

Minutes of the February 27, 2007 Faculty Senate Meeting

The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, February 27, 2007, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the January 30, 2007 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

The President

New College of Charleston President, George Benson, described his first month here as being “like drinking out of a fire hose.” He has been trying to meet as many people as he can and learn as much as he can as rapidly as possible. He would like to start a strategic planning process later in the year (in October or November). This process will be an open one, with input from many sources, including the legislature. Mr. Benson also plans to hold open meetings in different cities in the state as part of the strategic plan process.

Next, Mr. Benson said that he and his wife Jane are delighted to be here and that he finds the College a remarkable institution with great possibilities. As soon as he gets to know the campus better, he will focus on fundraising, which he said is perhaps the one black mark in the College’s record. Our endowment is low—only 43 million dollars, when it should be in the hundreds of millions. Mr. Benson noted that there are numerous reasons for this. In 1970, when the institution became public, we had only 500 students. As the number of students increased, the College received increasing revenue from tuition dollars. In addition, the state used to contribute more generously to the College than it does now. Because we have a good faculty/student ratio right now, the College is not going to increase the number of students to bring in revenue. Instead, we need to work on fundraising. Mr. Benson pointed out that previous president, Lee Higdon, used debt effectively, got fundraising started, and made good progress in recent years. But we still have a long way to go. He said that he had been warned that fundraising in Charleston is difficult. The city does not have a long history of giving at the levels that people are used to in the Northeast or even in Atlanta. But we can develop that culture. We do have a very young alumni group—whose average age is in the early 30’s or late 20’s—which is a negative in terms of fundraising. Because of this, we have to take good care of the parents and cultivate them. There is a great deal of wealth in Charleston, and new wealth comes to the city on a daily basis. Mr. Benson added that he enjoys fundraising and expects to be away from campus a good deal on this mission. We’ll see more of him in and around campus now than we might 6-8 months from now. He’ll be available, though not as much as some people might like. Fund-raising requires something of a trade-off in availability, but he said he would try to balance the need to travel and fundraise with campus availability as best he could.

Mr. Benson also announced that he had recently given out a list of his expectations to his administrative leadership team. He highlighted a few of these expectations.

- 1) First, he wishes to nurture an environment of openness, transparency and trust. Mr. Benson said that he won’t have any hidden agendas, ever. He doesn’t operate that way.
- 2) He plans to treat faculty and programs as valuable assets, but also as having unique needs and strengths. Mr. Benson mentioned that, as Dean of the Terry School of Business at Georgia, he instituted a policy whereby every individual faculty member had a specific

- contract with his or her department head that laid out expectations and responsibilities.
- 3) In hiring, he believes in reaching as high as our resources will permit. He believes it is extremely important to perform “careful and thorough due diligence” before making an offer. He is not pleased with current faculty and administrative salaries, however, which he believes are inadequate.
 - 4) He wants everyone at the College to be entrepreneurial, to strive to develop programs that pay for themselves (not only in a financial sense). Mr. Benson referred to himself as a risk-taker, someone who is willing to invest in programs that might not pay for themselves initially, but will eventually.
 - 5) He expects us to strive for diversity in the staff and student body.
 - 6) He urged faculty to never hesitate to share good news or bad news with the President’s Office. He wants to be informed.
 - 7) He believes that fundraising is a team sport. Everyone should be involved. Good fundraising begins with the development of deep and lasting relationships. We should begin by asking potential donors for their time, talent, inspiration, and ideas in order that they might form an emotional attachment to the College.
 - 8) He urged faculty members not to be intimidated by limits. He wants to “take the College of Charleston to the world.”

The Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens announced that her office has been making good progress on appointing an Associate Provost. She hopes to make an announcement by the end of the week. In addition, Academic Affairs has been busy with tenure and promotion reviews. The college-wide T&P committee has been working very hard. She sits in on deliberations of this committee, although she doesn’t actively take part in them. Since she’s been doing this, she has been extraordinarily impressed by the quality of faculty at the college.

Ms. Jorgens also reported that she attended the AASCU (American Association of State Colleges and Universities) provosts’ meeting earlier this month. She has been quite favorably impressed by these conferences and has returned to the College with many ideas, materials, and suggestions.

Vice President for Business Affairs, Steve Osborne

Mr. Osborne began his report by saying that he has been at the College since November 1. Parking was one of the first issues he had to deal with upon arrival because of both short-range and long-range problems. Over the past year, we have lost 102 employee parking permits due to expansion of facilities. In addition, we will soon be starting construction of a new science center. The 260 parking permits assigned to the K-Lot will disappear in fall of 2007. His office is working to find new parking places for all of us. Mr. Osborne added that the College will continue to use seniority in the state system as the basis for parking reassignment. In addition, because of lost revenue from the K-Lot and other sites, and because state law requires that auxiliary services be self-supporting, the College must increase parking fees.

Mr. Osborne stated that faculty and staff will continue to be given priority over students in parking matters. The new CARTA Express program might help ease parking problems. Also, the College will start offering block passes in the fall that allow faculty and staff to park in the

St. Philip or Wentworth garages for half price. These passes will have no expiration date. The College will continue to offer evening and weekend permits, which will cost 80 dollars per year.

Another problem is that numerous students use the K-Lot after hours, especially to go to the library. There will be a new lot behind Addlestone, open to anyone who has a permit on evenings and weekends. The St. Philip Street garage is another option for students coming after hours. A privately owned garage that is part of the George Street project will come on line in the fall as well. College officials have been discussing with the owners the possibility of College permitting for this garage. In addition, there will be 600 spaces in the aquarium garage in the fall, which has shuttle service with CARTA. The College has a contract with the city to use those spaces until 2012, when we expect to lose them because of the city's plan to develop that property. Mr. Osborne said the College is aggressively seeking to find new parking to replace these spots.

The floor was then opened to questions. Chip Voorneveld (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) asked what the College was doing about compliance with the Federal Disabilities Act. Students with disabilities have been told they have to arrive at 6 am for an 8 am class in order to find parking. Mr. Voorneveld asked what accommodations were being made to better comply with the spirit as well as the letter of the law. Mr. Osborne replied that he was unaware of the particular situation Mr. Voorneveld described. He said his office would review the number of spots the College has designated for disabled people. Janice Wright (Hispanic Studies) spoke next, pointing out that she is handicapped and has to arrive at 6:15 to find a place to park on St. Philip Street. She said that she thinks the office of auxiliary services is just ignoring the problem of handicapped parking. Bob Mignone stepped in at this point and offered to help set up a meeting with relevant people to discuss this issue further.

Idee Winfield (Sociology and Anthropology) then asked whether the College could consider some kind of payroll deduction plan for block passes. Mr. Osborne said he would investigate the possibility. Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) asked whether there were plans being made to boost the shuttle service to the aquarium garage, particularly in the evening. Jan Brewton (Auxiliary Services) responded that her office would look into it. Norris Preyer (Physics and Astronomy) pointed out that MUSC has surface lots away from campus, which they run frequent shuttles to. He wondered if that would be a possibility at the College. Mr. Osborne replied that his office has been considering a similar arrangement, possibly by using parking around Riley Stadium. Jaap Hillenius (Biology) asked whether any methods to enhance carpooling were being considered. Mr. Osborne replied that his office has been discussing such a possibility. They plan to hold focus groups on parking for the long-term. However, the College has no specific cost break for carpooling right now. Larry Krasnoff (Philosophy) then pointed out that the City of Charleston has a plan to retrofit the West Ashley bridge to build a bicycle lane. He wondered what the College and MUSC have planned in regard to bicycle travel. Mike Gomez (Hispanic Studies) asked whether the aquarium parking garage would continue to be a safe bet for faculty members, or whether there was a possibility that it would be full when someone requested it. Jan Brewton replied that she would assign any faculty member who wants to park in the aquarium to be in the aquarium, pointing out that students are willing to pay for closer garages. Terry Bowers (English) urged Mr. Osborne to find arrangements for students to park near the library, pointing out that it's essential students be able to get there in the evenings. Tom Ross (Psychology) asked whether there would be any parking at the new science center when it's complete. Provost Jorgens replied that plans for the science center are already slightly over its

maximum allowed fifty-foot height. We can't afford to give up space to build parking over it. In addition, the city Board of Architectural Review required a certain amount of green space around the building. Thus, there will be no parking at the science center when it is complete.

The Speaker

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone reminded Senators of the special meeting of the Senate, to discuss General Education proposals, on March 13, at 5:00 in Beatty Center 115. He then thanked all faculty and staff who participated in the MLK Challenge, including John Peters (Biology), Lisa Thomson Ross (Psychology), Cal Morrison (Alum/Chas Youth Leadership Council), Gabriel Magwood (Chas Youth Leadership Council), Merissa Ferrara (Communication), Justin Benefield (Finance), Dinesh Sarvate (Math), Tracey Hughes (Service Learning), Scott Peebles (English), Jocelyn Evans (Economics), Lauren Scott (Admissions), Rhonda Swickert (Psychology), Alex Kasman (Math), Bruce Fleming (HSS/LCWA), Mike Duvall (English), Fouchina Kirkendoll (Youth Build Charter School), Allura Henderson (Development), Marcia Snyder (Econ/Finance), Lil Maughan (English), Kristen Wing (CofC Bookstore), Bethany Laplante (Student Life), Carolyn Morales (Diversity), Ned Hartley (Art History), Catherine Veninga (Political Science), Andrew Lewis (Education), Garrett Mitchener (Math), and Alexa Thacker (President's Office).

Mr. Mignone also congratulated Joe Kelly on his election as new Speaker of the Faculty and Terry Bowers as Faculty Secretary. He thanked Larry Krasnoff and Robin Bowers for being willing to serve as Speaker and for running for the office. Finally, Mr. Mignone congratulated the nine newly elected at-large senators.

New Business

Academic Standards Committee—Resolution About Showing Films in Class

The Speaker recognized Larry Krasnoff, Chair of the Academic Standards Committee, who introduced the following resolution:

Motion: So that students receive the full 150 minutes of classroom instruction per week, the regular screening of feature-length films (approximately 70 minutes or more) for classes should be scheduled outside regularly scheduled class hours. The Registrar's Office will work with instructors in these classes to arrange extra hours for film screenings when courses are first scheduled.

Rationale: In courses where film is the primary focus, required films are treated as texts. The teaching methodology of such courses must take into account that, as texts, required films should be viewed outside of the regularly scheduled 150 minutes, which are reserved for lecture and/or discussion. The planning for a course in which film is the primary focus should parallel that typical in other disciplines for which students are expected to be familiar with course readings in advance. The Registrar's Office is willing to work with professors in affected courses to schedule times for outside screenings.

The floor was opened to discussion. Idee Winfield (Sociology/Anthropology) said that students often feel that attending scheduled events outside of classroom time is beyond the bounds of

what they have to do. She would like to see classes that schedule out-of-class time for films carry some kind of special designation so that students would know what the course entailed when they signed up. Cathy Boyd, College Registrar, said such sections would show up on Cougar Trail as an extra meeting of the class.

Susan Kattwinkel (Theatre) said that her theatre colleagues strongly disliked the motion. They argue that it is a fundamental misunderstanding of the nature of film that you can view film independently. The department also offers a screenwriting class that shows many films in class which students discuss as they are viewing them. In general, it would be problematic to schedule extra time for theater classes since many of them already meet double-time as it is. Joy Vandervort-Cobb (Theatre) added that she shows two films in her African American theater class each semester. They're not films her students are prepared to see alone; reaction from peers is important. Because of evening rehearsals, she simply doesn't have time to take her entire class to another place and view the films. Larry Krasnoff replied that the premise of the resolution is not to make students watch films alone (by checking out DVDs from the library, for instance). In addition, the resolution does not necessarily refer to a class in which only two films are viewed. "Regular screening" might not apply to this situation.

Chris Boucher (History) asked about Maymester classes, pointing out that it would be extremely difficult to expect students to watch films outside of class along with the reading that is expected of them and the papers they must write in the limited time they have during this very short semester.

Hugh Wilder (Philosophy) said that he was sympathetic to the motion as it applies to many film courses that exist at the college. He understands that the standard model for film studies is to conduct regular showings outside of class and to hold discussion in class, but he worried that one size might not fill all in this respect. Mr. Wilder added that, while this may be a very good motion for film studies-style courses, the showing of films in other types of courses might better be handled by department chairs, who can be sensitive to the sort of problems that have been pointed out in this conversation. John Bruns, Director of the Film Studies Minor, argued that it is important that the same guidelines applied to film studies courses should apply to courses where the object of study is not film itself.

Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) argued that the value of the resolution lies in the fact that it provides a mechanism for scheduling screenings outside of regular class time. This is a good thing that is available if a professor wants to use it. But Mr. Boetje added that the resolution itself is too prescriptive. Richard Nunan (Philosophy) spoke along the same lines, pointing out that he has taught a philosophy and film class, and that he sees a "hortatory quality" about the resolution that is a good thing. It provides a guideline that we should aspire to in ideal circumstances. But he suggested adding the word "normally" to the motion as a friendly amendment. (The first sentence would then read: "So that students receive the full 150 minutes of classroom instruction per week, the regular screening of feature-length films [approximately 70 minutes or more] for classes should **normally** be scheduled outside regularly scheduled class hours.") Mr. Krasnoff accepted Mr. Nunan's suggestion as a friendly amendment.

Next, several Senators, including Susan Kattwinkel, David Maves (Music), Meg Cormack (Religious Studies), Darryl Phillips (Classics), Mick Norton (Math), and Jaap Hillenius

(Biology) spoke against the need for such a resolution, arguing variously that it violates academic freedom, that a professor's common sense and training in his or her discipline should be trusted, and that there are other mechanisms in place, such as annual evaluations and the college-wide curriculum committee, to check irresponsible teaching. Mr. Krasnoff replied that the curriculum committee vets course content when it approves new courses, but has no input about *when* the viewing of films would actually take place. He added that he's not sure department chairs are considering such issues in annual evaluations.

The discussion then turned back to the film studies minor in particular. Scott Peeples (English) asked Mr. Bruns if he were concerned that the practice of showing films in class compromises the film studies minor because he is forced to include courses that are taught in ways that film studies people believe is illegitimate. Mr. Bruns replied that he believed showing films in class undermined the entire undergraduate curriculum. Hugh Wilder asked about the process whereby new courses are approved for the minor. Mr. Bruns replied that only one person has approached him about adding a course to the minor; he rejected it on precisely these terms. Mr. Wilder then suggested the possibility that the minor institute a requirement that courses approved for film studies follow this recommendation (rather than the resolution being applied to all classes in general).

Carol Toris (Psychology) then called the question. The motion to call the question was seconded by Calvin Blackwell (Economics/Finance). The Senate voted in favor of calling the question.

A voice vote was then taken, and the motion failed.

Faculty Welfare Committee—Resolution Concerning Fall Break

Steve Jaume, Chair of the Faculty Welfare Committee introduced the following resolution concerning fall break:

Whereas, during the 2006-07 calendar year the College has returned to having a November fall break in conjunction with Election Day; and

Whereas, students and faculty are in need of a time of rest and regeneration prior to this time; and

Whereas, the Thanksgiving break is just two weeks after fall break when taken in conjunction with Election Day; and

Whereas, Election Day is an optional state holiday and faculty, staff and students can exercise their right to vote within the allotted polling times or by making use of absentee voting,

Therefore, be it resolved that the Faculty of the College of Charleston urge that a return be made to scheduling fall break every year during the month of October and that Election Day not be taken as a holiday.

The floor was opened to discussion. Mary Beth Heston (Art History) spoke in favor of the motion, reminding faculty members about the opportunity for absentee voting. Mr. Jaume added that his committee investigated whether students need election day off to return home to vote.

Their research, however, showed that students tended not to go home on election day. Since Thanksgiving is so close, they wait to go home until then.

Discussion ended, and the motion passed on a voice vote.

Academic Planning Committee—Recommendation on Online Course Delivery

Chris Hope, Chair of the Academic Planning Committee, introduced the following recommendation about online course delivery:

Whereas online courses for undergraduates fail to fulfill the self-proclaimed mission of the College of Charleston to be a traditional Liberal Arts and Sciences college emphasizing a close relationship between faculty and students fostered through one-on-one interaction and group learning experiences, and

Whereas online courses fail to provide for education of the whole student promoted by the College of Charleston by limiting the creativity, spontaneity, shared understanding, use of all the senses, and face-to-face contact with class members from diverse backgrounds that live meetings can produce, and

Whereas online courses fail to provide the human connection and on campus experience necessary to develop a personal relationship between the school and the student critical to the college's goal of improving student retention and

Whereas online courses fail to develop interpersonal, oral, and group communication skills in students specified by the College of Charleston general education guidelines and

Whereas online courses make it more difficult to ensure that student work was actually done by the student submitting the work, thus undermining the high personal integrity standards the College of Charleston holds students to, and

Whereas the College would need to make a considerable budgetary investment to guarantee the necessary technology support for online coursework and

Whereas online coursework requires considerable faculty investment in terms of preparation and delivery and, once invested, individual faculty and departments might feel compelled to further expand such offerings and

Whereas online courses increase the commodification of knowledge, the corporatization of higher education, and the deprofessionalization of the faculty

The Academic Planning Committee recommends against instituting online courses for undergraduates at the College of Charleston. While we recognize there are certain problems that such courses might help alleviate, we believe that online course delivery significantly compromises the mission of the undergraduate program and should thus be avoided.

Because the mission of the Graduate School differs from that of the undergraduate program, graduate online courses may be appropriate under special circumstances.

The floor was opened to discussion. Mike Gomez (Hispanic Studies) asked about the definition of online courses. Ms. Hope replied that her committee defined these as courses in which what would normally take place in a class happens online. This recommendation is not intended to speak to supplemental material course material being provided online.

Provost Jorgens, stating that she doesn't usually speak to motions on the Senate floor, and doesn't like to do so, nevertheless urged Senators not to support the recommendation. While she is not an advocate of online course delivery, she believes the resolution is not a good idea at this point, partly because there is already an existing committee (chaired by Deb Vaughn) on alternative course delivery methods. This is not a Senate committee, but it does have mostly faculty members on it. She is troubled that this committee seems to have been by-passed. In addition, Ms. Jorgens argued that the proposal is too broad, that it is too definitive in that it says that online course delivery is never acceptable for any one of us. Finally, she urged holding off on such a motion until our new president, Mr. Benson, has had adequate time to learn the college and to be able to make an informed decision about the resolution.

Mike Gomez added that the recommendation makes assumptions about what can and cannot happen in online courses, that it is a "one-size fits all" kind of statement. He believes we need to be more open-minded in developing curriculum. Jerry Boetje (Computer Science) said that online courses have been around for ten years. The market is only now finding out what kind of courses work online and what don't. He argued that a blanket refusal of online courses at this time would cut course development off before we have solid answers about what works. In addition, the Legislature is about to give out money for developing online courses. Therefore, it would be foolish of us to pass this recommendation at this point. Finally, he argued the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools currently defines an "online course" as a course which offers at least 50% of its content online.

Chip Voorneveld (Foundations, Secondary, and Special Education) then said that approximately 60% of his students have already taken online courses in high school. He argued that some types of courses are appropriate for online delivery, while other courses, particularly "process courses" are not. Jerry Boetje added that students are very comfortable doing a lot of things online that people his age aren't comfortable doing. It sends a bad message to tell them we'll never develop online courses.

Darryl Phillips (Classics) pointed out that the College does accept transfer credit of on-line courses, so we'd need to be consistent. Brian McGee (Communication) added that it is impossible to tell, from transfer credit evaluations, whether a course has been taught online or not, so "the genie is already out of the bottle." He thought the resolution was too restrictive, and he pointed out that it doesn't deal with many distance education courses that have been taught for years, but that are not online courses.

Idee Winfield (Sociology/Anthropology) spoke in favor of the motion, pointing out worries about a two-tiered education system in which some students will get classroom experience and some won't. As a public liberal arts college, we want to be part of the tier that is not the technical school, job-training model of education. Skip Godow (Dean of the North Campus) disagreed, arguing that there is much literature to show that a variety of courses can foster interaction among students. While he agrees with Ms. Winfield's stated model of a liberal arts institution, he thinks this motion is overly restrictive. Sylvia Gamboa (Dean of Summer School) added that, in a survey concerning summer school, 40% of our students said they'd be very interested in taking an online course in the summer and 23% would be somewhat interested.

Scott Peoples (English) then spoke in favor of the recommendation. He asked whether anyone

could think of an example of a course in which the professor and students never gather in the same space that would be consistent with the College's mission. He has difficulty in doing this. Several people, including the Provost and Deanna Caveny (Math) responded, providing examples of professors who happened to be out of the country, high school teachers who work during the day and cannot attend upper-division classes offered only once a year or so, and students who may wish to work cooperatively with students in other countries. Ms. Hope replied that her committee anticipated there might be exceptions like those mentioned, and they didn't want to preclude them. Mr. Peeples added that the committee's intent was that the College shouldn't be actively pursuing online courses, shouldn't be "scheming about how to make money on them." But there might be small exceptions. Mr. Boetje argued that everyone is on the same page about what we want the College to look like, that there would be a rebellion if the president said we need to do lots of online courses, but he believes the best this recommendation could do for us is nothing and that it might in fact have a negative impact.

Erin Beutel called the question. Her motion was seconded by Joy Vandervort-Cobb. The Senate approved called the question.

A vote was then taken, and the motion failed on a show of hands.

Committee on Nominations and Elections—Proposed Amendment to the FAM

Michael Phillips, Chair of the Committee on Nominations and Elections, introduced the following proposed amendment to the Faculty/Administration Manual:

On page 38 of the current FAM under Section 3. Standing College Committees, add a phrase and a second sentence such that letter A now reads the following: Members of standing College committees are nominated by March 15 by the Committee on Nominations and Elections and are elected by members of the faculty (as defined in Article I Section1) at the April faculty meeting, *with the exception of the Committee on Nominations and Elections and any contested Standing committees. These slates will be presented at the spring faculty meeting for an electronic election which will begin the day after this meeting and conclude on the Friday of that week.*

Rationale:

There is currently no prescribed method in the FAM for holding elections of contested committees. It is expected that participation in the election of contested committees and the election of the Nominations Committee will increase if these elections are held electronically over a period of days rather than at a single meeting of the faculty.

This amendment will go to the Faculty By-laws Committee for consideration. The By-Laws Committee will make a report at the next Senate meeting, and the proposed amendment will be voted on at that time.

Curriculum Committee

The Senate considered the entire slate of curriculum proposals as one package. In discussion, Richard Nunan (At-Large, Philosophy), pointed out that the document proposing to add FINC 375: Principles of Real Estate to the list of approved electives for the major in Hospitality and Tourism Management was missing in the online Senate documents. The Secretary confirmed

that Gerry Gonsalves, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, had indeed sent her the proposal, so the error was hers, not his. The Senate went ahead with a vote on the bundle of proposals in any case.

All curriculum proposals passed. (Please see Appendix 1 for a complete list of the proposals.)

Graduate Curriculum Committee

All of the proposals brought by the Graduate Education Committee passed without discussion. (Please see Appendix 2 for a complete list of these proposals.)

With no further business, the Senate adjourned at 7:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary

Appendix 1.

**College of Charleston
Faculty Curriculum Committee
Proposals for February 27, 2007 Senate Meeting**

A. Hospitality and Tourism Management (HTMT)

Proposal to Change Requirements for Major – HTMT

- Add FINC 375: Principles of Real Estate to the list of approved electives

B. Religious Studies

Proposal to Change a Course—RELS 110: Approaches to Religion

- Change Course Number to RELS 101

Proposal to Change Requirements for Minor—Religious Studies

C. Management and Entrepreneurship (M&E)

New Course Proposal—ENTR 320: Principles of Entrepreneurship

New Course Proposal—ENTR 321: New Venture Planning

Proposal to Change a Course—MGMT 405: Small Business Management

- Change “MGMT” to “ENTR” and add prerequisite, ENTR 320: Principles of Entrepreneurship

D. Management and Entrepreneurship (M&E)

Proposal to Change Requirements for Concentration—Leadership, Change etc.

- Changes to correct mistake. Incorrect version (see ref. last 5 pages) approved by Senate in February 2006.

Appendix 2.

College of Charleston Committee on Graduate Education, Continuing Education, and Special Programs Proposals for February 27, 2007 Senate Meeting

A. Science and Math for Teachers

Proposal to Change a Course—SMFT 647, Spectroscopy: The Interaction of Light and Matter

B. M.S. in Accountancy

1. Graduate Program Change proposal

2. New courses proposals

ACCT 510 – Internal Audit and Forensic Accounting

ACCT 551 – Corporate Transactional Data Management

ACCT 552 – Quantitative Analysis for Accountants

ACCT 553 – Advanced Corporate Transactional Data Management

ACCT 554 – Advanced Quantitative Analysis for Accountants

3. Course Change proposals

ACCT 500 – Theory and Financial Reporting (title change)

ACCT 509 – Professional Auditing Concepts (title and course description change)

ACCT 513 – Current Issues in Accounting (title and course description change)

ACCT 545 – Taxation of Estate/Gift Transfers & Deferred Compensation (title and course description change)