CALL TO ORDER

Following the Board roll call, Chairman McHugh called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., declaring a quorum present.

* Participation via teleconference
ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Chairman McHugh requested a motion to adopt the agenda as presented. Vice Chairman Krapek moved, seconded by Trustee Balducci to add a Resolution Awarding the title of Chairman Emeritus to Lawrence D. McHugh to the Executive Committee Section of the Agenda. Following distribution of the subject resolution, Trustee Pugliese moved to adopt the agenda as revised; with a second by Trustee Doyle; the agenda as revised was adopted.

OATH OF OFFICE – NEW STUDENT TRUSTEE

Chairman McHugh administered the oath of office to Alex Rodriguez, the new student trustee elected by the students from Central Connecticut State University, and welcomed him to the Board. Trustee Rodriguez indicated he was honored and humbled to be serving on the Board of Trustees and hoped to successfully bring the students’ perspective to the Board’s deliberations.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman McHugh requested a motion to accept the Minutes of the June 11, 2009 Regular Session meeting; Trustee Balducci moved; Trustee John Sholtis seconded; motion unanimously passed.

CHANCELLOR’S REPORT

Chancellor Carter noted he would keep his remarks brief due to the significance of the meeting, that being the final meeting over which Chairman McHugh would preside.

Chancellor Carter indicated the presidents would be providing their assessment reports in compliance with the Board’s 2005 resolution, mandating annual reports on university enhancements to education opportunities.

PRESIDENTS REPORTS

The university presidents each provided to trustees an overview of the executive summary of their assessment reports (refer to Attachment A, which is hereby incorporated and made a part of these minutes).
AUDIT SUBCOMMITTEE

Trustee Messina reported that the Audit Subcommittee met on July 17th with PricewaterhouseCoopers, the independent auditors for the CSU System, on the status of an Information Security Diagnostic Review taking place at Southern Connecticut State University. This work was initiated to address certain IT security concerns at Southern and the results of the review will be presented to the Audit Committee later in the current calendar year.

Trustee Messina also noted that PwC provided an update on their interim field work for the FY2009 Financial Audit. PwC reported that all findings from fiscal 2008 appear to be satisfied, subject to further testing at year-end. Preliminary testing revealed no matters of significance, although the audit will not be finished until year-end testing is complete. The IT reviews at the three other universities are also progressing, and in general PwC expressed satisfaction regarding the areas they have reviewed to date.

The Committee also reviewed the Internal Audit plan for FY2010 presented by Mitch Knight, the System’s Internal Auditor. The Audit Plan concentrates on a number of risk factors and selects those areas for audit that are deemed to be higher risk. After review, the Audit Committee approved the FY 2010 Internal Audit Plan.

Following Subcommittee Chairman Messina’s report, Chairman McHugh congratulated Trustee Messina and the members of the Subcommittee for their efforts and noted that he believed the formation of the Audit & Risk Management Committee will continue the excellent work that the Subcommittee started.

FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Trustee Krapek reported that the Finance and Administration Committee met on Friday, July 17, and had one action item to bring before the Board: a Resolution concerning the Postponement of Retroactive Funding to Central Connecticut State University.

Trustee Krapek noted that in November of 2006, the Board of Trustees approved a plan to retroactively reimburse Central, Eastern, and Southern for funding lost during FYs 1996-2000 as a result of the phase-in of a funding distribution model in use during that time (BR #06-80). The funding to be reimbursed amounted to approximately $3.27 million for Central, approximately $4.27 million for Eastern, and almost $420,000 for Southern. Retroactive reimbursement to both Eastern and Southern has now been completed in full. Retroactive reimbursement to Central is due to begin in FY2011 and continue until FY2015.
Trustee Krapek went on to note that there has been a major decline in the fiscal circumstances of the State, due to the severe recession being experienced worldwide. The Governor and the Legislature are currently working to put together a balanced budget for the FY 09-11, in the face of a projected deficit of over $8 billion. While it is unclear what the level of funding will be for CSUS at the end of this process, it is clear that the coming biennium will be difficult. Trustee Krapek stated that, thanks to the Chancellor and the University Presidents, CSUS had already taken major steps to constrain hiring and spending over the past year, and would continue to do so.

Trustee Krapek indicated that while it was the Board’s intention to complete this retroactive reimbursement when economic circumstances permit, given this uncertain environment, and the importance of conserving our funds to order to be able to ensure every university’s fiscal health during the upcoming biennium and beyond, the action before the Board delays the retroactive reimbursement to Central until such time as the Board of Trustees determines it should be reinstated.

Trustee Krapek moved the resolution; Trustee Pugliese seconded and the resolution below concerning Postponement of Retroactive Funding to Central Connecticut State University was unanimously approved.

WHEREAS, In November of 2006 the Board of Trustees approved via BR #06-80 a plan to reimburse Central, Eastern, and Southern Connecticut State Universities for the funding it would have received had distribution methodologies that were phased in from FYs 1996 to 2000 been implemented immediately, and

WHEREAS, Retroactive reimbursement to both Eastern and Southern have been completed in full, and

WHEREAS, Retroactive reimbursement to Central is due to begin in FY2011 and continue until FY2015, and

WHEREAS, Since the passage of the retroactive reimbursement plan there has been a major economic downturn, adversely affecting the fiscal circumstances of the State and CSUS, and

WHEREAS, It is the intention of the Board of Trustees to provide the retroactive reimbursement to Central when economic circumstances permit, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the retroactive reimbursement to Central is delayed until such time as the Board of Trustees determines it should be reinstated.
Trustee Krapek added that the action item regarding the General Fund Distribution Methodology was moved to a discussion item, and a full discussion of the concept took place within committee. It is expected that the item would be brought forward for action at the next regularly scheduled committee meeting. In addition, the action item concerning an amendment to the SCSU 2004 Master Plan was tabled. The Committee also reviewed the write-off of uncollectible accounts for FY2009, received the monthly CSUS 2020 Project Status report, heard a report on the final claim settlement regarding construction of the Adanti Student Center at SCSU, and was provided with a description of new security procedures that will be taking place at the System Office.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Chairman reported that the Executive Committee met on July 17th and had two action items to bring before the Board.

Revision to Board Bylaws. Chairman McHugh noted that the Board’s existing Bylaws call for the following “Standing Committees of the Board: Academic Affairs, Development, Finance and Administration, and Student Life.” There also exists an Audit Subcommittee of the Executive Committee.

Because of the extreme importance of the function which it performs, it has been determined that the Audit Subcommittee of the Executive Committee should be recognized as a Standing Committee of the Board of Trustees.

The Chairman further noted that it is recognized that it is the responsibility of the Board to ensure that there are procedures in place to safeguard CSUS assets and identify, evaluate, prevent and or protect against a wide range of risks that may threaten the System's mission and institutional goals. It is therefore recommended that in migrating from a subcommittee to a full standing committee, the Committee shall be known as the Audit & Risk Management Committee of the Board of Trustees.

In addition to the previously identified responsibilities held by the Audit Subcommittee, the Audit & Risk Management Committee responsibilities will also include identifying and evaluating risk exposures and implementing loss prevention measures by the System from a policy perspective, and making recommendations to the Board directing the Chancellor with regard to the enhancement of risk management. The Chairman requested a motion to approve and adopt the revised Bylaws of the Board of Trustees as noted within the proposed
resolution below. Trustee Balducci so moved; seconded by Trustee Rosa, and the following resolution was unanimously approved

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees for the Connecticut State University System has enacted bylaws to govern its operation; and

WHEREAS, The existing Bylaws of the Board of Trustees for the Connecticut State University System state that the “Standing Committees of the Board shall be the Academic Affairs Committee, Development Committee, Finance and Administration Committee, and Student Life Committee;” and

WHEREAS, There currently exists an Audit Subcommittee of the Executive Committee of the Board; and

WHEREAS, The Chancellor has recommended and the Executive Committee of the Board concurs that the critical role of the Audit Subcommittee necessitates its functioning as a Standing Committee of the Board; and

WHEREAS, It is recognized that it is the responsibility of the Board of Trustees of the Connecticut State University System ("CSUS") to ensure that there are procedures in place to safeguard CSUS assets and identify, evaluate, prevent and or protect against a wide range of risks that may threaten the System's mission and institutional goals, and.

WHEREAS, The Board of Trustees is aware that the purpose of risk management is to identify, understand, prevent and/or protect against such risks, including, but not limited to, those which may exist in the areas of finance, operations, compliance, and life safety; and

WHEREAS, In migrating from a subcommittee to a full standing committee, the Committee shall henceforth be known as the Audit & Risk Management Committee of the Board of Trustees.

WHEREAS, In addition to the previously identified responsibilities held by the Audit Subcommittee, the Audit & Risk Management Committee responsibilities will also include identifying and evaluating risk exposures and implementing loss prevention measures by the System from a policy perspective, and making recommendations to the Board directing the Chancellor with regard to the enhancement of risk management, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees approves the following revisions to its Bylaws, effective immediately upon passage:

**ARTICLE III. COMMITTEES AND REPRESENTATIVES OF THE BOARD**

**SECTION 1 - EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE**
The Executive Committee shall consist of the Chair of the Board, officers of the Board, the Standing Committee Chairs, and, at the discretion of the Board Chair, two (2) Members-at-Large appointed by the Chair of the Board.

The Executive Committee may transact business on behalf of the Board during the interim between regular meetings of the Board, and any actions taken shall be confirmed by the full Board at its next regularly-scheduled meeting.

SECTION 2 - STANDING COMMITTEES

Standing Committees of the Board shall be the Academic Affairs Committee, Audit & Risk Management Committee, Development Committee, Finance and Administration Committee, and Student Life Committee, and such additional committees as may be authorized by the Board Chair from time to time for purposes of efficient operation.

Resolution on the Policy for the Establishment of Endowed Chairs  Chairman McHugh stated that the proposed policy contained two revisions to the existing policy: #1) requiring that a national search be conducted when filling an endowed chair; and #2) the stipulation that an individual may not simultaneously hold an endowed chair and the title of CSU Professor. Request a motion approving the policy for the Establishment of Endowed Chairs. The Chairman requested a motion to approve and adopt the revised Policy for the Establishment of Endowed Chairs as noted within the proposed resolution below. Trustee Doyle so moved; seconded by Trustee Sholtis, and the following resolution was unanimously approved

WHEREAS, Under the provisions of Section 10a-20a of the Connecticut General Statutes, the Board of Governors for Higher Education may establish and administer an Endowed Chair Investment Fund, and

WHEREAS, Section 10a-20a also provides that the Board of Trustees for the Connecticut State University System may submit a grant application, shall select candidates to fill the endowed chair, shall develop a budget for expenditures associated with the endowed chair, and shall submit annual reports to the Board of Governors concerning endowed chair expenditures, and

WHEREAS, Establishment of an endowed chair expresses a major programmatic commitment and fund-raising effort by the University; enhances the stature and visibility of the University and the CSU system; and provides benefits to the entire University community and the State of Connecticut by creating a mechanism to engage a distinguished individual in a prestigious, nationally recognized role, now, therefore, be it
RESOLVED, The Board of Trustees adopts the following requirements for the establishment of endowed chairs in the Connecticut State University System:

Submission of Grant Application for Matching Funds

Applications for establishment of endowed chairs are accepted by the Board of Governors on October first and April first in each year funds are available, indicating that matching nonstate contributions in the amount of at least $500,000 to support an endowed chair in a specific academic discipline have been raised. The proposed endowed chair must be established in a center of excellence as defined in Section 10a-25h, subsection b of the general statutes.

Applications for submission to the Board of Governors on April 1 must be received by the Board of Trustees, Academic Affairs Committee for review in its January meeting; applications for submission on October 1 must be received for review in July.

Selection of Candidates

The selection and appointment of the person occupying an endowed chair shall be made in accordance with University personnel policies, Affirmative Action objectives, and the terms of the CSU-AAUP contract. Appointment to the endowed chair may be for a fixed term, for up to two years, to secure a person with extraordinary expertise for a short duration; by regular, tenure track appointment; or by permanent assignments with tenure granted as a condition of appointment. A national search must be conducted to fill an endowed chair position. The candidate may not simultaneously hold the title of CSU Professor. The President of the university shall submit the name of the appointee, along with details of the term and type of appointment and evidence of appropriate credentials, to the CSUS Chancellor. The CSUS Chancellor, following review and subject to concurrence therewith, shall submit the recommendation to the Board of Trustees University System Board of Trustees for approval.

Endowed Chair Budget

A proposed budget for expenditures associated with the endowed chair shall be submitted at the time the appointment recommendation is made to the Board of Trustees.

Annual Reports

Annual reports on the endowed chair, including the previous year’s fiscal report and budget projections for the coming year shall be submitted annually to the Board of Trustees in October for transmittal to the Board of Governors.

and be it further,

RESOLVED, That an endowed chair established by a university with non-matching funds shall follow the same procedures with the exception of the portion pertaining to the
submission of a grant application and transmittal of an annual report to the Board of Governors.

And be it further,

RESOLVED, That this resolution rescinds BR#99-46.

Chairman McHugh reported that while not an action item for the Board’s consideration, he wished to share that the Committee accepted Chancellor Carter’s 08-09 Annual Report and approved the Chancellor’s evaluation for the same period. The committee also received and approved the Chancellor’s Letter of Priority for 2009-2010, a copy of which was placed within Board members’ folders. Chairman McHugh noted that the Chancellor’s performance was excellent, and that he appreciated the input received from members of the Executive Committee. He commended the Chancellor for the staff he has assembled noting the level of professional was second to none.

The Executive Committee also received an update from the Chancellor following up with Board Resolution 09-18, calling for a 10% reduction in management and confidential staff by July 1, 2010, and detailing compliance therewith.

Note: Chairman McHugh’s wife, Patricia McHugh, granddaughter, Chelsea, and assistant, Joan Wood, joined the meeting.

Resolution Awarding the Title of Chairman Emeritus to Lawrence D. McHugh

The Vice Chairman requested a motion to approve the proposed resolution below. Trustee Pugliese so moved; seconded by Trustee Messina, and the following resolution was unanimously approved

Whereas, Lawrence D. McHugh has served on the Board of Trustees for the Connecticut State University System selflessly, honorably and with distinction from 1983 through 2009, and

Whereas, Lawrence D. McHugh was named Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the Connecticut State University System in 1995 after being appointed to the board in 1983 by Governor William O’Neill, and reappointed by Governor Lowell Weicker, Governor John Rowland and Governor M. Jodi Rell, and

Whereas, On July 16, 2009, Chairman McHugh was appointed by Governor M. Jodi Rell to serve as Chairman of the Board of Trustees for the University of Connecticut, effective July 24, 2009, and
Whereas, Chairman McHugh’s unparalleled involvement and skillful leadership has defined Connecticut’s largest public university system for a quarter century, spurring its transformation, growth, development, and earning him the esteem of colleagues and the respect and admiration of individuals across Connecticut and beyond, and

Whereas, Chairman McHugh’s unwavering and uncompromising devotion to students, faculty and staff has contributed significantly to the advancement of academic offerings, increased enrollment and the upgrade of facilities and infrastructure; now therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Trustees for the Connecticut State University System extends its deepest appreciation, heartfelt thanks and best wishes to Chairman McHugh at this time and for years to come; and be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Trustees for the Connecticut State University System hereby confers upon Lawrence D. McHugh the title, Chairman Emeritus of the Board of Trustees for the Connecticut State University System, with all the privileges pertaining thereto, effective July 24, 2009.

Following presentation of the framed resolution, Trustee Doyle offered remarks, which he directed be included in the meeting minutes:

Looking around this room today, there is only one Trustee remaining from that day 16 years ago when I first joined the Board. That Trustee is Larry McHugh, who already had 10 years of services before I arrived.

If Board seniority were a horse race, I’d be running 10 lengths behind.

Larry and I have a few other things in common besides being Trustees. We are both CSU graduates. We both were teachers early in our careers and we both taught in Middletown. We both have the same color hair and we both are descendents of a race of people renowned for their amicable spirit and aversion to argument.

But you, Larry, have been our Chairman--our leader. In your time as Chair you have organized our efforts and focused our direction. But you did much more than simply make the trains run on time. You were driven by a fierce determination that this University System was to excel in its mission of providing accessible higher education to Connecticut residents. And by excel, you clearly stated that you meant, “Second to No One”.

To paraphrase those immortal words published on an Easter Sunday morning in 1916: “Connecticut State University through you has summoned her children to her flag”.

We have heard your summons, Mr. Chairman, and the best way to honor the leadership you have given us is for that summons to continue to ring in our ears as we carry on your work here at CSU.

You can expect, I assure you, that your leadership will continue to live here at your university system.
Trustee Pugliese then presented a plaque commemorating the Chairman’s years of service to the Board, noting that the Chairman often refers to himself as “the old Coach” and while that was a true descriptor, Trustee Pugliese felt that “mentor” was more accurate. Every trustee on the Board has had the benefit of receiving Chairman McHugh’s committed mentoring. He indicated he knew every Trustee present, as well as the Chancellor, Presidents, and staff, all were appreciative of the Chairman’s tireless efforts and respected him a great deal.

Trustees Messina and Balducci presented the Chairman with an academic chair affixed with the seal of the Connecticut State University System, with Trustee Messina thanking the Chairman for his service to the Board. Trustee Balducci noted that he has known the Chairman longer than anyone, going back to their college days. He stated that the Chairman was a tremendous competitor and fought constantly for the interests of the Connecticut State University System.

Chancellor Carter, on behalf of the presidents, Board, faculty and staff and, most importantly, the students, thanked the Chairman for his mentorship, his leadership, his counsel, his friendship and his never-ending source of energy. He noted that he first met the Chairman when arriving as President of ECSU. The Chancellor thanked Mrs. McHugh and grand-daughter Chelsea for their selflessness in sharing the Chairman with the System. He concluded by remarking that although he was leaving physically, his spirit and the legacy the Chairman has left behind would touch generations that are yet to be born.

Vice chairman Krapek announced the establishment of the Lawrence and Patricia McHugh Foundation Scholarship and presented the Chairman with his old gavel to take with him when he begins his service at the University of Connecticut. Vice chairman Krapek remarked that Chairman McHugh was courageous, sensitive, bold, caring, loving, patriotic, fearless, and a tireless visionary; a loyal friend who is both mentally and physically tough; inspiring and passionate.

CHAIRMAN’S REPORT

Chairman McHugh presented incoming Chairman Krapek with a gavel for his use at future Board meetings. The Chairman accepted the tributes paid to him indicating that he was honored the Governor asked him to take on the Chairmanship of the Board of Trustees for the University of Connecticut. He added that he would not have been able to consider accepting the position, were he not absolutely convinced and assured of the strength of the leadership team, in the system office, the universities and within the Board. He remarked that he was extremely
proud of the advances the System has made, not only in academics and facilities, but in the efforts to increase diversity within the faculty, staff and student body. He commended the university presidents, both those present and those in the past, as well as the current and past members of the Board. He indicated that Chancellor Carter has been an unbelievable friend and a wonderful leader, and someone whom he considers a brother. He reiterated his appreciation for the day’s tributes and indicated that the CSUS Board will be a part of him forever.

Chairman McHugh announced that the next regularly scheduled meeting of the full Board was scheduled for 10:00 a.m. on Thursday, October 8, 2009 at Eastern Connecticut State University in Willimantic.

Trustee Pugliese moved to adjourn; Trustee Sholtis seconded the motion and the meeting was adjourned at 10:02 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Theresa J. Eberhard-Asch, Secretary
INSTITUTIONAL LEVEL ASSESSMENT

- Academic Assessment Policy
  A formal policy for academic assessment was approved by the Faculty Senate in April 2008, which establishes faculty responsibility for determining and assessing student learning; an annual reporting cycle, including how results are used for improvement; and peer review of assessment activities by an elected Academic Assessment Committee.

- Responses to New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC)
  The NEASC Commission on Higher Education reaffirmed CCSU’s regional accreditation on April 7, 2009. NEASC found the University to be “substantially in compliance with the Standards for Accreditation.” The Commission requested follow-up reports on development of the institution’s systematic and broad-based program of student learning assessment and development of a systematic and periodic review of all academic programs.
  - Since the NEASC site visit in October 2008, the submission rate of degree program assessment reports has increased from 70% to 85%.
  - A draft of a program review process that will include review of student learning outcomes as well as other important metrics has already been approved by the Provost’s Council and will be submitted to the Faculty Senate in fall 2009 for approval.

ASSESSMENT IN DEGREE PROGRAMS

- Feedback from Academic Assessment Committee
  The newly elected Academic Assessment Committee reviewed assessment reports from 74 degree programs and provided formal written feedback to all of them directed at improving learning outcomes, measurement practices, analysis, use of findings and general education assessment.
Quality Indicators for Degree Program Assessment Reports
Baseline quality indicators for reports were established; a majority of reviewers rated principal aspects of these reports as follows:
- Learning outcomes: 65% were developed; 35% were developing
- Findings/measurements: 33% were developed; 42% were developing
- Analysis of findings: 14% were developed; 45% were developing
- Use of results: 16% were developed; 38% were developing
- General education assessment: 23% were developed; 55% were developing

ASSESSMENT ACROSS PROGRAMS
Student learning at the institutional level largely comprises assessment of general education competencies and universal programs, such as the First-Year Experience.

General Education
General education competencies were refined in 2008-09, and two outcomes were added in the areas of social equity and justice and civic responsibility.
- The Collegiate Learning Assessment was administered in 2007-08 and 2008-09 to measure critical thinking, problem solving, analytical reasoning, and writing skills. Results indicate that first-year students and seniors score at expected levels based upon their entering characteristics.
- Results from the National Survey of Student Engagement indicate that CCSU students report levels of intellectual and personal development comparable to students at peer institutions. Critical thinking and use of computing technology are generally rated highest among CCSU students, while contributing the welfare of the community is rated lowest. The University has begun initiatives to increase community engagement in coursework and co-curricular activities.
- Local assessment projects continue to produce results that are used to improve general education competencies.

First-Year Experience
Participation of first-year students increased from 67% in 2007-08 to over 90% in 2008-09. Students who completed a FYE course in 2007-08 reported a greater institutional contribution to their ability to work effectively with others, write clearly and effectively, speak clearly and effectively, and analyze quantitative problems than students who did not take a FYE course.
ASSESSMENT OF EXTRA-AND CO-CURRICULAR ACTIVITIES

- Participation in Extra- and Co-Curricular Activities
  Assessment of extra- and co-curricular activities indicates that students who participate in campus organizations have better perceptions of residence life staff, athletics programs, intramural recreational activities, campus pride, overall satisfaction, use of student activity fees, registration, course availability, and the campus experience.

- Student Satisfaction Inventory
  The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory administered every other year showed that satisfaction was higher in 2008 than in 2006 on 45 out of 55 items; 30 were higher at statistically significant levels. Overall satisfaction was the item most significantly related to retention of full-time first-time students. Among first-time full-time students who were satisfied with their overall experience, the one-year retention rate was 88%, while among those who were dissatisfied with their overall experience, the one-year retention rate was 64%.

- Future Plans
  While all units in Student Affairs have completed a self-assessment based on learning outcomes developed by the Council for Standards in Higher Education (CAS), future plans are to transform current occasional assessment practices into deliberately systematic processes that figure into regular decision making and planning for these programs.
Eastern Connecticut State University

Assessment of Learning for Educational Improvement at Eastern: 2008-2009

Executive Summary

Eastern has implemented assessment at various levels in Academic Year 2008-2009 resulting in a wide range of program modifications aimed at improving student learning, retention, and graduation.

Assessment and the 2008-2013 Strategic Plan

Eastern’s Strategic Plan 2008-2013 relied on extensive data collection and multivariate data analysis from which the strategic plan goals were developed. Of critical importance were “driving forces” that documented internal and environmental challenges and opportunities for change. Extensive analysis of our student population characteristics, national and local trends in population and higher education, peer institution outcomes, and the key variables that predict Eastern’s students’ success drove Eastern’s vision and mission, and the strategic plan goals and strategies.

Assessment of student success goals, especially as related to persistence and timely graduation, became central to the overall goals of the strategic plan and embedded within each of the eighteen strategies for change. Each proposal to implement the strategic plan was required to link its implementation to measures of student success, establish specific outcomes, and design a plan for assessing the efficacy of its approach. The Strategic Plan Implementation Steering Committee (SIPS), which supported the development of the strategic plan proposals through its area chairs, and became the first vetting committee for the proposals, evaluated each proposal and ranked its funding priority based on four critical factors: impact on student success, the quality of the implementation plan, the effectiveness of the assessment plan, and its support for Eastern’s overall vision and mission. Strategic initiatives linked most directly to student learning outcomes include:

- Full Implementation of First Year Program and Liberal Arts Core Initiative
- Global Citizenship Initiative
- Liberal Arts Works Initiative
- Electronic Portfolio Initiative
- Community Engagement Initiative

Project Compass

Eastern received funding from Nellie Mae in 2008 – 2009 (continuing through 2010) to implement and evaluate programs and practices that will promote the success of traditionally underrepresented and underserved students. Project funds were used to identify students at risk of leaving Eastern, provide them with intensive advising, and offer them support services, in particular tutoring through a Math Achievement Center and a Writing Center. Effects of these services on student performance including GPA and retention have been evaluated and are being used to modify program offerings in 2009-2010.

New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC)

In response to NEASC guidelines for reporting of learning outcomes Eastern’s annual report template for academic programs was revised in 2009. The template ensures that information is reported in a format compatible with NEASC forms and standards. See the new form and the instructions below.
Eastern’s revised Academic Department Annual Report Learning Outcomes Template

Major: _________________________________________

Assessment of Student Learning in the Major: 2008 – 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1</th>
<th>Criterion 1:</th>
<th>Criterion 2:</th>
<th>Criterion 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2</td>
<td>Criterion 1:</td>
<td>Criterion 2:</td>
<td>Criterion 3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 3</td>
<td>Criterion 1:</td>
<td>Criterion 2:</td>
<td>Criterion 3:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 4</td>
<td>Criterion 1:</td>
<td>Criterion 2:</td>
<td>Criterion 3:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructions for completing Academic Department Annual Report Template

Departmental Accountability Measures on Student Learning of Majors

Each department at Eastern Connecticut State University will use the following format to provide annual data on student learning and program improvements.

**Student Learning Outcomes:** List the 3–5 core or essential student learning outcomes for majors in your program(s).

**Performance criteria:** List 2-4 criteria for each learning outcome. The criteria must be measurable and must indicate the specific characteristics students should exhibit in order to demonstrate desired achievement.

**Courses or Activities:** List the names of courses or activities where students get the opportunity to demonstrate their performance.

**Assessment Methods:** What assessment methods or tools did you use to measure performance criteria? When did you use it? If a rubric was used, please attach it. It is preferred that the data is based on direct measures such as tests, writing tasks, and portfolios rather than indirect measures such as surveys and observations. Please note if your assessment methods were externally developed (e.g., GRE Major Field Test, Praxis II Content Knowledge Test) and being used by other peer institutions. *Please note that the data on student learning should not be based solely on course grades assigned by an individual instructor.*

**Assessment Results and Interpretation:** What percent of your majors are achieving the learning outcomes? Attach a data table showing the distribution of scores for each learning outcome or performance criterion. If you used an externally developed tests or assessment methods, provide comparison data. How did the students in your department perform compared to students in a peer institution? Did the results from this assessment meet your expectations about student learning in your department/program?

**Program Modification:** How are the assessment results being used? Please note changes that have been made as a result of using the data/evidence. Also, note any future modification you have planned.

Please use the data table in the next page to provide the information from your department/program. The table is a template and it will keep on expanding as you add in your information.
Information reported by departments using the new template indicates that most academic departments have clearly defined learning outcomes, performance criteria, and assessment measures and that about half have made related program modifications.

**Percentages of academic major programs at Eastern conducting selected assessment activities: 2008-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs that have identified program-based student learning outcomes</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs that have clearly defined assessment measures</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs that have been gathering and analyzing data related to their goals for student learning outcomes</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs that have used evidence on learning outcomes to modify programs</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Academic Program Review Process**

NEASC requirements also call for systematic review of all academic programs. Eastern's Academic Program Review process satisfies this requirement and is used for program modification and resource allocation. On a six-year rotating cycle this process requires that each academic major program complete a self-study, undergo evaluation by external reviewers, and develop a department response to the review. The review process includes consideration of the means by which the program assesses learning outcomes and responds to findings. In 2007-2008 the Business Information Systems, Honors, Writing, and Modern and Classical Languages programs completed the review process. Based on the self-study and recommendations of external reviewers several modifications were made in the BIS program. A significant revision of the Writing Program is part way through the curriculum approval process. Modern and Classical Languages, which was affected by changes in the Liberal Arts Core, is still in the process of developing program revisions. In AY 2008-2009 the Sociology, Computer Science, and Psychology programs completed the APR process and are in various stages of responding to the external reviews.

**Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA) and Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)**

Partly in response to NEASC reporting requirements, Eastern is in the second year of participating in the VSA. All information required including general information about assessment has been posted. The VSA requires that one of three tests be used to measure core learning outcomes and that results be posted within four years. The Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) was administered at Eastern to first year students in the fall and to seniors in the spring of AY 2008-2009.
Eastern’s first year students scored in the 77th percentile for students from comparable institutions when entering academic ability is not taken into consideration. When scores are adjusted based on entering academic ability Eastern’s first year students scored above the 90th percentile in all categories and in the 99th percentile in two. All of the results were “Well above expected” based on entering academic ability. Administrators and faculty members involved with administration of the CLA at Eastern and others with expertise in testing and measurement have met to discuss the implications of the first-year student scores. Scores of senior students will be available in late summer. In 2009-2010 the CLA will be administered again to first year students and to seniors.

First Year Program and Liberal Arts Core

Over one third of each student’s coursework at Eastern and a similar portion of the university’s teaching resources are allocated to the First Year Program and Liberal Arts Core. Key elements of the First Year Program were revised in 2008-2009 based on earlier assessments of learning outcomes and the program’s effects on student performance. To ensure that a sophisticated and thorough assessment of these changes is conducted a faculty member with significant expertise in the area of testing and measurement has been contracted to develop an assessment plan for the First Year Program. The plan will be implemented beginning in 2009-2010. The same faculty member will develop a plan for assessing the learning outcomes of the Liberal Arts Core. While assessment of learning outcomes is a critical consideration in the approval of individual courses for inclusion in the LAC, there is no method in place to evaluate the impact of the complete program on student learning. The CLA will be one of several assessment methods included in the plan.

Council on Academic Standards and the Office of Student Affairs

The Division of Student Affairs has initiated new learning outcomes for 2009/2010 developed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards (CAS) and derived from the Learning Reconsidered2 model for higher education. The assessment plan for evaluating these outcomes will be in place for the 2010-2011 academic year.

Faculty development and allocation of resources to assessment

Eastern used internal and external grant funds in 2009-2010 to promote faculty expertise required for assessment and to support innovative assessment approaches in academic programs. Additional resources were allocated by the Offices of Planning and Institutional Research and Information Technology to support the data and reporting needs of faculty and administrators involved in assessment.
Assessment of Extra- and Co-Curricular Experiences

Student participation in co-curricular activities has increased steadily over the past three years. Students who participated in the FYE pilot had significantly higher rates of participation in co-curricular activities than students who did not. The participating students also tended to have statistically significantly higher scores on the series of items on the 2008 NSSE that measured Active and Collaborating Learning, Student-Faculty Interaction, and Enriching Educational Experiences.2

Other Assessments in 2008-09

- Post-program participation surveys of students’ experiences with events such as the New Student Orientation and interventions sponsored by the Drug and Alcohol Resource Center.
- Demographic data on students with respect to housing choices.
- Demographic data on graduate student yield as a result of financial aid policy/program changes.
- Post-service periodic surveys administered to clients of Disability Resource Center.
- A study of part-time students’ demographics and experiences.
- Comprehensive evaluation of student experiences with the radically transformed dining program. Those data, coupled with the use of the Dining Service Advisory Committee (which serves as a consistent focus group for validation/explanation of data from the surveys) have served as the basis for further program planning and refinement.
- SEOP and ConnCAS pre-program assessments (written and oral via interview) of each student’s current skill/attitude/motivation level, mid-program assessments of student progress toward program goals, and end-of-program assessments (paper and interview and self assessment) to determine continuation in the program/SCSU. Our retention and attrition data indicate that this kind of intensive monitoring of student learning goals and progress toward them contribute directly to the success of students in these programs.

Institutional-Level Assessments

- National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and Beginning College Student Survey of Engagement (BCSSE)
  - National surveys that provide important data about students’ college experiences in a variety of curricular and co-curricular areas; Southern has participated since 2004.
  - Results shared with campus community in variety of venues; departmental and school reports generated.
  - Longitudinal and cross-sectional studies, as well as trend analyses, document positive changes in student development and learning over time.
- Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA)
  - Developed through a partnership between the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) and the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) to communicate comparable information about public colleges in a common format through the College Portrait.
  - Initial College Portrait has been completed (see http://www.southernct.edu/collegeportrait/)
  - A pilot of the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) is planned for 2009-10.
- Accreditation/Reaccreditation Reviews During 2008-09
  - The 2008 progress report for NEASC was accepted. This report detailed our progress in five areas of emphasis cited during the 2001 site visit.
  - Several successful reaccreditation site visits were completed during 2008-09:
    - Council on Academic Accreditation for Marriage and Family Therapy Education (COAMFTE)
    - Public Health Council on Education for Public Health (CEPH)
    - National Association for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

2 Scores were converted to a scale of 0-100 for ease of comparison.
Assessment Within Degree Programs

Student Learning Outcomes in the Major
All academic departments have a faculty assessment coordinator; many departments have created standing assessment committees. All programs have identified student learning outcomes for their major, and all have identified appropriate assessment measures; 68 percent of programs have collected data, and 48 percent have completed data analyses that have resulted in changes to the curriculum or other aspects of the program.

5-Year Academic Program Review

Undergraduate: A new process for the 5-year program review was approved in 2008. On a rotating basis, departments complete a self-study providing evidence of meeting 17 standards. The Program Review and Assessment Committee (PRAC), a standing faculty committee of the Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF), provides peer review and support. The new process is being phased in over three years. In 2008-09, seven departments completed modified self-studies: Journalism, Communication Disorders, Biology, Nursing, Psychology, Media Studies, and Political Science.

Graduate: An ongoing 5-year review process is in place with six programs having completed the cycle in 2008-09: Urban Studies, Communication Disorders, Biology, Nursing, Psychology, and Political Science. The Academic Standards Committee (ASC) of the Graduate Council provides peer review and support for this process.

Assessment Across Programs

University-wide programs — such as the First-Year Experience Program, Writing Across the Curriculum, and the new Liberal Education Program — are designed with assessment embedded into the program structure.

First-Year Experience
All students are part of learning communities and are tracked longitudinally. Information sources include a student survey at New Student Orientation; BCSSE; two self-assessments during the first semester; demographic data; and NSSE during the spring of students’ first year. Results from the 2007 pilot year and the first year of full implementation in 2008 suggest the program is effective on the basis of higher first-to-second year retention rates, a decrease of students on academic probation, higher GPAs, and an increase in the number of credits completed.

General Education Assessment
Since 2005, we have conducted trend analyses of NSSE items. The following table, for example, is a summary of seniors’ responses from 2005-2008 to the NSSE question “To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?” The table is rank-ordered in percent of seniors reporting substantial impact on their learning in 16 general education areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING OUTCOME AREA</th>
<th>2008 (N=497)</th>
<th>2007 (N=446)</th>
<th>2006 (N=618)</th>
<th>2005 (N=369)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Thinking critically and analytically</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Acquiring a broad general education</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Writing clearly and effectively</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Using computing and information technology</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Working effectively with others</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Speaking clearly and effectively</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Acquiring job or work related knowledge and skills</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Learning effectively on your own</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Analyzing quantitative problems</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Understanding yourself</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Understanding people of other racial and ethnic backgrounds</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Solving complex real-world problems</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Developing a personal code of values and ethics</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Contributing to the welfare of your community</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Voting in local, state, or national elections</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Developing a deepened sense of spirituality</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As implementation of the new Liberal Education Program is being planned, a committee is working to design embedded assessments into the new program. Data from several competencies (written communication, quantitative reasoning, multilingual communication) are being analyzed this summer.

Writing Across the Curriculum

Fully implemented in 2007-08

Results of indirect assessments (student and faculty surveys) have been used to make initial revisions in the program; direct assessment of student writing with rubrics created by academic departments is planned for the 2009-2010 year.

Assessing Faculty Development

Faculty development is an integral element in the assessment process. Events planned are based on identified faculty needs and student assessment data; workshops and training are evaluated. Follow-up evaluations are conducted to gauge long-term effects of professional development activities.

1 Percent of seniors responding “quite a bit” or “very much” to the question, “To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?”
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WCSU's Assessment Plan
Assessment is an ongoing process aimed at understanding and improving student learning. In 2004-05 WCSU developed and implemented a comprehensive plan in response to the 2004 New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) reaccreditation report. The plan calls for ongoing collection, analysis and dissemination of information on student learning outcomes in every degree program. The five stages of the assessment cycle are to be reported on annually:

1. Determine program goals and objectives.
2. Gather direct and indirect evidence of student learning outcomes.
3. Interpret the evidence.
4. Make changes in curriculum and/or instruction for improvement, when necessary.
5. “Close the loop” by gathering information on the effectiveness of changes and/or by focusing on different objectives and repeating the process.

Organizational Structure and Support for Assessment
Each school has an assessment budget to support data collection and analysis. Moreover, each school has a committee with responsibilities for integrating curriculum development and assessment of student learning outcomes. Both the Assessment Committee and General Education Committee are standing committees of the University Senate, with responsibilities for advising the Provost and the Senate.

Student attainment of general education goals is measured by administration of the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) test (first-year students in November 2008 and seniors in April 2009). Student participation in activities that tend to result in learning is measured by the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE).

Western Connecticut State University capitalizes on its outstanding faculty and its location in the greater New York metropolitan area to create a diverse university community that—in its range of quality academic programs and in its enriching and supportive student-focused environment—is characteristic of New England’s best small private universities, but with much more affordable costs.

WCSU Vision Statement
Adopted, March, 2007
Program Review and Results
A plan for academic program review was approved by the Committee on Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Standards in December 2007 and by the Graduate Council in April 2008. Assessment of student learning outcomes is an integral part of program review. All degree programs have assessment plans in place. As of May 30, 2009, one program had completed its review (Psychology Baccalaureate). Six programs are continuing the three-year program review cycle begun in 2008-09, and six programs are scheduled to begin the process in 2009-2010. See Appendix. In addition, accredited programs require evidence of student learning. Eleven degree programs are pursuing accreditation and nine are currently accredited. See Appendix.

Assessments Across Academic Programs

Results

Ancell School of Business
The school has begun to use SEDONA software to organize and summarize information on faculty teaching, service, experience, professional development and assessment of student learning outcomes. All departments have student learning outcomes integrated into their programs.

Example: The Marketing Department’s assessment of student skill levels determined that students needed to have a managerial writing course (WRT 210 W). The course was first offered to students in Fall 2008.

School of Arts and Sciences
Assessment of student learning outcomes is conducted using a variety of methods including pre and post testing, external reviews by experts, portfolio evaluation and standardized national tests. All departments have student learning outcomes integrated into their programs.

Example: In 2008-09 the Mathematics Department undertook a revision of the calculus sequence and a larger program revision based on the 2007-08 assessment. The Educational Testing Service (ETS) testing showed that students were weak in proof reading and writing as well as basic calculus skills. The resulting calculus revision indentified topics most important to cover in each course and revised course outlines accordingly. The broader program revision is designed to provide breadth of knowledge and proof writing skills early in the curriculum.

School of Professional Studies
All teacher education programs are in their third year of using TK20 software to achieve full compliance with the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) standards for accreditation. All departments have student learning outcomes integrated into their programs.

Example: The Social Work Department continues to meet the standards of its national accrediting body, the Council on Social Work Education (CSWE). Every other year the department surveys field agency personnel, which includes fifteen items measuring students’ functioning in the context of program objectives. Recent results indicated the need for improved communication skills. In response, course content will place additional emphasis on exploring student perspectives on the scope and nature of all types of communication.

School of Visual and Performing Arts
All departments have student learning outcomes integrated into their programs.

Example: The Music and Music Education Department maintains policies and procedures that contribute to the learning assessment of students. These policies and procedures are consistent with the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) accreditation agency. Assessment data are collected and most recently, in Fall 2008, faculty adopted stricter standards for admission to the B.M. Jazz programs as well as the sophomore barrier assessment prior to enrollment in upper division music courses.

Assessments of Student Learning Outcomes
Division of Student Affairs
Two years ago, the Division of Student Affairs mandated that every department begin the process of self study using the standards developed by the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS). This past year, seven of the twelve departments completed the process which included creating a set of action plans focusing on measuring student learning outcomes. Each of these seven areas are now in the process of developing student learning outcome measures using the six student outcome domains based on research presented in “Learning Reconsidered 2: Implementing a Campus-Wide Focus on the Student Experience,” Richard Keeling, ed., 2006.

Example: For the 2008-2009 academic year, students in the WCSU Cooperative Education and Internship program who completed the Student Evaluation Form indentified the following learning outcomes as a result of their involvement in the co-op program: enhanced knowledge of a particular discipline (e.g. accounting, marketing, justice and law); expanded interpersonal skills (e.g. confidence, speaking ability, communications, time management); and expanded support and understanding of personal career goals. As a result, Student Affairs will continue providing the same structured co-op program as in 2008-09.
Assessment Initiatives

Results

**NEASC**
The university’s Fifth Year Interim Report to NEASC-CIHE was accepted by the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education at its meeting on November 20, 2008, and the comprehensive evaluation scheduled for Fall 2010 confirmed. The Commission’s letter to President Schmotter read, in part: “The Commission commends [WCSU] for progress made in addressing the areas of emphasis…We note with approval that WCSU has implemented an assessment plan across academic units…”

**MAPP TEST**
The Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) test is a measure of college-level reading, mathematics, writing and critical thinking in the context of the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences. It is designed to assess general education outcomes. This test was implemented this academic year in order to gain a unified picture of the effectiveness of the WCSU general education program.

**NSSE**
The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) obtains, on an annual basis, information from hundreds of four-year colleges and universities nationwide about student participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending college. Institutions use their data to identify aspects of the undergraduate experience inside and outside the classroom that can be improved through changes in policies and procedures more consistent with good practices in undergraduate education. The Spring 2009 administration of NSSE at WCSU achieved a 23.8 percent response rate (232 of 1036 first-year students and 170 of 650 seniors responded).

**NASM**
The National Association of Schools of Music had a site team visit WCSU during the Spring 2009 academic semester. The Music Department has a comprehensive student outcomes assessment plan which received an excellent review.

**NCATE**
The visitation team for NCATE in April 2009 reviewed the standards as they are implemented in the varied departments of the School of Professional Studies and the School of Arts and Sciences and offered complimentary statements about the WCSU assessment plan.

**CCNE**
The Nursing Department received excellent comments from the Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education accreditation team for a comprehensive student outcome assessment plan and impressive results.
### Western Connecticut State University Approved Degree Programs

#### Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Division/Dept.</th>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Status of Accreditation or Academic Program Review (APR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Arts &amp; Sciences</strong></td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Biological and Environmental Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Medical Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>Accredited by American Chemical Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comm.</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>Continue APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hist./NWC</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hist./NWC</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>History</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Continue APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Math.</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Continue APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAM</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Earth and Planetary Sciences</td>
<td>Begin APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAM</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Earth and Planetary Sciences</td>
<td>Begin APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PAM</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Meteorology</td>
<td>Begin APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psy</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Completed APR in May 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soc. Sci.</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Anthropology/Sociology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soc. Sci.</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soc. Sci.</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soc. Sci.</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WLCP</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Professional Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WLCP</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Professional Writing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WLL</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WLL</td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>American Studies</td>
<td>Continue APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>Contract Major (individualized study)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AS</td>
<td></td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business</strong></td>
<td>JLA</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Justice Administration</td>
<td>Begin APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JLA</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Justice and Law Admin</td>
<td>Begin APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acct.</td>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>Assoc. to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Pre-Candidacy August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Assoc. to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Pre-Candidacy August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mgt.</td>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Assoc. to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Pre-Candidacy August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>Management Info Systems</td>
<td>Assoc. to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Pre-Candidacy August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mkt.</td>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>Assoc. to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Pre-Candidacy August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>BBA</td>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>Assoc. to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business Pre-Candidacy August 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mgt.</td>
<td>MHA</td>
<td>Health Administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educ./EP</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>NCATE Site Visit in April 2009 / Licensed by the CT State Dept. of Ed. (SDE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educ./EP</td>
<td>MAT</td>
<td>Master of Arts in Teaching</td>
<td>New program in Spring 2009 / Licensed by the CT State Dept. of Ed. (SDE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educ./EP</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>NCATE Site Visit in April 2009 / Licensed by the CT State Dept. of Ed. (SDE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Educ./EP</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>NCATE Site Visit in April 2009 / Licensed by the CT State Dept. of Ed. (SDE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HPX</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Health Education</td>
<td>NCATE Site Visit in April 2009 / Licensed by the CT State Dept. of Ed. (SDE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HPX</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Health Promotion Studies</td>
<td>Prepare for Society for Public Health Education Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Comm. on Coll. Nursing Ed. Accreditation in October 2008, accreditation through 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>Comm. on Coll. Nursing Ed. Accreditation in October 2008, accreditation through 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>Council on Social Work Education Accreditation through 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Visual &amp; Performing Arts</strong></td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>Continue APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>Continue APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music/ME</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>National Assoc. of Schools of Music Site Visit in March 2009, accreditation through 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music/ME</td>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Music (Perf., Comp., Theory)</td>
<td>National Assoc. of Schools of Music Site Visit in March 2009, accreditation through 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music/ME</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>National Assoc. of Schools of Music Site Visit in March 2009, accreditation through 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Music/ME</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>National Assoc. of Schools of Music Site Visit in March 2009, accreditation through 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Theatre Arts</td>
<td>Begin APR in 2009-2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>