appeal process follows the procedure listed in #3.

B. Upon approval of the proposal by the SCC, the proposal shall be forwarded electronically with any changes incorporated into the document to the UCF office to be logged by the UCF secretary and forwarded to the UWIC.

III. University-Wide Impact Committee (UWIC)

A. Upon receipt and review of the proposal, the UWIC shall take one of the following four actions:

1. Approve the proposal as is.

2. Approve with minor (e.g. syntax) changes. These changes would be made by the committee, with the consent of the Department.

3. Return with substantive concerns that need to be addressed. For process purposes, this should be considered a rejection. The following procedures may be followed if the Department does not consider the objections to be valid.

a. The contact person may meet with the UWIC. If the committee is persuaded, the proposal is approved and moves on.

b. If the UWIC stands by its evaluation, the Department may choose to make the suggested changes or appeal to the UCF. The UCF either accepts or rejects the proposal.

c. If the proposal is rejected, the Department may either modify it according to the UCF’s recommendations or withdraw it.

4. Proposal is rejected outright. Reasons for rejection must be provided.

B. Upon approval of the proposal by the UWIC, the proposal shall be forwarded electronically with any changes incorporated into the document to the UCF office to be logged by the UCF secretary and forwarded to the UCF.

IV. Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF)

Recommendations from the UWIC shall be considered as actions of the UCF unless they are challenged at the UCF meeting. Approved proposals shall be
A. Recommendations from the UWIC for minor program proposals shall be considered as actions of the UCF unless they are challenged at the UCF meeting.

Approved proposals shall be recommended for acceptance to the Provost of the University or his/her designee.

B. If a proposal is challenged, the proposal is put before the UCF for thorough review. The UCF shall take one of the following four actions:

1. If a proposal is challenged, the UCF shall take one of the four actions outlined in Section B below.

2. Upon receipt and review of a new program proposal, the UCF shall take one of the following four actions:

2.1. Approve the proposal and recommend acceptance to the Provost of the University or his/her designee.

2.2. Propose modifications to the proposal.

   a) If the modifications are acceptable to the Department, the UCF approves the proposal and recommends acceptance to the Provost of the University or his/her designee.

   b) If, after discussions between the UCF and the Department, the Department deems the modifications unacceptable, the UCF may reject the proposal.

3. Return the proposal to the Department at the Department’s request.

4. Reject the proposal.
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W-Sections (Writing Sections)

Note: Proposals for W-Sections may be submitted only for approved courses.

- The following procedures are designed for all new W-Sections
- Proposals for W-Sections require a second level of careful review. These reviews are conducted by the Writing across Curriculum Committee (WACC).

I. Faculty (Proposer) or departments generate proposals for W-sections using the designated form. Forms and directions may be obtained from the UCF website: http://www.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/ucf/forms-directions.html
   A thorough review is conducted at the Department level. Upon successful review, one copy of the proposal is sent as an email attachment to the UCF office for logging by the UCF Secretary and distribution to the WACC. The signature page only, properly executed, must be delivered to the UCF office. At the option of the Department, counsel may be sought from the WACC during the development of any proposal.

II. Writing across the Curriculum Committee (WACC)
   A. Upon receipt and review, the WACC shall take one of the following four actions on each proposal. Each of these actions stops the clock with regard to pocket-approval for the WACC.
      1. Approve the proposal as is.
      2. Approve with minor (e.g. syntax) changes. These changes may be made by the committee, with the consent of the Proposer.
      3. Return with substantive concerns that need to be addressed. For process purposes, this should be considered a rejection. The following procedures may be followed if the Department does not consider the objections to be valid.
         a. The contact person may meet with the WACC. If the committee is persuaded, the proposal is approved and moves on.
         b. If the WACC stands by its evaluation, the Department may choose to make the suggested changes or appeal to the UCF. The UCF either approves or rejects the proposal.
         c. If the proposal is rejected, the Department may either modify it according to the UCF’s recommendations or withdraw it.
      4. Proposal is rejected outright. Reasons for rejection must be provided.
         Appeal process follows the procedure listed in #3.

   B. If no action has been taken in four academic weeks, the proposal is considered pocket-approved. The Proposer notifies the UCF Chair.

III. Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF)
   A. Recommendations from the WACC shall be considered as actions of the UCF unless they are challenged in the meeting.
B. Upon challenge, the proposal is put before the UCF for a thorough review. The UCF shall take one of the following four actions:
   1. Approve the proposal.
   2. Propose modifications to the proposal.
      a) If the modifications are acceptable to the Proposer, the UCF approves the proposal.
      b) If, after discussions between the UCF and the Proposer, the Department deems the modifications unacceptable, the UCF may reject the proposal.
   3. Return the proposal to the Proposer at the Proposer’s request.
   4. Reject the proposal.
**Special Topics Courses**

I. **Departments** generate proposals for Special Topics (ST) courses using the designated form. Forms and directions may be obtained at: [http://www.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/ucf/forms-directions.html](http://www.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/ucf/forms-directions.html)

An expedient review is conducted at the Department level. Upon successful review, one copy of the proposal is sent as an email attachment to the UCF office. The signature page only, properly executed, must be delivered to the UCF office. At the option request of the Department, UCF Chair counsel may be sought during the development of any proposal.

II. **UCF Chair**

Upon receipt and review, the UCF Chair shall log the courses and present these to UCF as part of its minutes. Recommendations from the UCF Chair shall be considered as actions of the UCF.
Recommendations Coming from the UCF

All of the recommendations from the UCF to the Provost of the University or his/her designee shall have the effect of a resolution from the Faculty Senate, which requires a response to the UCF by the Provost or his/her designee on the recommendation.
I. The Department may give the Dean the opportunity to review the proposal when the proposal is developed.

II. The SCC-UCF Secretary shall submit a copy of the proposal to the appropriate Dean upon receipt.

III. The Dean may draft a written response to the proposal. This response (attached to the proposal) shall be forwarded by the Dean to the UCF Secretary who will forward it to the appropriate committee, the SCC, and the proposer.

IV. A negative response by the Dean shall not stop a proposal from going forward through the curriculum process.

V. Deans shall have the opportunity to speak at any thorough review sessions.
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Abbreviations

DCC  Department Curriculum Committee
MDC  Multidisciplinary Course
LEP  Liberal Education Program
NMC  Notifications Management Committee
SCC  School Curriculum Committee
SoE SCC School of Education School Curriculum Committee
UCF  Undergraduate Curriculum Forum
UWIC University-Wide Impact Committee
WACC  Writing Across Curriculum Committee
Connecticut State Colleges and Universities  
Transfer and Articulation Policy, additional General Education courses  
GLOBAL KNOWLEDGE  
Common Course Outcomes Confirmation form

Having completed our usual process for vetting student learning outcomes, we confirm (with a checkmark) that the following student learning outcomes will be taught and assessed in the identified course.

1. Students are able to apply theories and methods of social sciences.

2. Students can make informed evaluations of contemporary social institutions and phenomena outside the United States.

3. Students explore non-U.S. perspectives on global social institutions and phenomena.

Signature, XCC Course Contact  Signature, XCC Curriculum Committee Chair

Once this form has been completed and signed, please forward an electronic copy to the TAP Co-Managers, who will post it to the CSCU TAP website.
having completed our usual process for vetting student learning outcomes, we confirm (with a checkmark) that the following student learning outcomes will be taught and assessed in the identified course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Having completed our usual process for vetting student learning outcomes, we confirm (with a checkmark) that the following student learning outcomes will be taught and assessed in the identified course.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students convey ideas and express aesthetic values with hands-on, creative activities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Students demonstrate understanding of practice in a specific medium or genre.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Students present creative project to audience.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature, XCC Course Contact                                      Signature, XCC Curriculum Committee Chair

*Once this form has been completed and signed, please forward an electronic copy to the TAP Co-Managers, who will post it to the CSCU TAP website.*