

Southern Connecticut State University  
**FACULTY SENATE**

---

February 3, 2021 | 12:10 p.m. | WebEx

To join the meeting, please click [here](#) to be connected via WebEx.

Alternatively, copy and paste this link:

<https://southernct.webex.com/southernct/j.php?MTID=mcb9940b322a45cbd0502f3eb6eb494df>

**AGENDA ..... 2**

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 2020 ..... 3**

DOCUMENTS TO ACCOMPANY MINUTES (DECEMBER 2, 2020 MEETING)..... 6

*Resolution Regarding BOR ACME Policy..... 6*

*Resolution Regarding Revisions to the Student Opinion Survey..... 11*

**STANDING COMMITTEES ..... 12**

    ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE (APC) ..... 12

    ELECTIONS COMMITTEE (EC)..... 13

    FINANCE COMMITTEE (FC) ..... 14

    PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE (PPC)..... 15

    RULES COMMITTEE (RC) ..... 16

    STUDENT POLICY COMMITTEE (SPC) ..... 17

    TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE (TC) ..... 18

**SPECIAL COMMITTEES ..... 19**

    UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM (UCF)..... 19

    GRADUATE COUNCIL ..... 25

**DOCUMENTS/RESOLUTIONS FOR REVIEW FOR THE FEBRUARY 3, 2020 MEETING ..... 26**

Southern Connecticut State University  
**FACULTY SENATE**

---

AGENDA

February 3, 2021

12:10 p.m.

To join the meeting, please click [here](#) to be connected via WebEx.

Alternatively, copy and paste this link:

<https://southernct.webex.com/southernct/j.php?MTID=mcb9940b322a45cbd0502f3eb6eb494df>

- I. Announcements Relevant to the Faculty Senate
- II. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting held on December 2, 2020
- III. Faculty Senate President's Report
- IV. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees
  - a. Academic Policy
  - b. Elections
  - c. Finance
  - d. Personnel Policy
  - e. Rules
  - f. Student Policy
  - g. Technology
- V. Reports of Faculty Senate Special Committees
  - a. UCF
  - b. Graduate Council
- VI. Unfinished Business
- VII. New Business
- VIII. Guest(s)
  - a. President J. Bertolino
  - b. Provost R. Prezant
  - c. H. Marx

Spring 2021 meetings: February 3, February 17, March 3, March 17, March 31, April 14, April 28, May 5.

# FACULTY SENATE

## UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 2020

<https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings>

The 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Faculty Senate AY 2020-2021 was held on December 2, 2020, at 12:10 p.m. via WebEx.

### Attendance

Dave Allen <i>Accounting</i> 8/8	Matthew Ouimet <i>Counseling</i> 8/8	Sandip Dutta <i>Finance</i> 5/8	Atul Kulkarni <i>Marketing</i> 8/8	Rex Gilliland <i>Philosophy</i> 8/8	Angela Lopez-Velasquez* <i>Special Education</i> 5/8
William Farley <i>Anthropology</i> 8/8	Natalie Starling <i>Counseling &amp; School Psychology</i> 8/8	Lawrence Brancazio <i>Health &amp; Movement Sciences</i> 8/8	Joe Fields <i>Mathematics</i> 8/8	Binlin Wu <i>Physics</i> 8/8	Douglas Macur <i>Theatre</i> 8/8
Jeff Slomba <i>Art</i> 8/8	Beena Achhpal <i>Curriculum &amp; Learning</i> 8/8	Robert Gregory <i>Health &amp; Movement Sciences</i> 8/8	Klay Kruczek <i>Mathematics</i> 8/8	Jon Wharton <i>Political Science</i> 8/8	Luke Eilderts <i>World Languages &amp; Literatures</i> 8/8
Kevin Siedlecki <i>Athletics</i> 8/8	Maria Diamantis <i>Curriculum &amp; Learning</i> 8/8	Troy Paddock <i>History</i> 7/8	Jonathan Irving <i>Music</i> 8/8	Michael Nizhnikov <i>Psychology</i> 6/8	
Sean Grace <i>Biology</i> 8/8	Dushmantha Jayawickreme <i>Earth Science</i> 8/8	Darcy Kern* <i>History</i> 6/8	Frances Penny <i>Nursing</i> 4/7	Kate Marsland <i>Psychology</i> 8/8	Deborah Weiss <i>Faculty Senate President</i> 8/8
Mina Park <i>Business Information Systems</i> 8/8	Sanja Grubacic <i>Economics</i> 8/8	Yan Liu <i>Information &amp; Library Science</i> 6/8	Kelly Martinez* <i>Nursing</i> 4/8	William Faraclas <i>Public Health</i> 8/8	Cindy Simoneau <i>Undergraduate Curriculum Forum</i> 8/8
Jeff Webb <i>Chemistry</i> 8/8	Peter Madonia* <i>Educational Leadership</i> 6/8	Cindy Simoneau <i>Journalism</i> 8/8	Obiageli Okwuka <i>Part-time Faculty</i> 8/8	Michael Dodge <i>Recreation, Tourism &amp; Sport Management</i> 8/8	Meredith Sinclair <i>Undergraduate Curriculum Forum</i> 8/8
Barbara Cook <i>Communication Disorders</i> 8/8	Mike Shea <i>English</i> 8/8	Patrick Crowley* <i>Library Services</i> 7/8	Mary Ellen Minichiello <i>Part-time Faculty</i> 5/8	Sebastian Perumbilly <i>Social Work</i> 8/8	Cynthia O'Sullivan <i>Graduate Council</i> 8/8
Derek Taylor <i>Communication, Media &amp; Screen Studies</i> 8/8	Paul Petrie <i>English</i> 8/8	Jacqueline Toce <i>Library Services</i> 8/8	Stephanie Fischer <i>Part-time Faculty</i> 4/4	Stephen Monroe Tomczak <i>Social Work</i> 8/8	Aidan Coleman <i>Student Government Association</i> 8/8
Alaa Sheta <i>Computer Science</i> 8/8	Matthew Miller <i>Environment, Geography &amp; Marine Studies</i> 8/8	Carol Stewart <i>Management, International Business &amp; Public Utilities</i> 7/8	Virginia Metaxas <i>Part-time Faculty</i> 3/4	Adam Pittman* <i>Sociology</i> 6/7	Dr. Joe Bertolino <i>SCSU President</i> 5/8
Guests:	B. Zamfir C. Hlavac J. H. Kim	K. Swanson M. Vancour T. Bennett	T. Brolliar T. Millburn		

\*An asterisk denotes an absence. Overall attendance recorded below each member.

Faculty Senate President D. Weiss called the 8<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 12:10 p.m.

- I. Announcements
  - A. M. Diamantis: Reminder for the Robert Jirsa Service Award submission deadline.
  - B. K. Marsland: Commended A. Carroll, University Registrar, and her office for their work.
  - C. L. Eilderts: Reminder that Faculty Development Grants are due by February 1, 2021.
  - D. L. Eilderts: Reminder that the J. Philip Smith Outstanding Teacher and Outstanding Academic Advisor nominations will close on January 29, 2021.
  - E. M. Shea: Reminder that FYRE presentations take place from 4-6 p.m. December 2, 2020.
  
- II. Minutes of the previous meeting held on November 11, 2020 were accepted as distributed.  
<https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings>
  
- III. President’s Report  
<https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings>
  
- IV. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees
  - A. Minutes of the standing committees received. No additional reports.
  
- V. Reports of Faculty Senate Special Committees
  - A. Graduate Council (M. Diamantis): Curricular development discussions; how to sustain and grow graduate enrollments during the pandemic.
  - B. UCF (C. Simoneau): Updates and clarifications to the language concerning student’s ability to select and change catalog years.
  
- VI. New Business
  - A. D. Weiss, on behalf of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee, **moved to approve** the Resolution on BOR ACME Policy.
    - i. Vote tally
      - 1. Yes ..... 40
      - 2. No ..... 0
    - a. Motion to approve the resolution **passed unanimously**.
  - B. J. Fields **moved to approve** the Resolution Regarding Revisions to the Student Opinion Survey.
    - i. R. Gilliland **moved to amend the resolution by striking** “The course content was available when I needed it” and **replacing** it with “The instructor made course content available in a timely manner.” **Seconded**.
      - 1. W. Faraclas **moved to amend the amendment by inserting** “Once the course began,” before “The instructor made...” and **striking** “in a timely manner,” and **replacing** it with “as it was needed.” The proposed wording would read: “Once the course began, the instructor made course content available as it was needed.”
        - a. Through unanimous consent, “content” was **replaced** by “materials.”
          - i. Vote tally
            - 1. Yes ..... 32
            - 2. No ..... 10

- a. Motion to approve the amendment to the amendment **passed**.
    - 2. Motion to approve the amended amendment **passed** by unanimous consent.
  - ii. M. Shea moved to **amend the resolution by striking** “were well organized and” **and by replacing** it with, “The instructor made the course materials easy to navigate.”
    - 1. Discussion continued, but motion did not receive a second.
  - iii. J. Fields **moved to amend the resolution by striking** “The course materials were well-organized and easy to navigate” and by **replacing** it with “The Instructor provided course materials that were well-organized and easy to navigate.” **Seconded**.
    - 1. Vote tally
      - a. Yes ..... 30
      - b. No ..... 7
      - i. Motion to amend the resolution **passed**.
  - iv. M. Shea **moved to call the previous question. Seconded**.
    - 1. Yes ..... 30
    - 2. No ..... 10
      - a. Motion to **call the previous question passed**.
        - 1. Vote tally
          - a. Yes ..... 33
          - b. No ..... 7
          - i. Motion to approve the Resolution Regarding Revisions Student Opinion Surveys as amended **passed**.

VII. Adjournment

- A. D. Macur **moved to adjourn. Seconded**.
  - i. Meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

---

L. Eilderts  
Secretary

Resolution Regarding BOR ACME Policy

**SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE  
RESOLUTION REGARDING BOR ACME POLICY**

Whereas, Southern Connecticut State University exists for the primary purpose of furthering academic excellence;

Whereas, SCSU Faculty Senate is the official representative body of the Academic Faculty;

Whereas, The Board of Regents (BOR) has presented for commentary an [Executive Summary](#) of a draft policy (hereafter referred to as ‘Proposal,’ regarding Alignment and Timely Completion of Mathematics and English Implementation at Connecticut State Community College in fall 2023 (ACME);

Whereas, by necessity, given the close coordination between the colleges and the universities in the CSCU system, especially given efforts since 2012 to design, approve, and provide seamless transfer opportunities through the Transfer and Articulation Policy (TAP) Pathways, what occurs at the colleges, will subsequently affect what occurs at the universities;

Whereas, The Proposal violates faculty purview over curriculum (Collective Bargaining Agreement, 5.17<sup>1</sup>) in removing Algebra as the “required prerequisite for any math pathways” and dictating “transfer of and applicability of mathematics courses,” thus co-opting this responsibility from the departments, and subsequently also violating the Framework portion of the TAP Transfer Pathways;

Whereas, The Proposal mandates utilization of 1) a new corequisite delivery of support (rather than the current prerequisite developmental course sequences), 2) course placement based solely on high school GPA, and 3) utilization of self-reported high school GPA for course placement in lieu of transcripts at the community colleges, but fails to support those proposed changes due to citation inaccuracies and the presentation of incomplete information (Appendix A);

Whereas, despite evidence in the research literature that clearly differentiates between the needs of students with marginal levels of academic preparedness and the needs of students who are more severely underprepared, the Proposal calls for a one-size-fits-all corequisite program for students, which simplified approach could jeopardize the academic success of the most vulnerable students;

Whereas, Although the proposal purports to address Connecticut's racial and socioeconomic achievement gap, in actuality, it would reinforce these disparities by lowering academic standards and expectations for community college and state university graduates; and

Whereas, The BOR Proposal would be damaging to students and would violate the principles of shared governance set forth in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA); now therefore be it

---

<sup>1</sup> “The department shall have responsibility for the content and development of courses, curriculum and Programs of study within its discipline, research and service within its area...”

*Resolved*, That we reject the BOR proposal; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the BOR follow appropriate pathways of engagement with the faculty to create a more thoughtful and nuanced approach; and be it further

*Resolved*, That the BOR must respect that changes to curricula are to be decided through the curricular approval processes established by each university and the CBA, and that any changes to the TAP Transfer Agreements are to be made only through mutual agreement between the faculty of the colleges and the universities.

## Appendix A

### Commentary on the BOR Executive Summary draft entitled:

“Board of Regents Policy: Alignment and Timely Completion of Mathematics and English Implementation at Connecticut State Community College in fall 2023”

These comments relate to the draft of the policy regarding alignment and timely completion of math. Although the policy is proposed as related only to the community colleges, by necessity, given the close coordination between the colleges and the universities, especially given efforts since 2012 to design, approve, and provide seamless transfer opportunities through the TAP Transfer Pathways (and other venues), the colleges and universities cannot be separated, since what occurs at the colleges, will subsequently affect what occurs at the universities. This commentary is divided into several sections to address a number of points.

**Mathematics Pathways – Aligning Mathematics to Program and Career** - The proposal states, “For programs that do not require algebra-based math, algebra is no longer a required prerequisite in order for the college-level mathematics courses to be accepted and applied at four-year schools to which students transfer.”

This is a decision that can only be made with the agreement of the CSUs. Neither has a discussion taken place nor has an agreement been reached; in fact this math model has been rejected by the CSUs in the past. The TAP Transfer Pathways have been worked out cooperatively between the CSUs and the community colleges over a period of five or more years. This change would negate those negotiated agreements and would render the TAP transfer pathways as invalid since the agreed-upon math requirement would no longer be met (as defined in the original framework of the program from 2012).

### **Placement Based on High School GPA**

The proposal advocates for placing students in classes primarily based solely upon high school GPA, citing the Bahr et al. article:

“Bahr and associates (2019) report that “cumulative high school grade point average (GPA) is the most consistently useful predictor of performance across levels of math and English coursework” (pp. 178-179).”

While Bahr et al. (2019) support using high school GPA for placement, they acknowledge that there is “limited research to date” on the subject, and they recommend using the data in a much more nuanced manner than advocated in the proposal, which on a practical level might be difficult to apply. Among other conclusions, Behr et al., state that an overall higher GPA would be needed to “signal a given level of math competence than is necessary to signal the corresponding level of English competency.” It is also unclear how reliable GPA would be for students who are not recent high school graduates with the authors stating, “More research is needed on the relationship between the length of delay between high school graduation and college enrollment and the extent to which measures of high school achievement can be used to predict performance in math and English coursework.” They further state that if high school GPA is used, a differential model would need to be employed for various college-level math courses and that the information should be used in conjunction with subject-specific skill milestones that come



late in the high school career. Therefore, “the most up-to-date transcript information” should be utilized for incoming college students. This leads to the next issue of the suggestion in the proposal that “Students may opt to self-report their high school GPA” because simple reporting of a cumulative number will not allow for the nuanced placement criteria described in the article and self-reporting has not been demonstrated to be reliable in place of transcripts.

#### **Self-reporting of high school GPA**

The proposal states that according to Kadlec and Dadgar (2020), “the latest research indicates that students self-reporting of high school course grades and GPAs can be reliably used in place of official high school transcripts.” The Kadlec and Dadgar report, however, is not a peer-reviewed article, but rather a compilation of information with citations that are not clearly linked to the statements that are made. In fact, the most recent article cited by Kadlec and Dadgar on this subject is the Bahr article from 2019 which states “It will be important for future research to investigate the viability of students’ self-reported information about high school achievement in place of information reported directly by high schools.” Further, the Kadlec and Dadgar article is actually produced by an organization called Strong Start to Finish, which self-describes on its website as “a network of like-minded individuals and organizations from the policy, research, and practice spaces who’ve come together for one reason – to help all students, not just the select few, find success in postsecondary education.” This is not a credible source to utilize in the development of policy that will determine student course placement.

#### **Corequisite rather than Prerequisite Delivery of Support**

The proposal advocates for elimination of prerequisites and utilization of a corequisite model with all students to be enrolled directly in college-level English and mathematics with supports to maximize success as needed. In the proposal there are a number of conclusions that have been drawn based upon selectively citing some statements from the Ran and Lin article (2019) and other articles without presenting a complete picture.

Several conclusions from this article, however, indicate that the corequisite model is not supported as a one-size-fits all solution:

“We found no significant impacts of placement into corequisite remediation on enrollment persistence, transfer to a four-year college, or degree completion. This suggests that corequisite reforms, though effective in helping students pass college-level math and English, are not sufficient to improve college completion rates overall.”

Further, more importantly, the success of the corequisite model in the article refers specifically to the group of students who have taken an alternate math model. Therefore, the predicted effects in the proposal of utilizing a corequisite model are not supported based on this article, since the results are due to the alternate math model and not the corequisite model.

“In the current study, we were able to disentangle the effects of these two approaches and found that the positive effects of corequisite reform in Tennessee in math, relative to prerequisite remediation, were largely driven by efforts to guide students not interested in a STEM program to take statistics, math for liberal arts, or other types of math that align with their program requirements. Students placed into corequisite algebra had gateway completion rates similar to those of students taking prerequisite

remedial math on the algebra-calculus track.”

Boatman and Long (2018) also do not conclude in favor of unilateral application of a co-requisite model stating that, “Importantly, while most of the literature only examines the effectiveness of developmental courses for students at the margin of needing any remediation, our results suggest that more, rather than less remediation may be beneficial for students with weaker preparation. These results suggest that states and institutions need not treat remediation as a singular policy but instead should consider it as an intervention that might vary in its impact according to student needs.”

They describe a distinct difference between students who are “on the margin of needing one remedial course,” and those who are less prepared by stating, “However, students with lower levels of academic preparedness experienced much smaller negative effects from remediation, and in some cases, remedial courses are estimated to improve later student outcomes, particularly for students attending 2-year colleges. For example, we estimate that students placed in reading and writing courses two levels below college level are more likely to persist or attain a degree than similar students who were placed one level below college courses. These results suggest that remedial and developmental courses can either help or hinder students differently depending on their level of academic preparedness.”

Therefore, the proposal should not be approved based upon its faulty premises regarding course placement based solely upon GPA, utilization of self-reported GPA, and use of the co-requisite model. This proposal would serve to disenfranchise our least academically-prepared students by denying them the preparation that would help them to succeed. It is suggested that, based upon the literature, a more thoughtful and nuanced approach be proposed that takes into consideration the fact that a one-size-fits-all approach is simplistic and not supported by the literature. Further, the unilateral proposal to not require the algebra prerequisite dictates curriculum, which is a faculty purview, in a top-down manner that violates the Collective Bargaining Agreement and invalidates the TAP transfer agreements.

## Resolution Regarding Revisions to the Student Opinion Survey

### **SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION REGARDING REVISIONS TO THE STUDENT OPINION SURVEY**

Whereas, Southern Connecticut State University exists for the primary purpose of furthering academic excellence;

Whereas, The SCSU Faculty Senate is the official representative body of the Academic Faculty;

Whereas, The Covid-19 pandemic has caused a significant shift in course delivery methods;

Whereas, Technology is often a component of courses whether they be on ground, hybrid, or online; and

Whereas, The gathering of data on technology use in the classroom could be valuable for faculty members; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the following questions be added to the Student Opinion Survey:

Open answer:

- Comment on the instructor's use of technology in the course.

Likert Scale:

- The instructor was accessible and was available to help me.
- Once the course began, the instructor made course materials available as they were needed.
- The instructor provided course materials that were well-organized and easy to navigate.
- The instructor made effective use of technology in this course.

## STANDING COMMITTEES

---

### ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE (APC)

#### **APC MINUTES Dec 2020-Jan 2021**

- In a series of subcommittee meetings, P&T focus group leaders reviewed results in order to identify areas of general consensus, points of disagreement, and areas needing further university-wide discussion. The resulting document will form the basis of presentation to Senate of focus group process, results, and APC recommendations.
- Committee is working on draft powerpoint presentation for finalization at Feb. 10 APC meeting and presentation to Faculty Senate thereafter.

## ELECTIONS COMMITTEE (EC)

### **Minutes Jan. 27, 2021**

Present: Klay Kruczek; Darcy Kern; Mina Park; Frances Penny; Cindy Simoneau, chairperson.  
Note: Jonathan Wharton is no longer serving on this committee or Faculty Senate due to full-time interim appointment in School of Graduate and Professional Studies.

1. Announcements
2. Old Business
  - A. Continuing discussion on request for university resolution on free speech
3. New Business
  - A. Discussions and preliminary actions on resolutions on:  
COMPOSITION, AND TERM LENGTH OF THE UNIVERSITY  
RESOLUTION REGARDING FORMING A CSU  
  
PROFESSORSHIP ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
RESOLUTION REGARDING THE SIZE OF THE UNIVERSITY  
  
LIBRARY COMMITTEE  
  
Further review on all these to discuss feedback from Executive  
Committee.
  - B. Discussion about resolution on university elections' process for unfilled  
school/college slots. Consulting executive committee.
4. Adjourn at 1 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,  
Cindy Simoneau

FINANCE COMMITTEE (FC)

No Report

## PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE (PPC)

Minutes  
January 27, 2021

### Teams Meeting

**Members:** Toce, Jacqueline; Slomba, Jeffrey; Lopez-Velasquez, Angela; Tomczak, Stephen; Shea, Michael; Kelly Martinez; Metaxas, Virginia; Pittman, Adam; Starling, Natalie (chair)

12:10

Approval of Minutes: PPC approved minutes from 11/18/2020.

### ANNOUNCEMENTS/NEW BUSINESS:

The PPC continued reviewing and making edits to the P&T, Renewal Procedures document

The PPC will plan to review the notes from the Rules Committee, and begin reviewing the P & T Guidebooks at the next meeting on 2/10/2021

A subgroup will proofread edits to the P&T, Renewal Procedures documents and compare documents for consistency before 2/24/2021

The PPC will plan a joint meeting with the Rules Committee on 2/24/2021

## RULES COMMITTEE (RC)

**Date:** Wednesday, January 27, 2021

**Time:** 12:10 PM

**Attendees:** Barb Cook, Robert Gregory (chair), Matt Miller, & Jeff Webb  
**Guests:** Scott Elliott & Wendy Hardenberg (University Sabbatical Leave Committee)

**Agenda items:**

1. Discussion of potential revisions to the Sabbatical Leave document.

Meeting adjourned at 1:20 PM.

Minutes prepared and respectfully submitted by Robert Gregory, SCSU Faculty Senate Rules Committee Chair



STUDENT POLICY COMMITTEE (SPC)

## TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE (TC)

## SPECIAL COMMITTEES

---

### UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM (UCF)

#### **Report to Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Forum on Dec. 10, 2020 meeting actions**

**The UCF approved the following policies:**

A. Adopt the current W-Course Pilot Program as the permanent University Wide Writing Program.

**(see attached)**

B. Approve the revised catalog language clarifying the policy on students' ability to select and change catalog years.

**(see attached)**

C. Adopt a new pilot program creating LEP Tier II Special Topics course shells; program will be evaluated for revision or adoption in Spring 2023 after a 2-year period (Fall 2021-Spring 2023).

**(see attached)**

New UCF Chair Meredith Sinclair begins her term Spring 2021.

Respectfully submitted,  
Meredith Sinclair (UCF Chair, Sp. 2021)  
Cindy Simoneau (UCF Secretary, Sp. 2021)  
UCF Co-chairs  
Dec. 2020

## **Southern Writing Across the Curriculum Program for Designing and Teaching W-Courses**

The Writing-Across-the-Curriculum Committee (WACC) wants the W-course program to include courses in all disciplines and delivery formats; we particularly want to foster W-courses in such previously under-represented fields as applied arts and social sciences, and the technical, professional, and quantitative sciences. W-courses are not faculty specific. Department chairs may use their discretion in assigning faculty to those courses.

*THE FOLLOWING GUIDELINES DESCRIBE THE SORT OF COURSE THE WACC ENVISAGES, THOUGH ALTERNATIVE MEANS TO THE SAME END WILL ALWAYS BE CONSIDERED.*

### **a. A significant portion of the course is dedicated to either general academic writing skills or disciplinary writing skills.**

- General academic writing is comprised of the following tasks:
  - reading comprehension
  - developing an argument/thesis in response to what is read
  - organization
  - grammatical/syntactical knowledge.

Generally, reading comprehension and developing an argument can be taught by a series of comprehension, synthetic, and analytic questions. Organization and grammatical/syntactical skills can be taught via model papers.

- Disciplinary specific writing focuses more on teaching genre conventions—the specific features of writing tasks that characterize a discipline’s writing. Examples of genres are: the lab report in science classes, case notes in human service fields, proposals in business classes, etc.
- Courses that are writing-intensive by their nature (e.g., journalism, technical writing, creative writing) may be approved as W-courses. However, writing in these courses must clearly articulate what writing skills they will teach.
- W-course proposals must summarize which skills students will learn in their classroom, and explanation of why those particular skills are relevant for that level course.

### **b. The instructor of the course will teach those skills.**

- Instructors may communicate their knowledge of writing in their disciplines to their students through a variety of means such as paper comments, conferences, handouts, in-class presentations on writing, and/or online discussions and presentations.
- In addition to formal papers, the writing component may include short, unrevised papers, essay exams, and in-class writings.
- W- course proposals should outline the process of teaching the writing skills summarized in part a.

### **c. At least one writing assignment in the course should require revision**

Revised: Spring 2019, Fall 2019, Spring 2020, Fall 2020

- "Revision" implies making substantive changes to writing: rethinking the thesis, organization, support, or content, rather than simply correcting surface errors.
- Instructors may encourage revision in a variety of ways, e.g., written comments on drafts, one-on-one conferences, and in-class peer workshops.
- To encourage revision, instructors' comments should suggest changes and explain reasons for the suggestions.
- W-course proposals should indicate clearly the process of revision, and how many assignments will require revision.

**d. Written assignments should be a major part of the course grade.**

- The WACC suggests that out-of-class papers count for 50% or more of the semester grade, though in certain fields, other percentages may appropriately be applied.
- The weight of the revision should be explicit and should be communicated clearly to the students (e.g., in the syllabus).

**Course Outline or Syllabus**

The course outline or syllabus must include specific references to the above points a through d. It is highly recommended that the course outline or syllabus explicitly state the writing objectives for the course.

**Writing Assignments and Rubrics**

At least one sample writing assignment must clearly align with the writing objectives for the course. The rubric for that assignment must assess whether students meet those writing objectives.

**Directions for submitting W proposals:**

- Complete the W proposal forms that are available on-line at UCF Confluence Forms and Directions page.
- Submit a signed hard copy to the UCF office in EN C216.
  - During Covid, please send a single document with proposal form, memo, syllabus, assignments and rubric to [ucfoffice@southernct.edu](mailto:ucfoffice@southernct.edu).
  - In lieu of signatures, an email from affected parties (proposer, chair, other departments) will suffice.
- Submit an electronic copy to [ucfoffice@southernct.edu](mailto:ucfoffice@southernct.edu). Please try to include all supplemental materials (e.g., cover memo, syllabus, and 2-3 sample assignments) in one .doc/.rtf/.pdf document.

***Directions for proposing new courses as "Ws":***

- Submit new course proposal to UCF for review by NMC.
- Upon approval, submit W proposal to UCF for review by the WACC.

Revised: Spring 2019, Fall 2019, Spring 2020, Fall 2020

## **Catalog Year**

~~The student must meet the graduation requirements for their selected undergraduate program of the University as published in the catalog in effect at the time of the student's initial enrollment as long as they maintain continuous matriculating status. are those which must be met for completion of an undergraduate program provided that the student maintains a continuous matriculating status. For all students, the initial enrollment shall be the first day of classes following matriculation in a regular semester at the University.~~

~~Courses listed in this catalog are subject to change through normal academic channels. New courses and changes in degree requirements are initiated by departments and approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Forum and the Provost. The student will have the option to change catalog years to meet or substitute these program requirements.~~

~~Students re-enrolling at the University may elect to revert to their original catalog year provided that it is no more than 5 years prior to the current term. Students may not. However, students may neither revert to a catalog year that is prior to their initial admission term nor to a term more than 5 years prior to the current term. Furthermore,~~

~~Students may also elect to switch to a newer catalog year once enrolled.~~

~~By changing catalog years, a student becomes responsible for fulfilling all the graduation requirements for their new catalog year, including all changes in general education requirements, major requirements, or other areas. To ensure timely graduation, the director of the LEP may approve substitutions of courses in the LEP, and the Chairperson of the Department may approve substitutions of courses in the program.~~

~~Matriculated students re-enrolling at the University may elect to revert to their original catalog year provided that it is no more than 5 years prior to the current term. Students may not revert to a catalog year that is prior to their initial admission term. Students may elect to switch to a newer catalog year once enrolled. Students must receive departmental approval to switch catalog year.~~

~~Courses listed in this catalog are subject to change through normal academic channels. New courses and changes in degree requirements are initiated by departments and approved by the Undergraduate Curriculum Forum and the Provost. Subsequent changes in program requirements, as published in the catalog, or amended by proper authority, may be substituted at the option of the student.~~

### Additional recommendations for the catalog:

~~Keep the names of the degrees, certificates, certification for teacher preparation, double baccalaureate, double major, double major in education, honors college & subject abbreviations~~

### Change:

~~Curriculum to Major, Minor, and LEP curriculum requirements~~

~~Keep Graduation create separate tab for Catalog Year & Requirements~~

**Commented [FW1]:** This new heading is to be placed under the main section called ACADEMIC STANDARDS.

**Formatted:** Normal

**Formatted:** Space After: 0 pt

**Formatted:** Normal, No bullets or numbering

**Formatted:** Space After: 0 pt

### **Program Requirements**

Students should be acquainted with the Programs and Degrees section **for their catalog year (see Academic Standards for more information on catalog year)** of this catalog and with the requirements of their degree program. Students are responsible for maintaining regular contact with their academic advisers. Students are responsible for fulfilling the specific program requirements for their own degree program and maintaining regular contact with their academic adviser. The department chairperson has the authority to waive or provide substitute course work for departmental requirements.

Students should be aware that additional requirements may be imposed for certification or licensure (even once a plan of study has been prepared) if such requirements are imposed by outside licensing or accrediting agencies. A plan of study may be subject to revision to reflect such additional requirements.

## Proposal for Pilot Special Topics Courses in LEP Tier 2 areas

### **Why do we need this?**

Imagine that a world-wide pandemic occurs in early March causing widespread mental health issues. Also imagine a faculty member would like to offer a course specifically addressing the capacious issues surrounding the affects on the mental and physical aspects caused by isolationism. In order to offer the course in a timely semester that is relevant to the timing of the event, the professor would need to offer it as a special topics course, which currently cannot satisfy an LEP requirement.

### **Problems with offering such courses under current Special Topics Format:**

- The special topics course is unlikely to be part of a student's plan of study and thus may be disqualified for financial aid purposes.
- The course is less likely to run if students are not able to satisfy graduation course requirements.

### **What are we creating?**

We are proposing to create a special topics course for each Tier 2 category as shown below. Under this model these courses would exist on the degree evaluation and associated with the appropriate LEP category to clearly communicate this as a degree requirement possibility to the students.

- T2AE 298/398/498 – Special Topics in American Experience
- T2CD 298/398/498 – Special Topics in Creative Drive
- T2CE 298/398/498 – Special Topics in Cultural Expression
- T2GA 298/398/498 – Special Topics in Global Awareness
- T2MB 298/398/498 – Special Topics in Mind and Body
- T2PR 298/398/498 – Special Topics in Natural World 1: Physical Realm
- T2LE 298/398/498 – Special Topics in Natural World 2: Life and Environment
- T2CC 298/398/498 – Special Topics in Social Structure, Conflict and Consensus
- T2TP 298/398/498 – Special Topics in Time and Place

### **Proposal Process:**

The proposer will complete a special topics form and **provide the appropriate LEP addendum** to the UCF office. The UCF chairperson (in consultation with the NMC Chair(s) to ensure the LEP addendum shows promise for future approval) will log the course. No more than one special topics course per LEP Tier 2 category may be submitted from any one department per semester. Any faculty teaching a LEP special topics course must participate in the LEP assessment and affinity group activities related to that LEP category in each semester the course is offered.

\*The approval of a LEP special topics course does not guarantee the future approval of being an LEP course, which is still the purview of the NMC approval process.



## GRADUATE COUNCIL

DOCUMENTS/RESOLUTIONS FOR REVIEW FOR THE FEBRUARY 3, 2020  
MEETING

---