

# **Undergraduate Curriculum Forum**

## **AGENDA**

Adanti Student Center, Room 301A

Thursday, Sept. 29, 2011

- I. Call to order
- II. Announcements
- III. Approval of UCF minutes of September 15, 2011
- IV. Standing Committee Reports
  - a. NPIC – New Programs and Innovations Committee
  - b. NMC – Notifications Management Committee
  - c. WACC – Writing Across the Curriculum Committee
  - d. PRAC – Program Review and Assessment Committee
  - e. UWIC – University Wide Impact Committee
  - f. LEPC – Liberal Education Committee
- V. Old Business
  - a. Demonstration of the new tracker program.
  - b. Update on electives in degree programs.
  - c. Update on technology issues.
- VI. New Business
- VII. Adjournment

**Undergraduate Curriculum Forum**  
**MINUTES**

Adanti Student Center, Room 301A

Thursday, September 15, 2011

Present: M. Hartog, K. McGill, S. Grace, G. Kowalczyk, R. Zipoli, D. Weiss, M. Bay, D. Taylor, L. Lancor, S. Grubacic, L. Bower, M. McClain, N. Henderson, J. Fullmer, J. Cooper, C. Hannah, B. Nakamura, J. Liu, C. Simoneau, J. Zonderman, J. Hong, C. Dellinger-Pate, J. Irving, K. Lacey, M. Davidson, M. Vancour, S. Bernard, K. Gatzke, P. Kahlbaugh, D. Smith, J. Tait, J. Terpstra, E. Keenan, S. Latorre, C. O'Sullivan, P. Beals, S. Clerc, N. Moniello, D. Bentley-Drobish, J. Thorson, A. Marsoobian

Guest: A. Marsoobian

Absent: M. Narumanchi, B. Phelan, M. Generali, E. West, R. Basset, R. Kustin, J. O'hara, S. Michalek, J. Mielczarski, S. Graves, B. Glynn, M. Rothbard, M. Shea, S. Keller, J. Mills

- I. The meeting was called to order at 9:38 a.m.
  - Quorum (50% + 1) was reached at 9:43 a.m.
  
- II. Announcements
  - a. Marty Hartog met with Marianne Kennedy learned that the new learning management system, Blackboard Learn, is being piloted now and it will be implemented in spring 2012. E-learning Vista will still be available through the spring semester; Kim Lacey reminded the UCF to invite an IT representative to join the UCF this semester.
  - b. Deb Weiss noted that Judaic Studies is offering a interfaith dialog on Mon., Sept. 19<sup>th</sup> at 1:10pm in EN 120
  - c. Tricia Lin announced two events – the campus celebration of Hispanic heritage month – (1) three lives “Tres Vidas,” musical theatre will be held on Sept. 27<sup>th</sup> at 7:30pm in EN C112; (2) Women’s Studies 9<sup>th</sup> annual graduate conference will feature Dr. Ericka Huggins, former Black Panther, as the keynote, on Oct. 29<sup>th</sup> from 9am-4pm in EN C112.
  - d. Nicole Henderson informed the UCF that Wes Moore, author of *The Other Wes Moore*, will be here Nov. 15<sup>th</sup> at 7:30pm.
  - e. Polly Beals reminded the UCF that the LEP advising guide was sent on 9/14 by Public Affairs via email. Polly is looking for feedback on this guide as it is a living document.
  
- III. Approval of UCF minutes of September 1, 2011
  - a. \*Polly Beals needs to be added to in attendance list
  - b. Minutes of May 1<sup>st</sup> approved with one abstention
  
- IV. Standing Committee Reports
  - a. NPIC
    - i. Discussion of 9/8 meeting
      1. Special Topics Courses:
        - 1) MDS 298 Contemporary Media Debates
        - 2) MDS 298 Social Media: Public Life/Private Life
        - 3) MDS 398 Daily Resistance: TV Satire
        - 4) NUR 498 Palliative & End-of-Life Care
    - ii. Minutes of 9/8 accepted
  - b. NMC
    - i. Discussion of 9/8 meeting

1. *New course proposal, revised course proposal, and revised program proposal* forms will be updated this academic year and any revisions will be made to UCF.
  - ii. Minutes of 9/8 received
- c. WACC
- i. Discussion of 9/8 meeting
    1. Motion to approve the following W-Course:
      - 1) PCH 358 Health Policy (Ellen Andrews)
    2. Motion passed unanimously
    3. Nancy Marano, a longtime active member of UCF, died this summer, and the fall writing awards will include a special option under her area, education/secondary education. Further, there was a SCSU scholarship created in her name.
  - ii. Minutes of 9/8 received
- d. PRAC
- i. Discussion of 9/8 meeting
    1. This year Marketing and Accounting will be reviewed. Questions were posed in the minutes regarding procedures and external reviewers.
  - ii. Minutes of 9/28 received
- e. UWIC
- i. Discussion of 9/8 meeting
    1. Reviewed its procedures for reviewing LEP courses and decided to include sample syllabi on its website among other items to help LEP course proposers.
    2. Motion to approve the following LEP-Courses:
      - 1) ARB 200 (T1 MC) Arabic III
    3. Motion approved with one abstention
  - ii. Minutes of 9/8 received
- f. LEPC
- i. Discussion of 8/31 meeting
    1. Course equivalency project completed this summer by Terri Bennett and Lisa Lancor, reviewed by LEPC and forwarded to VP Kennedy for approval before posting to the UCF LEPC website.
    2. Motion to approve the attached Tier 3 form
    3. Motion approved with one abstention
  - ii. Minutes 8/31 received
- V. New Business
- a. Discussion on minimum elective credits for the BA (28 credits) and BS (12 credits) in degree programs. Summary points below:
    - SCSU is missing an opportunity to showcase semester-by-semester course offerings, especially its electives. Under the banner system, it's challenging to show students what is available and have them shop for courses that interest them.
    - Students need to be able to explore electives – LEPC asked Kim Laing yesterday to see how many students are not meeting the requirement with their electives before LEP to provide a basis for examination after LEP.
    - Developmental courses are easily identified in the LEPC advisement guide, but these particular courses are not eligible for students' electives
    - We should explore the impact on smaller departments.
    - LEP provides more choice than old AUR.

- One-hundred twenty (120) is the minimum total credits for graduation but there is no maximum stated.
- The average credits in tier 1 total 18-credits required in year one – but most students need developmental courses – i.e., World Languages, MAT, ENG, so is the discussion of minimum electives moot?
- Four-year graduation should direct the UCF decision, 120 credits over four years is 30 credits a year or 15 credits a semester. Certification folks will be here forever – why do “free” electives only count in this category? Can hidden prerequisites count?
- Developmental courses are basically pre-college course work and time spent – is our goal to put them out as soon as possible into the workforce or are we trying to train a sophisticated graduate?
- (1) We need a definition of “electives”. (2) Registration is responsible for students not being in some of the major courses this semester. This was done purposefully this year to control incoming student registration as a new program involving many components (i.e., new World Lang.) was being implemented. This likely will be adjusted next year.
- We should track/study the average length of time students graduate under LEP (4.72 average graduation years under AUR). Who are our students? Transfers come to us with a lot of extra courses – how are these averages determined – who’s the study population? Are transfer students coming in with 90 credits part of this calculation?
- We should examine the “exploring” students who come here to find a major.
- Consider reducing number for departments that have requirements and their students need to take courses for certification, however, what about the other departments? We want students to be well-rounded. Look at programs individually and consider on a dept. basis allowing them to be flexible.
- No-Child Left Behind impact – it’ll get worse before it gets better
- Higher education compared/contrasted to college degree [i.e., education for education’s sake to vocational focus). SCSU needs to develop an identity in this area.

Meeting adjourned at 10:52 a.m.

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Michele Vancour.

Called to order at 9:35 a.m.

Present: G. Adams (Chair), M. Bay, G. Kowalczyk, K. McGill, J. Hong, S. Keller, P. Sessler, Branden, D. Smith, S. Michalek, J. Thorson

### **I. New Business**

A. Notification of 2 special topic sections were presented and logged.

<u>Course #</u>	<u>Transcript Title</u>	<u>Semester</u>	<u>Times taught</u>
ENG 198	Writing Arguments with Lab	Spring 2012	0
WMS 298	The Non-Western World	Spring 2012	1

#### **Description of logged courses with full titles**

##### ENG 198 – Writing Arguments with Lab

Development of critical reading and writing skills with a focus on intellectually demanding texts. Emphasis on source-based argument writing. One-hour weekly laboratory session required. By assignment only. Satisfies the AUR English Composition requirement or the LEP tier 1 Written Communication requirement. Prerequisite: ENG 110 or placement exam. 3 credits.

##### WMS 298 – The Non-Western World: Women Culture, Displacement

In this course we read, analyze, and critique works & voices, critical and creative, from the Americas (including the Caribbean), Asia, the Pacific, and Africa. The course offers us an opportunity to explore the relationships between women, culture and displacement. Cross-listed with HON 240.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by: Gregory Adams

**Undergraduate Curriculum Forum  
Notification Management Committee Minutes  
September 22, 2011**

Present: Cindy Simoneau (Chair), Laura Bower, Jen Cooper, Sean Grace, Corey Hannah, Sobeira Latorre, Nuncia Moniello, Jingjing Liu, Derek Taylor, Elizabeth Rodriguez-Reyes, Sophia Myers (UCF Secretary)

Absent: Margaret Das, Erin Larkin

Guest: Marty Hartog

**Meeting called to order at 9:35am**

The committee discussed the role of the SCC in the course and program approval process. All SCC chairs were invited to attend NMC, none were able to attend. Cindy and Marty agreed to reach out to the SCC chairs.

The committee then continued to discuss updates to the New Course Proposal, Revised Course Proposal, and Revised Program Proposal forms and instructions with M. Hartog.

**Motion to approve:** revised forms

**Motion:** S. Grace; C. Hannah

**Motion passed:** 10-0-0

The committee then discussed creating NMC by-laws for its next meeting.

**Meeting adjourned at 10:50am**

PRAC minutes for Sept. 22, 2011

Present: S. Clerc, C. Dellinger-Pate, M. Enjalran, M. Fede, P. Kahlbaugh, T. Lin, C. O'Sullivan, R. Zipoli.

Absent: T. Radice

Guests: Dr. Shyam Lodha, Dr. Robert Forbus

Meeting called to order 10:42 a.m.

The committee reviewed the self-study reports from Marketing and Accounting. After reviewing the Marketing self-study and discussing it with Drs. Lodha and Forbus, PRAC recommends that UCF grant conditional approval for Marketing. PRAC & Marketing agree to meet and review the report again in February 2012.

Marketing self-study report comments:

Standard 1: Met.

Standard 2: Met.

Standard 3: Not met. Tables 1 and 2 are very good, and the creation of the School of Business Assessment Committee, move to standardize syllabi, and MGT 450 as a capstone are positive signs. The primary weakness of this standard is the disconnect between student learning outcomes and the objectives given in standard 2. There should be a progression from broad to specific among standards 1-3 where the mission leads to the goals and objectives and the goals and objectives lead to the learning outcomes. The committee felt that a change to the wording of the objectives or outcomes could make the connection clear. If they had a goal that stated something like: to create graduates in marketing who possess the following skills: leadership, communicative, social/organizational, technological and planning, then they could align the objectives with these goals and then further map their outcomes onto these.

Standard 4: Not met. The School of Business Program Assessment Committee is an excellent plan. Please provide more detail about the kinds of data they plan to gather, specifically how it will relate to the student outcomes and measures for Standard 3. Will programs meet regularly to discuss data without the School Assessment committee?

Standard 5a: Met.

Standard 5b: Met.

Standard 6a: Not met. For this standard, the committee suggests either more narrative describing the coherence of the curriculum or perhaps using a matrix that illustrates how curriculum is mapped onto knowledge sets. What was missing: one, an idea of how these were purposively and logically structured to accomplish their goals & objectives for the student and two, an idea of what they have decided works and what they have thought about that may need changing .... if nothing needs changing, then some narrative about why they are happy with the current curriculum structure.

Standard 6b: Met. Although a bit more discussion would be welcome.

Standard 7a: Met. The committee suggests spelling out why recruitment is limited to the Majors Expo and placing greater emphasis on assessing and describing student involvement, accolades, awards, and so on.

Standard 7b: Not met. This is the place to explain and document why more full-time faculty are needed and perhaps provide a number that would suffice. The sentence above the table on p. 15 ends mid-sentence.

Standard 8a: Not met. Most of the information requested in the checklist is absent. Nothing that indicates office hours, planned programs, course rotation, or any explanation as to why these things are missing.

Standard 8b: Not met. Missing.

Standard 9: Not met. Mislabeled Standard 8. The table of sections offered over a 3 year term is helpful but more narrative, and perhaps reference to the table of graduate rates, should be given.

Standard 10: Met. The plan to improve the climate of curiosity is commendable. For future assessment, the committee suggests briefly describing how MBA students perform research or creative work (i.e. with faculty, independently, with local businesses). The department is urged to recognize recent successes within the department in order to have a base line when they evaluate the progress on this standard in the next assessment cycle.

Standard 11: Met in previous report. The committee suggests the department expand this standard now in order to have a clear point of comparison against which they can continually compare to monitor the progress of their creative output. The committee suggests including more information on the faculty's research interests, publications, honors, and a broad definition of creative and scholarly work beyond traditional publications and presentations.

Standard 12: Met.

Standard 13: Met in previous report.

Standard 14a: Not met.

Standard 14b: Not met.

Standard 14c: Not met.

Need more information to show the process/schedule indicating systematic plans for the future and historical data showing periodic evaluations, not just one study. AACSB is a good idea. Need to show plans for obtaining this, including the schedule for action. Need to show a schedule or systematic plan and progression of students and surveys.

Standard 15: Met in previous report.

Standard 16: Met.

Standard 17: Met.

Dr. Emanuel Emenyonu of the Accounting Department was unable to attend the PRAC meeting.

The Committee has reviewed the Accounting self-study and found that few of the nine standards included were met. Due to Accounting's previous noncompliance with the UCF review process, the Academic Program Review document restricts PRAC to one of the following: recommend continuing approval or do not recommend continuing approval. Given the number of standards that are not met, PRAC does not recommend continuing approval.

Accounting self-study comments:

Standard 1: Met, but marginally. They could try to do more than just the “access” issue and discuss how Accounting uniquely fulfills the university’s mission would be welcome.

Standard 2: Not met. The discussion is insufficient, more narrative is needed. This sounds more like a mission statement than a set of goals.

Standard 3: Not met. A matrix relating outcomes to measures and courses would help here; if content were graphed it might be easier to understand. It’s not clear where the data comes from, if there is any. Assertions about course coverage is not data that can be measured. The key omission is a strategy to measure these outcomes to provide quantitative results. I think the content of #3 becomes the goals for #2.

Standard 4: Not met. They mention an alumnus who noticed some deficiencies in some of our more recent graduates, and that this information sparked an extensive discussion in the department. The alumnus was using an “employment assessment exercise.” Maybe the department could adopt this exercise to gather data more directly? There is nothing wrong with surveying employers, but they might want to find some things out before they send our graduates into the workforce. There should also be an indication of whether the department meets regularly, or least plans to, to discuss changes based on data. There isn’t any discussion of how to measure outcomes listed in 3 and how such data could be used to improve learning. What is provided is anecdotal.

Standard 5a: Met. There are 5 syllabi and a summary of course evaluations, but the summary of how course assignments relate to outcomes should be more detailed. Two surveys are mentioned in their discussion, one we know of (the CIS) the other we know nothing about (Accounting Current Student Survey). There should be some supporting data from each of these, and then some discussion about their confidence in these surveys to provide an accurate measure of quality instruction.

Standard 5b: Not Met. No evidence is provided. There is no discussion of the teaching of course content. Student satisfaction is important, but it’s not a good gauge of whether they actually learned what you think they should have learned. Need more measures of learning and how these determinants have been derived.

Standard 6a: Not met. A matrix or map and a narrative are needed. The tables in the appendices fulfill the basics, but do not support the claim of “continuous improvement” in the narrative. Appendix 3 contains a copy of the Accounting Department catalog pages and appendix 7 contains data – tabular form – comparing course offerings against accounting programs at comparable, neighboring, universities. This is fine, but there is no coherent message associated with these data. Need to show systematic and measurable ways in which teaching is shown to be effective.

Standard 6b: Met or N/A because there is no graduate program.

Standard 7a: Not met. The list of faculty is missing details requested, no CVs are included, and comments concerning students and staff are insufficient. Needs more data. Appendix 1, for example, could include the names of faculty who are teaching or have taught the courses. No statistical data and nothing about how they get their students or keep them around. They discuss faculty expertise but not any of the information about recruiting and keeping students. Show more measurements.

Standard 7b: Not met. No documentation provided.

Standard 8a: Not met. They address the first three points on the checklist, and omit the rest – for a total of eight points missing. Course rotation plans are listed in Appendix 1, but there is no mention of that here; it would also help if there were discussion of how effective/helpful advising has been to students. Not all items are covered.

Standard 8b: Not met. There needs to be a more detailed account of the chair's responsibilities.

Standard 9: Not met. Again, a little more explanation/narrative about the number of courses and students would help. It would be nice if appendices were separated so that they were easier to sift through. It would be nice if the data were analyzed in such a way that I didn't have to sift through all the appendices. Seems to be missing the supporting documents. Course rotation plans are noted as being in Appendix 1, summaries of course enrollments going back several years are provided in Appendix 6 (but some of the data was cut off), and the number of majors are tracked over several years (showing significant growth) with data in Appendix 8 (some of the data appears to be missing). But what is missing is any narrative that puts all of this into perspective.

The report is poorly formatted and contains several typographical/ grammatical errors. Lacks page numbers, poorly organized.

Meeting adjourned 10:55

Minutes respectfully submitted by Susan Clerc

University-Wide Impact Committee  
Minutes 9/22/11

**Present**

P. Beals, JWA. Fullmer, E. Keenan, L. Lancor, K. Laing, H. Lockwood, A. Marsoobian, M. McClain, J. Mielczarski, J. Mills, B. Nakamura, W. O'Brien, D. Weiss.

**Absent**

N. Henderson, J. O'Hara, T. Regan, A. Reynaga, M. Shea, W. Yu

**I. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order at 9:37 am.

**II. Old Business**

Discussion of UWIC by-laws (tabled)

**III. New Business**

- The standing committee decided to modify the voting language used to evaluate LEP courses to 1.) Approve 2.) Approve w/clarification 3.) Approve w/minor revision 4.) Revise w/major revisions 5.) Reject

- **LEP Courses Proposals**

PSC 200 (Political Change & Conflict, T2 SSCC)

Motion to Revise with major revisions by L. Lacor, seconded D. Weiss

Motion passed 9-1-0

ANT 201 (The Global Community, T2 GA)

Motion to approve by D. Weiss, seconded L. Lancor

Motion passed 10-0-0

ANT 321 (Indians in North America, T2 AE)

Motion to approve w/clarification M. McClain, seconded P. Beals

Motion passed 10-0-0

SOC 203 (Social Organizations, T2 SSCC)

SOC 216 (Men's Studies, T2 SSCC)

SOC 251 (Sociology of Religion, T2 SSCC)

SOC 265 (Self and Society, T2 MB)

Motion to approve *en bloc* by D. Weiss, seconded W. O'Brien

Motion passed 8-1-1

**IV. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 10:55 am.

Minutes prepared by Byron Nakamura

Southern Connecticut State University  
Writing Across the Curriculum Committee  
Minutes  
September 22, 2011

1. In attendance:
  - a. Kim Lacey (chair of WACC and interim director of WAC Program), Elena Schmidt, Patrick McBrine, Marie B. McDaniel, Sanja Grubacic, Dorothy Vasquez-Levy, Maria Diamantis, Astrid Eich-Krohnm (secretary), Thomas Ferrucci (ex-officio), Steven J. Corbett (ex-officio)
2. Update from Chair – Kim Lacey
  - a. New Writing Program Director will be Kim Lacey but in limited position and only for the fall semester.
  - b. Dr. Nancy Marano, Associate Professor of Education and long-time WACC member passed away in July. The committee discussed an award in honor of Nancy as part of the WAC Program Writing Contest.
  - c. Steven Corbett informed us about news from the writing assessment group led by Deborah Carroll. The group will be able to implement questions into the SCSU Freshmen survey. The questions will provide information about how much freshmen feel prepared for college writing and what their needs are regarding writing.
3. Update from Writing Center – Thomas Ferrucci
  - a. Tutor position open in the writing center please announce to students
4. WAC-Practical Pedagogy Workshop (Steven Corbett)
  - a. Workshops for Fall 2011
    - i. October 5<sup>th</sup> first workshop “Best Strategies for Writing the Proposal”  
Time 1:00 to 1:50 PM in the English Common Room
    - ii. Next idea: How to prepare students for writing intensive courses in composition courses
5. Revision of Bylaws
  - i. The Bylaws have to be revised and will need to be in the format as the UCF Bylaws approved in Spring 2011. NPIC has revised their bylaws and these are a model for other standing committees. Tentative plan for presenting bylaws to UCF for approval is October 13, 2011. The WAC committee will devote the next meeting to revising Bylaws.
6. Proposal review deferred until next meeting due to issues with members having accessibility to proposals.
  - i. ART 270 Introduction to Art – Erica Udoff
  - ii. ENG 217 Introduction to Literature – Marianna Vierra
  - iii. PHI 325 Bioethics of Life Sciences – C. Hildreth-Reed
7. Adjournment at 10:15 AM

Respectfully submitted by Astrid Eich-Krohnm, Secretary WACC

## Minutes

### Liberal Education Program Committee

Wednesday, September 7, 2011

Math Conference Room

3:30-5:00

Present: ), P. Beals, J. DaPonte, J. Fields, W. Hardenberg, E. Keenan, K. Laing, R. Kustin, A. Marsoobian, W. O'Brien (recording), E. Okobi, J. Tait, D. Weiss (Chairperson)

Members reviewed and approved the list of LEPC members.

Wes O'Brien was appointed secretary. He declined unsuccessfully.

The remainder of the meeting was devoted to reviewing, discussing, and editing the form for proposing Tier 3 LEP courses. Deb Weiss has sent the results to members via email; therefore, the specific language need not be reiterated here.

Regarding Tier 1 competencies (Box B): The committee discussed the number of competencies that should be required. There was a lengthy discussion about how to define the word *many*, which appears in the LEP document.

Regarding Tier 2 Areas of Knowledge (Box C): Another checkbox for "Intellectual Foundations" was proposed. Following a long discussion, the committee decided against the addition.

Throughout the document, various language changes were proposed and accepted, e.g., in places the word *address* replaces the word *meet*; in other places the word *utilized* replaces the word *address*. Plural forms were added, removed, or included parenthetically. Again, see the document for specifics.

Headings on the form and the directions page were repositioned for clarity.

The committee discussed whether or not to include information to indicate cases where a proposal is for an interdisciplinary (IDS) course. Although this information will appear on the New or Revised course proposal form, a line was added to the Course and Contact Information box for purposes of clarity.<sup>1</sup>

The changes to the proposal form and directions passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40pm.

---

<sup>1</sup> It was discovered after the meeting that this information is in fact not included on the New or Revised course proposal form.

## Minutes

Liberal Education Program Committee Meeting

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

3:25-4:45, Math Conference Room - EN D122

Present: P. Beals, J. DaPonte, J. Fields, W. Hardenberg, N. Henderson, E. Keenan, K. Laing, R. Kustin, A. Marsoobian, W. O'Brien (recording), E. Okobi, J. Tait, D. Weiss (Chairperson)

Call to Order: 3:30p

### Assignment of UWIC tasks

Deborah called for volunteers for a number of tasks requested of the LEPC by UWIC.

Wendy Hardenberg agreed to create a checklist of key elements for Tier 2 courses (akin to the checklists provided for Tier 1 creative thinking and tech fluency courses).

Armen Marsoobian will work to clarify what constitutes a primary (non-textbook) expository source in the Intellectual Foundations Component for Tier 2 courses. He will seek input from Mike Shea.

UWIC's suggestion that a board of nine coordinators representing the nine key areas of knowledge be formed generated some discussion, including questions pertaining to:

- Selection criteria and process
- Length of service
- Level of input from coordinators regarding transfer courses equivalent (or comparable) to LEP courses
- Whether or not administration should be involved in creating the board
- Whether board members will receive release time credits (and when these should be requested and how many are appropriate)

Polly Beals agreed to take on the task and will begin by considering the best way to proceed.

### Priority issues for LEPC.

A number of issues were discussed regarding the continued implementation of the LEP. These included:

Circumstances under which freshmen should be allowed to take Tier 2 courses—how many such placements are appropriate?

Are there circumstances allowing students failing Tier 1 CT courses to take Tier 2 courses? Kim Laing pointed out the increasing urgency of this question as we approach mid-term grades and

advisement. She also asked Armen Marsoobian to urge Tier 1 CT instructors to put midterm grades on Banner.

A suggestion was made that the committee should think about intervention procedures for students in danger of failing LEP Tier 1 courses. Nicole Henderson will begin devising possible solutions to problems arising from such failures.

What is the mechanism for deciding how many Tier 1 CT courses would be offered during Winter, Summer, and Spring sessions (and what department will offer them)?

Jim Tait urged the committee to be proactive so as to not allow LEP to come under renewed attack by those departments who feel that their concerns are not being addressed. A discussion followed regarding how many departments still felt the LEP compromises their ability to expeditiously move students towards their degrees and whether or not students were, in some cases, unable to meet elective requirements because of LEP requirements

### **Transfer document and transfer bank—what's next?**

John DaPonte suggested the need to include courses from UConn and Middlesex.

Polly Beals pointed to the need to include transfer information and criteria for CT courses.

The committee engaged in a long discussion regarding who should have authority to approve transfer courses not in the transfer document. These courses present a unique problem because, although they are offered by specific disciplines, the criteria are skills-based. We generally agreed that some level of consultation between coordinators and chairs would probably be necessary.

Bruce Kalk has begun to enter courses into the transfer bank. The committee felt that chairs would ultimately need to approve these, and that Bruce would solicit that input.

Kim Laing suggested that some courses could transfer as LEP equivalencies via the mechanism of a generic elective LEP shell.

The committee discussed the number of LEP courses that are waived depending on the number of transfer credits with which a student enters the university. Many members expressed surprise at the complexity of the formula in the LEP document.

Adjourned: 4:45p

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM  
 NEW COURSE PROPOSAL – [SIGNATURE SHEET](#)

See New Course Proposal Directions or use highlighted links for directions to complete forms.  
 See [Key to Abbreviations](#) as needed.

[Box 1](#)

Subject Code: \_\_\_\_ Course Number: \_\_\_\_ (Verify Availability of the Number with Registrar)

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Ext.: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

DCC Votes: For: \_\_\_\_ Against: \_\_\_\_ Abstentions: \_\_\_\_

Department Votes: For: \_\_\_\_ Against: \_\_\_\_ Abstentions: \_\_\_\_

[Box 2](#)

**Signatures:**

DCC Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date DCC approved: \_\_\_\_\_ [No DCC](#)

Dept. Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Dept. Chair approved: \_\_\_\_\_

[Box 3](#)

List other depts. (use dept. code) affected by this proposal and attach letters/email of acknowledgment from the chair(s).

Department: \_\_\_\_ Acknowledgment Attached:

Department: \_\_\_\_ Acknowledgment Attached:

Department: \_\_\_\_ Acknowledgment Attached:

Department: \_\_\_\_ Acknowledgment Attached:

No Departments Are Affected:

**UCF Use Only:**

Date the Completed proposal (with all necessary attachments) was received in UCF Office: \_\_\_\_\_

SCC Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date SCC Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

NMC Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date NMC Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

UCF Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date UCF Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Provost or Designee: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Date UCF Received Final Approval: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM  
NEW COURSE PROPOSAL – SUMMARY SHEET

Proposed Effective Term: (Check UCF timetable for suggested dates to submit proposals.)

Fall:  Spring:  Summer:  Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Subject Code: \_\_\_\_ Course Number: \_\_\_\_\_ (Check with Registrar for availability of numbers)

Title: \_\_\_\_\_

(If more than 29 characters, provide Transcript Title)

Transcript Title (max 29 characters): \_\_\_\_\_

Catalog Description: \_\_\_\_\_

Prerequisites: \_\_\_\_\_

Credits: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Hours **per Week:** Lecture: \_\_\_\_\_ Lab: \_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Check appropriate boxes below (see directions for details):

- [Required in Program](#) (Revised Program Proposal is required)
- [Elective in Major](#)
- [Free Elective](#)
- I intend to submit this proposal to the UWIC for Liberal Education Program (LEP) approval.
- I intend to submit this proposal to the WACC for [“W” course approval](#).

I have attached the following appendices (see directions for details):

- [Rationale](#)
- [Learning Objectives](#)
- [Course Outline](#)
- [Method\(s\) of Evaluating Students](#)
- [Bibliography](#)
- [Acknowledgement\(s\) from affected departments](#)

Appendices (Copy and paste or enter directly course outline, bibliography, etc.)

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM  
Directions for Preparing a New Course Proposal

All forms are to be sent via electronic submission with the exception of the signature page. See key at end of directions for all abbreviations.

**Signature Sheet** ([return to form](#))

**BOX 1**

- Complete all fields. If you are requesting a new course number, verify its availability with the Registrar, telephone Ext-25301 or via email.
- Enter Department Curriculum Committee (DCC) votes and Department votes. If Department does not have a DCC, indicate this by checking “No DCC” box.

**BOX 2**

- Form must be signed and dated by the Department Curriculum Committee Chair, if appropriate, and the Department Chair

**BOX 3**

- A proposal that has an effect on another department(s) needs an acknowledgment (email or memo) from the chair of the affected department(s), to indicate awareness (although not necessarily approval) of the proposal. Be sure to include the email or memo in the appendices at the end of the summary sheet. If you do not have it in electronic form, scan it and include in appendices. If you do not have access to a scanner, contact UCF office at 25206. If no other departments are affected, check the box labeled “No Departments Are Affected.”

**After completing forms:**

- 1) Either bring or send via inter-university mail **one** copy of the Signature Sheet, signed appropriately as described in Box 3 below to the UCF office, EN C 216. Bring or send only the Signature Sheet, ONE page. The proposal will not be forwarded to the School Curriculum Committee (SCC) until the Signature Sheet has been received.
- 2) Email the entire completed form as one attachment named NCP XXX (dept. code) XXX (course number), (i.e. NCP ANT 349) to the UCF Office at [ucfoffice@southernct.edu](mailto:ucfoffice@southernct.edu). Include: a) Signature Sheet, b) Summary Sheet and c) Appendices.
  - You will be able to [view your proposal](#) on the UCF website to determine the stage of your proposal in the approval process.

[\(return to form\)](#)

## Summary Sheet

- Enter **Proposed Effective Term**. Allow sufficient time for proposal to be approved by various entities. Adhere to [Catalogue Deadlines](#) if you wish to ensure that your course will appear in the hard copy of the Undergraduate Catalogue. Please note that if a proposal requires numerous revisions, suggested time frames may not be sufficient.
- Enter **Subject Code** and **Course Number** and **Title** as they appear in Signature Sheet.
- **Transcript Title** - If the Title is longer than 29 characters (including spaces), provide a 29 character Transcript Title.
- **Catalog Description** – This should be concise and consistent with the rationale and course outline. For brevity, use phrases as opposed to full sentences. Avoid "This course covers..." and avoid restating the course title in the description. Use present tense, i.e. not what they will do in the course, but what they do in the course (example: "Students investigate..." not "Students will investigate..."). Information about the major focus, objective, teaching, methodology, and learning environment may be included, if appropriate. When applicable, indicate if special fees, equipment or field studies are required.
- **Prerequisites** – Be specific. List by Subject Code and Course Number when possible (Examples: ANT 101, PSY 100, SOC 211) or if specific courses are not appropriate use descriptors such as "junior or senior status" or "6 PSC credits" etc. Avoid vague prerequisites such as "Social Science B Requirement." Do not add "*or* departmental permission to the prerequisite;" this is a given for all courses. However, if a course *requires* department permission indicate, "Departmental permission."
- Enter number of **Credits**.
- Enter number of **Contact Hours per Week** in appropriate box: **Lecture, Lab, Other**. Lectures, discussions, and seminars meet 1 academic hour (50 minutes) per credit per week. Laboratories and studios usually meet 2 or 3 hours per credit per week.
- Check all appropriate boxes.
  - **Required in Program** - If the course is required in the Program, a Revised Program Proposal is also required.
  - **Elective in Major** – If the course is an elective within the program, a Revised Program Proposal *may* be required (see below).
    - A Revised Program Proposal is required if the course will be included in a specific list; example: "select 9 credits from the following courses."
    - A Revised Program Proposal is not needed if the program already specifies electives as part of the program, i.e. "select 9 credits from the 300-level," and this course is a 300 level course.
  - **Free Elective** – The course may be used to satisfy a free elective in the student's program.

[\(return to form\)](#)

- **Liberal Education Program approval**– Check this box if this course is proposed as an LEP Tier 1, Tier 2, or Capstone course and is not currently so designated. This is a two-part process. Following new course approval by NMC, the proposal will be brought before the UCF body for approval *and* will be sent by NMC to UWIC for consideration as an LEP course. Following UWIC approval for LEP status, the proposal will be brought before the UCF body for LEP approval. The applications for new course approval and LEP approval may be submitted simultaneously.
- **“W” Course approval** – Check this box if this course will be proposed to fulfill the university “W” course requirement. This is a two-part process. Following approval by the UCF, the proposal should be submitted to the WACC committee (via the UCF office) by utilizing the appropriate [forms](#). The applications for course revision approval and “W” course approval may be submitted simultaneously.
- Check all appropriate boxes to indicate the appendices that have been attached.
  - **Rationale**  
The rationale should describe why and how the course is an appropriate addition to the department and the University, particularly addressing its unique aspects. If similar courses exist in other departments, provide adequate justification for redundancy. The course contents and requirements should be appropriate for the course level, i.e. 100, 200, 300 or 400 numbering.
  - **Learning objectives**  
The course learning objectives will state the skills and knowledge the students are expected to gain from this course.
  - **Course outline**  
The course outline should be approximately one or two pages and should clearly support the title, description and rationale presented. The outline should indicate the topics to be covered and the approximate percentage of the course to be devoted to each major topic. A syllabus that includes the above criteria may fulfill the requirements for a course outline.
  - **Method(s) of evaluating students**  
Describe and define each evaluation tool or assignment that will be used in determining a student’s grade.
  - **Bibliography**  
The bibliography for a new course should include readings that were relevant for developing the course, and those that the students might use to learn more about the topic. Your bibliography must be alphabetized and presented consistently in a recognized scholarly format typical of your discipline.
  - **Acknowledgment(s) from affected departments** – See directions under **Signature Sheet Box 3** above.

Key to abbreviations

**LEP** – Liberal Education Program

**DCC** – Department Curriculum Committee

**NMC** – Notifications Management Committee – UCF standing committee that reviews new and revised course proposals and revised programs

**SCC** – School Curriculum Committee

**UCF** – Undergraduate Curriculum Forum

**UWIC** – University Wide Impact Committee – UCF standing committee that reviews courses already approved by NMC for appropriateness as fulfilling an AUR.

**WACC** – Writing across Curriculum Committee – UCF standing committee that reviews courses already approved by NMC to fulfill university Writing (“W”) requirement.

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM  
REVISED COURSE PROPOSAL – [SIGNATURE SHEET](#)

See Revised Course Proposal Directions or use highlighted links for directions to complete forms.  
See [Key to Abbreviations](#) as needed.

**Box 1**

Current Course: Subject Code: \_\_\_\_ Course Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Title:

Revised Course: Subject Code: \_\_\_\_ Course Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Title:

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Ext.: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

DCC Votes: For: \_\_\_\_ Against: \_\_\_\_ Abstentions: \_\_\_\_

Department Votes: For: \_\_\_\_ Against: \_\_\_\_ Abstentions: \_\_\_\_

**Box 2****Signatures:**DCC Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date DCC approved: \_\_\_\_\_ [No DCC](#) 

Dept. Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Dept. Chair approved: \_\_\_\_\_

**Box 3**List other depts. (use dept. code) affected by this proposal and attach letters/email of acknowledgment from the chair(s).Department: \_\_\_\_ Acknowledgment Attached: Department: \_\_\_\_ Acknowledgment Attached: Department: \_\_\_\_ Acknowledgment Attached: Department: \_\_\_\_ Acknowledgment Attached: No Departments Are Affected: **UCF Use Only:**Date completed proposal (with all necessary attachments) received in UCF Office: \_\_\_\_\_ Proposal code: \_\_\_\_\_

SCC Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date SCC Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

NMC Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date NMC Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

UCF Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date UCF Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Provost or Designee: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Date UCF Received Final Approval: \_\_\_\_\_

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM  
REVISED COURSE PROPOSAL – SUMMARY SHEET

Proposed Effective Term: (Check UCF timetable for suggested dates to submit proposals.)

Fall:  Spring:  Summer:  Year: \_\_\_\_

**Current Course:** (from current Undergraduate Catalog)

Subject Code: \_\_\_\_ Course Number: \_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_

(If more than 29 characters, provide Transcript Title)

Transcript Title (max 29 characters): \_\_\_\_

Catalog Description:

Prerequisites: \_\_\_\_ Credits: \_\_\_\_

Contact hours per week: Lecture: \_\_\_\_ Lab: \_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_

**Revised Course:** (enter 'SAME' if no change) - (if a new number, check with the Registrar for availability)

Subject Code: \_\_\_\_ Course Number: \_\_\_\_ Title: \_\_\_\_

(If more than 29 characters, provide Transcript Title)

Transcript Title (max 29 characters): \_\_\_\_

Catalog Description:

Prerequisites: \_\_\_\_ Credits: \_\_\_\_

Contact hours per week: Lecture: \_\_\_\_ Lab: \_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_

Check appropriate boxes below by double-clicking on box and selecting "checked."

Click links for additional information.

- [Required in Program](#) (Revised Program Proposal is required)
- [Elective in Major](#)
- [Free Elective](#)
- I intend to submit this proposal to the UWIC for [Liberal Education Program](#) (LEP) approval.
- I intend to submit this proposal to the WACC for ["W" course approval](#).

Rationale for proposed change(s):

I have attached the following appendices (see directions for details):

- [Learning Objectives](#)
- [Course Outline](#)
- [Method\(s\) of Evaluating Students](#)
- [Bibliography](#)
- [Acknowledgement\(s\) from affected departments](#)

Appendices (Copy and paste or enter directly course outline, bibliography, etc.)

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM  
Directions for Preparing a Revised Course Proposal

All forms are to be sent via electronic submission with the exception of the signature page. See key at end of directions for all abbreviations.

**Signature Sheet** ([return to form](#))

**BOX 1**

- Complete all fields. If you are requesting a new course number, verify its availability with the Registrar, telephone Ext-25301 or via email.
- Enter Department Curriculum Committee (DCC) votes and Department votes. If Department does not have a DCC, indicate this by checking “No DCC” box.

**BOX 2**

- Form must be signed and dated by the Department Curriculum Committee Chair, if appropriate, and the Department Chair

**BOX 3**

- A proposal that has an effect on another department(s) requires an acknowledgment (email or memo) from the chair of the affected department(s), to indicate awareness (although not necessarily approval) of the proposal. Be sure to include the email or memo in the appendices at the end of the summary sheet. If you do not have it in electronic form, scan it and include in appendices. If you do not have access to a scanner, contact UCF office at 25206. If no other departments are affected, check the box labeled “No Departments Are Affected.”

**After completing forms:**

- 1) Either bring or send via inter-department mail **one** copy of the Signature Sheet, signed appropriately as described in Box 3 below to the UCF office, EN C 216. Bring or send only the Signature Sheet, ONE page. The proposal will not be forwarded to the School Curriculum Committee (SCC) until the Signature Sheet has been received.
- 2) Email the entire completed form as one attachment named RCP XXX (dept. code) XXX (course number), (i.e. RCP ANT 349) to the UCF Office at [ucfoffice@southernct.edu](mailto:ucfoffice@southernct.edu). Include: a) Signature Sheet, b) Summary Sheet and c) Appendices.
  - You will be able to [view your proposal](#) on the UCF website to determine the stage of your proposal in the approval process.

## Summary Sheet ([return to form](#))

- Enter **Proposed Effective Term**. Allow sufficient time for proposal to be approved by various entities. Adhere to [Catalogue Deadlines](#) if you wish to ensure that your course will appear in the hard copy of the Undergraduate Catalogue. Please note that if a proposal requires numerous revisions, suggested time frames may not be sufficient.

For both original and revised courses, enter information below. If there is no change, indicate “same” in Revised Course Box. Always complete all information in Current Course Box.

- **Subject Code, Course Number and Title** as they appear in Signature Sheet.
- **Transcript Title** - If the Title is longer than 29 characters (including spaces), provide a 29 character Transcript Title.
- **Catalog Description** – This should be concise and consistent with the rationale and course outline. For brevity, use phrases as opposed to full sentences. Avoid "This course covers..." and avoid restating the course title in the description. Use present tense, i.e. not what they will do in the course, but what they do in the course (example: “Students investigate...” not “Students will investigate...”). Information about the major focus, objective, teaching, methodology, and learning environment may be included, if appropriate. When applicable, indicate if special fees, equipment or field studies are required.
- **Prerequisites** – Be specific. List by Subject Code and Course Number when possible (Examples: ANT 101, PSY 100, SOC 211) or if specific courses are not appropriate use descriptors such as “junior or senior status” or “6 PSC credits” etc. Avoid vague prerequisites such as “Social Science B Requirement.” Do not add “*or* departmental permission to the prerequisite;” this is a given for all courses. However, if a course *requires* department permission indicate, “Departmental permission.”
- Enter number of **Credits**.
- Enter number of **Contact Hours per Week** in appropriate box: **Lecture, Lab, Other**. Lectures, discussions, and seminars meet 1 academic hour (50 minutes) per credit per week. Laboratories and studios usually meet 2 or 3 hours per credit per week.
- Check all appropriate boxes.
  - **Required in Program** - If the course is required in the Program, a Revised Program Proposal is also required.
  - **Elective in Major** – If the course is an elective within the program, a Revised Program Proposal *may* be required (see below).
    - A Revised Program Proposal is required if the course will be included in a specific list; example: “select 9 credits from the following courses.”
    - A Revised Program Proposal is not needed if the program already specifies electives as part of the program, i.e. “select 9 credits from the 300-level,” and this course is a 300 level course.
  - **Free Elective** – The course may be used to satisfy a free elective in the student’s program.

[\(return to form\)](#)

- **Liberal Education Program approval**– Check this box if this course is proposed as an LEP Tier 1, Tier 2, or Capstone course and is not currently so designated. This is a two part process. Following revised course approval by NMC, the proposal will be brought before the UCF body for approval *and* will be sent by NMC to UWIC for consideration as an LEP course. Following UWIC approval for LEP status, the proposal will be brought before the UCF body for LEP approval. The applications for course revision approval and LEP approval may be submitted simultaneously.
- **“W” Course approval** – Check this box if this course will be proposed to fulfill the university “W” course requirement and is not currently a “W” course. This is a two part process. Following revised course approval by NMC, the proposal should be submitted to the WACC committee (via the UCF office) by utilizing the appropriate [forms](#). The applications for course revision approval and “W” course approval may be submitted simultaneously.
- **Rationale** - The rationale should describe the reason(s) for the proposed change(s), i.e. “previous Title outdated” or “previous description lacking detail.”
- Check all appropriate boxes to indicate the appendices that have been attached. Note that while appendices may be attached, these are more common for new course proposals than revised course proposals.
  - **Learning objectives**  
The course learning objectives will state the skills and knowledge the students are expected to gain from this course.
  - **Course outline**  
The course outline should be approximately one or two pages and should clearly support the title, description and rationale presented. The outline should indicate the topics to be covered and the approximate percentage of the course to be devoted to each major topic. A syllabus that includes the above criteria may fulfill the requirements for a course outline.
  - **Method(s) of evaluating students**  
Describe and define each evaluation tool or assignment that will be used in determining a student’s grade.
  - **Bibliography**  
The bibliography for a new course should include readings that were relevant for developing the course, and those that the students might use to learn more about the topic. Your bibliography must be alphabetized and presented consistently in a recognized scholarly format typical of your discipline.
  - **Acknowledgment(s) from affected departments** – See directions under **Signature Sheet** Box 3 above.

[\(return to form\)](#)

Key to abbreviations

**LEP** – Liberal Education Program

**DCC** – Department Curriculum Committee

**NMC** – Notifications Management Committee – UCF standing committee that reviews new and revised course proposals and revised programs

**SCC** – School Curriculum Committee

**UCF** – Undergraduate Curriculum Forum

**UWIC** – University Wide Impact Committee – UCF standing committee that reviews courses already approved by NMC for appropriateness as fulfilling an AUR.

**WACC** – Writing Across Curriculum Committee – UCF standing committee that reviews courses already approved by NMC to fulfill university Writing (“W”) requirement.

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM  
REVISED PROGRAM PROPOSAL – SIGNATURE SHEET

**Box 1**

Program (BS/BA): \_\_\_\_\_ Major: \_\_\_\_\_ Concentration (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Department: \_\_\_\_\_

Contact Person: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Ext.: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Department Votes: For: \_\_\_\_\_ Against: \_\_\_\_\_ Abstentions: \_\_\_\_\_

**Box 2****Signatures:**

Dept. Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Dept. Chair Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

DCC Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date DCC Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

**Box 3****Attachments Required:**

- Current catalog description with proposed edits marked.
- Current online degree evaluation with proposed edits marked. (Call Registrar's Office if help is needed)

**Box 4****Other Departments Affected:**

Attach letters/emails of acknowledgement from the chair(s).

Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Acknowledgement Attached: Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Acknowledgement Attached: Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Acknowledgement Attached: Department: \_\_\_\_\_ Acknowledgement Attached:  No Departments Are Affected: **UCF Use Only:**Date the Completed Proposal (with all necessary attachments) was received in UCF Office: \_\_\_\_\_

SCC Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date SCC Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

NMC Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date NMC Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

UCF Chair: \_\_\_\_\_ Date UCF Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Provost or Designee: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Approved: \_\_\_\_\_

Date UCF Received Final Approval: \_\_\_\_\_

## UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM REVISED PROGRAM PROPOSAL – SUMMARY SHEET

Field 1:  
Proposed Effective: Fall \_\_\_\_\_

Field 2:  
Program (BS/BA): \_\_\_\_\_ Major: \_\_\_\_\_ Concentration (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_ Minor: \_\_\_\_\_

Field 3:  
Overall Requirements:

Current Overall Required Credits:	
Current Overall GPA Required:	

Proposed Overall Required Credits (min. 120)	
Proposed Overall GPA Required (min. 2.0)	

Field 4:  
Major Requirements (Minor Requirements, if applicable):

Deleted Requirements	Credits

Added Requirements	Credits

Field 5:  
Cognate Requirements:

Deleted Requirements	Credits

Added Requirements	Credits

Field 6:  
Rationale for Program Revision:

## UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM

### Directions for Revised Program Proposal

#### Signature Sheet

##### BOX 1

- Indicate the Program (BA/BS), Major, and Concentration (if applicable)
- Contact Information
- Department Votes (Departmental Curriculum Committee Votes)

##### BOX 2

- Program proposal form must be signed by the Department Chair and the Department Curriculum Committee Chair, if appropriate, before submitting to UCF Office, EN-C216.

##### BOX 3

Required attachments sent as scanned documents:

- Current catalog description with proposed edits marked. It may be helpful to enlarge each page on the photocopier and mark your edits.
- Current online degree evaluation with proposed edits marked. Use the student, Last Name: Staff, First Name TBA. Process a 'What-if' evaluation for the current term and the Program, Major, and Concentration you are revising. (Call the Registrar if help is needed.)

Note: The edited catalogue description and degree evaluation should be scanned using the "Line Art" or a similar setting on the scanner to guarantee that the document size will not cause problems when sending via email.

##### BOX 4

- A proposal that has an impact on another department needs an acknowledgement (email or memo) from the chair of the affected department(s), to indicate that he or she is aware of the proposal.

#### Summary Sheet

##### Field 1: Proposed Effective

Proposed effective will always be the following **Fall** term.

##### Field 2: Program

Fill in the Program (BA/BS), Major and Concentration (if applicable), or Minor.

For example:

Program: BS, Major: Business, Concentration: Marketing

Program: BS, Major: Anthropology, Concentration: Biological

Program: BA, Major: English, Concentration: NONE

##### Field 3: Overall Requirements

Current Overall Required Credits can be found on the top portion of the Current Online Degree Evaluation

Current Overall GPA Required can be found on the top portion of the Current Online Degree Evaluation

Proposed Overall Required Credits (minimum 120 credits)

Proposed Overall GPA Required (minimum 2.0)

##### Field 4: Major Requirements (Minor Requirements, if applicable)

Indicate any Deleted Requirements

Indicate any Added Requirements

##### Field 5: Cognate Requirements

Indicate any Deleted Cognates

Indicate any Added Cognates

**Field 6: Rationale**

The rationale for a program revision will describe the reasons for the changes, with particular reference to how they improve the program. The level of detail and explanation depends on the extent to which the program is changed. Therefore, a program revision that involves changing only a single course can be very brief, while major revisions in the program will require a more in-depth explanation.

**After completing forms:**

All forms and attachments are to be sent via electronic submission to the UCF Office ([ucfoffice@southernct.edu](mailto:ucfoffice@southernct.edu)). In addition, one hard copy of the signature sheet only is to be sent to the UCF Office, EN-C216. The proposal will not be forwarded to the SCC until the hard copy of the signature sheet is received.