



SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS  
COMMISSION ON COLLEGES

July 6, 2016

Dr. Adena Williams Loston  
President  
Saint Philip's College  
1801 Martin Luther King Drive  
San Antonio, TX 78203

Dear Dr. Loston:

The following action regarding your institution was taken by the Board of Trustees of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges during its meeting held on June 16, 2016:

The SACSCOC Board of Trustees deferred action on reaffirmation of accreditation for six months pending additional information regarding autonomy of the separately accredited institution. In addition, a Special Committee was authorized to visit the institution.

The Board requested that the institution submit a Monitoring Report due four weeks in advance of the Special Committee visit but **no later than September 6, 2016**, addressing the following referenced standards of the *Principles of Accreditation*:

**CR 2.3 (Chief executive officer)**

*This standard expects an institution's chief executive officer to have primary responsibility to the institution and that the chief executive officer is not the presiding officer of the board.*

**CS 3.2.2.3 (Governing board control)**

*This standard expects an institution to clearly define the legal authority and operating control within its governance structure for institutional policy.*

**CS 3.2.7 (Organizational structure)**

*This standard expects an institution to have a clearly defined and published organizational structure that delineates responsibility for the administration of policies.*

**CS 3.2.9 (Personnel appointment)**

*This standard expects an institution to publish policies regarding appointment, employment, and evaluation of all personnel.*

**CS 3.4.1 (Academic program approval)**

*This standard expects an institution to demonstrate that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration.*



Dr. Adena Williams Loston  
July 6, 2016  
Page Two

**CS 3.4.4 (Acceptance of academic credit)**

*This standard expects an institution to publish policies that include criteria for evaluating, awarding, and accepting credit for transfer, experiential learning, credit by examination, advanced placement, and professional certificates that is consistent with its mission and ensures that course work and learning outcomes are at the collegiate level and comparable to the institution's own degree programs. It expects the institution to assume responsibility for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution's transcript.*

**CS 3.4.7 (Consortial relationships/contractual agreements)**

*This standard expects an institution to ensure the quality of educational programs/courses offered through consortia relationships or contractual agreements, to ensure ongoing compliance with the Principles, and to periodically evaluate the consortial relationship and/or agreement against the mission of the institution.*

**CS 3.4.10 (Responsibility for curriculum)**

*This standard expects an institution to place primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of the curriculum with its faculty.*

**CS 3.7.5 (Faculty role in governance)**

*This standard expects an institution to publish policies on the responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters.*

**CS 3.13.1 (Policy compliance)**

*This standard expects an institution to comply with the following policies of the Commission on Colleges.*

**3.13.4b (Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports)**

*This policy requires the institution to describe its relationship to its system regarding governance, operating procedures of the system, and the individual institution's role within that system.*

In a **separate report**, the institution should update its response to the recommendations of the Reaffirmation Committee addressing standards **not cited** above, and resubmit four copies to the attention of your SACSCOC representative by September 6, 2016.

Guidelines for the monitoring report are enclosed. Because it is essential that institutions follow these guidelines, **please make certain that those responsible for preparing the report receive the document. If there are any questions about the format, contact the Commission staff member assigned to your institution.** When submitting your report, please send **four copies** to your Commission staff member.



Dr. Adena Williams Loston  
July 6, 2016  
Page Three

As noted earlier, a Special Committee has been authorized to visit your institution to review the specific standards of the *Principles* listed above. The Committee may extend its initial focus if any evidence of additional accreditation-related concerns comes to its attention. Your Commission staff member will contact you to discuss arrangements for this Special Committee.

If you have questions, please contact the Commission staff member assigned to your institution.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Belle S. Wheelan". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Belle S. Wheelan, Ph.D.  
President

BSW:ch

Enclosures

cc: Dr. Patricia L. Donat



Southern Association of Colleges and Schools  
Commission on Colleges  
1866 Southern Lane  
Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097

## REPORTS SUBMITTED FOR SACSCOC REVIEW

### - Policy Statement -

Institutions accredited by the Commission on Colleges are requested to submit various reports to an evaluation committee or to the Commission's Board of Trustees for review. Those reports include:

Response Report to the Visiting Committee  
Monitoring Report or Referral Report

When submitting a report, an institution should follow the directions below, keeping in mind that the report will be reviewed by a number of readers, most of whom will be unfamiliar with the institution.

### Information Pertaining to the Preparation of All Reports

#### *Preparation of a Title Page*

For any report requested, an institution should prepare a title page that includes the following:

1. Name of the institution
2. Address of the institution
3. Dates of the committee visit (*not applicable for the Referral Report*)
4. The kind of report submitted
5. Name, title, and contact numbers of person(s) preparing the report

#### *Presentation of Reports*

For any report requested, an institution should

1. ***For print copies***, copy all documents front and back, double-space the copy, and use no less than an 11 point font. If the report requires binding beyond stapling, do not submit the report in a three-ring binder. Ring binders are bulky and must be removed before mailing to the readers.
2. ***For electronic copies, please comply with all steps outlined below:***
  - (1) Copy the report and all attachments onto the appropriate number of flash drives, in accordance with the number of requested copies of the report. ***Each*** flash drive should be labeled with the name of the institution and the title of the report.
  - (2) ***Each*** flash drive should be submitted in a separate paper or plastic envelope not smaller than 4 x 4 inches and ***each*** envelope should be labeled with the name of the institution, the title of the report, and the list of document contents.
  - (3) Provide the name, title, email address, and phone number of the person who can be contacted if the readers have problems accessing the information.

- (4) Provide **one print copy** of the response **without** the attachments.
3. Provide a clear, complete, and concise report. If documentation is required, ensure that it is appropriate to demonstrating fulfillment of the requirement. Specify actions that have been taken and document their completion. Avoid vague responses indicating that the institution *plans to address* a problem in the future. If any actions remain to be accomplished, the institution should present an action plan, a schedule for accomplishing the plan, and evidence of commitment of resources for accomplishing the plan.
  4. When possible, excerpt passages from text and incorporate the narrative into the report. Provide definitive evidence, not documents that only address the process (e.g., do not include copies of letters or memos with directives).
  5. When possible and appropriate, provide samples of evidence of compliance rather than all documents pertaining to all activities associated with compliance.
  6. Reread the report before submission and eliminate all narrative that is not relevant to the focus of the report. If sending electronic copies, ensure that all devices are virus free and have been reviewed for easy access by reviewers external to your institution.

### **Information Specific for the Response to the Visiting Committee Report**

- Definition:** A Response Report addresses the findings of a visiting committee. It provides updated or additional documentation regarding the institution's compliance with the *Principles of Accreditation*.
- Audience:** The Response Report, along with the Committee Report and other documents, is reviewed by SACSCOC Board of Trustees and is subject to the review procedures of the Commission's standing committees, including the continuation of a monitoring period, the imposition of a sanction, or a change of accreditation status.
- Report Presentation:** Structure the response so that it addresses committee recommendations in the order that they appear in the report. Tabs should separate each response to a recommendation.
- For each recommendation, provide the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement and state the recommendation exactly as it appears in the visiting committee report. Describe the committee's concerns that led to the recommendation by either summarizing the concerns or inserting verbatim the complete narrative in the report pertaining to the recommendation. Provide a response with documentation.
- Due Date:** The Response Report is due on the day indicated in the transmittal letter from Commission staff accompanying the visiting committee report.
- Number of Copies:** See the transmittal letter from Commission staff accompanying the visiting committee report.

### **Information Specific to the Preparation of a Monitoring Report or a Referral Report**

- Definition:** These reports address recommendations and continued concerns of compliance usually identified by the Committee on Compliance and Reports (C & R) or by the Executive Council (or, for a Referral Report, identified by the Committee on Fifth-Year Interim Reports) and referred to the SACSCOC Board of Trustees. It follows the C & R Committee's review of an institution's response to a visiting committee report.

**Audience:** The Monitoring Report and the Referral Report are reviewed by SACSCOC Board of Trustees and are subject to the review procedures of the Commission's standing committees, including the continuation of a monitoring period, the imposition of a sanction, or a change of accreditation status.

**Report Presentation:** For a Monitoring Report, structure the response so that it addresses committee recommendations in the order that they appeared in the report. Tabs should separate each response to a recommendation.

For each recommendation, (1) restate the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement, the number of the recommendation, and the recommendation exactly as it appeared in the visiting committee report; (2) provide a brief history of responses to the recommendation if more than a first response (to include an accurate summary of the original concerns of the visiting committee, a summary of each previous institutional response and an explanation of what had been requested by the Commission); (3) cite verbatim the current request of the Commission that is related to the recommendation (reference notification letter from the President of the Commission); and (4) prepare a response to the recommendation.

For a Referral Report, structure the response so that it addresses the concerns described in the letter from SACSCOC President in the order that they appeared. Tabs should separate each response to each standard cited.

For each standard cited, (1) restate the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement exactly as it appeared in the letter; (2) cite verbatim the current request of the Commission that is related to the standard cited (reference notification letter from the President of SACSCOC); and (3) prepare a response to the recommendation.

**Due Date:** The Monitoring Report and the Referral Report are due on the date specified in the notification letter sent by SACSCOC President. Requests for extensions to the date must be made to the President at least two weeks in advance of the original due date. (See Commission policy "Deadlines for Submitting Reports.")

**Number of Copies:** See the letter from the President of SACSCOC requesting the Report.

**Document History**

*Edited and Revised for the Principles of Accreditation: December 2003*

*Updated: January 2007, January 2010, May 2010, January 2012*

*Edited: June 2015*



*Southern Association of Colleges and Schools  
Commission on Colleges  
1866 Southern Lane  
Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097*

## **SANCTIONS, DENIAL OF REAFFIRMATION, AND REMOVAL FROM MEMBERSHIP**

### **Policy Statement**

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) requires that a member institution be in compliance with the *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement* and its Core Requirements, comply with Commission policies and procedures, and provide information requested by the Commission's Board of Trustees in order to maintain membership and accreditation. When an institution fails to comply with these requirements within a maximum two-year monitoring period, the Commission may impose sanctions. Monitoring reports submitted during this period are not sanctions.

If the Commission determines that an institution's progress is insufficient during the two-year monitoring period but not significant enough to impose a sanction, the Commission will advise the institution that if progress or compliance is insufficient at the time of its next formal review by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees, the institution could be placed on sanction or removed from membership. (Institutions applying for membership with SACSCOC should refer to the Commission policy "Accreditation Procedures for Applicant Institutions" for procedures concerning the denial or removal of candidacy, or the denial of initial membership.)

Failure to make adequate progress toward compliance at any time during the two-year period or failure to comply with the *Principles* at the conclusion of two years may result in Commission action to remove accreditation.

The Commission's requirements, policies, processes, procedures and decisions are predicated on integrity. SACSCOC expects integrity to govern the operation of institutions. Therefore, evidence of withholding information, providing inaccurate information to the public, or failing to provide timely information to the Commission may be construed as an indication of the lack of a full commitment to integrity and may result in the imposition of sanctions or removal of accreditation.

### **Sanctions**

An institution found to be out of compliance with the *Principles of Accreditation* must correct the deficiencies or face the possibility of being placed on one of two sanctions: Warning or Probation, in order of degree of seriousness. These sanctions are not necessarily sequential, and the Commission may place an institution on either sanction with or without reviewing a visiting committee's report and with or without having previously requested a monitoring report, depending on the seriousness and extent of noncompliance. In certain circumstances, an institution may be removed from membership without having previously been placed on sanction.

During the two-year monitoring period, institutions may be placed on a sanction for six or twelve months, with a monitoring report required at the end of the period of the sanction. Institutional accreditation cannot be reaffirmed while the institution is on sanction. Denial of reaffirmation of accreditation and invocation of sanctions are not appealable actions. Actions invoking sanctions are publicly announced at the annual meeting of the College Delegate Assembly, posted on the SACSCOC website, and published in the *Annual Reports of SACSCOC*.

The characteristics of these sanctions include the following:

**Warning** – The less serious of the two sanctions, Warning is usually, but not necessarily, levied in the earlier stages of institutional review and often, but not necessarily, precedes Probation. It cannot, however, succeed Probation. An institution may be placed on Warning or Probation for noncompliance with any of the Core Requirements or significant noncompliance with the Comprehensive Standards. Additionally, an institution may be placed on Warning for failure to make timely and significant progress toward correcting the deficiencies that led to the finding of noncompliance with any of the *Principles of Accreditation*. An institution may also be placed on Warning for failure to comply with Commission policies and procedures, including failure to provide requested information in a timely manner. The maximum total time during one monitoring period that an institution may be on Warning is two years.

**Probation** – Failure to correct deficiencies or failure to make satisfactory progress toward compliance with the *Principles of Accreditation*, whether or not the institution is already on Warning, may result in the institution being placed on Probation. An institution may be placed on Probation for the same reasons as discussed above regarding Warning if the Commission's Board of Trustees deems noncompliance with the Principles to be serious enough to merit invoking Probation whether or not the institution is or has been on Warning. Probation is a more serious sanction than Warning and is usually, but not necessarily, invoked as the last step before an institution is removed from membership. Probation may be imposed upon initial institutional review, depending on the judgment of the Board regarding the seriousness of noncompliance or in the case of repeated violations recognized by the Board over a period of time. An institution must be placed on Probation when it is continued in membership for Good Cause beyond the maximum two-year monitoring period (see section on "Good Cause" below). The maximum consecutive time that an institution may be on Probation is two years.

### **Denial of Reaffirmation of Accreditation with the Imposition of a Sanction**

If an institution is judged by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees to be out of compliance with a Core Requirement, it will be placed on a sanction. For an institution seeking reaffirmation of accreditation, its reaffirmation will be denied, and it will be placed on a sanction. If an institution is judged to be significantly out of compliance with one or more of the Comprehensive Standards, its reaffirmation of accreditation may be denied. The action of denying reaffirmation of accreditation will be accompanied by the imposition of a sanction. The institution's accreditation will not be reaffirmed while it is on Warning or Probation, but its accreditation will be continued. Denial of reaffirmation does not affect the decennial review schedule.

### **Removal from Membership**

An institution may be removed from SACSCOC membership at any time, depending on the Board of Trustees' judgment of the seriousness of noncompliance with the *Principles of Accreditation* or with the Commission's policies and procedures. Removal from membership, however, usually occurs after persistent or significant noncompliance during a monitoring period or any time an institution is being followed for Good Cause. A serious instance of noncompliance or repeated instances of noncompliance may result in removal of membership without a monitoring period. If an institution has filed bankruptcy, the SACSCOC Board of Trustees may revoke the institution's accreditation for failure to comply with the *Principles of Accreditation* during the pendency of the bankruptcy.

An institution must be removed from membership if it has not demonstrated compliance with all the Principles of Accreditation within the two-year monitoring period and has not demonstrated Good Cause as to why it should not be dropped from membership. If an institution is continued in membership for Good Cause beyond the two-year monitoring period (and then only on Probation), it may be removed from membership at any time but must be removed from membership if it does not demonstrate compliance within the two years beyond the end of the two-year monitoring period (see "Good Cause" below).

When an institution fails to pay its dues by the designated deadline, the Commission will assume from this action that the institution no longer wants to maintain its membership or candidacy with SACSCOC. By that action, the institution withdraws from membership or candidacy. The SACSCOC Board of Trustees will take official action on



the termination of accreditation. However, if an institution has filed bankruptcy, the Board may not act to revoke accreditation for failure to pay membership fees and dues during the pendency of bankruptcy.

In accord with 34 CFR Section 602.24 of the Federal Code, notification of SACSCOC Board of Trustees action to withdraw or terminate membership will be accompanied by a request that the institution submit a teach-out plan to the Commission for approval. (See Commission policy "Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions" for the specific procedures.) This is applicable if (1) the institution fails to appeal the decision of the Commission's Board of Trustees or (2) the institution appeals the Board's decision and the Appeals Committee rules in favor of the Board.

### **Procedures for Applying Sanctions and for Terminating Membership**

Recommendations for Warning, Probation, and removal of membership are made by one of the Committees on Compliance and Reports to the Executive Council of the Commission. The Council forwards recommendations on Warning, Probation, and removal from membership to the SACSCOC Board of Trustees, which takes final action subject to any rights of appeal which the institution might have as described in Commission policies. Action placing an institution on Warning or Probation is not appealable.

In the cases of Warning, Probation, or loss of membership, both the chief executive officer and the chair of the institution's governing board will be informed in writing. (For public institutions that are part of a state system, the chief executive officer of the system will also receive a copy of the notification sent to the institution.) The Commission will include in its notification to the institution reasons for the imposition of sanction or for loss of membership.

An action to place an institution on Warning or Probation, to deny reaffirmation, or to remove an institution from membership, along with the reasons for the action, will be read during the annual meeting of the College Delegate Assembly, posted on the SACSCOC website, and recorded in the *Annual Reports of SACSCOC*. Actions which are appealable will be accompanied by a statement that Commission action will not take effect until the time period for filing an appeal has expired or until final action has been taken on the appeal. The Commission policy on disclosure is also applicable to these actions.

### **Definition and Conditions for Good Cause**

If an institution has not remedied deficiencies at the conclusion of its two-year maximum monitoring period, the SACSCOC Board of Trustees must (1) remove the institution from membership, or (2) continue accreditation for "good cause". If accreditation is extended for "good cause," the institution must also be placed on or continued on Probation.

An institution's accreditation can be extended for "good cause" if

1. the institution has demonstrated significant recent accomplishments in addressing non-compliance (e.g., the institution's cumulative operating deficit has been reduced significantly and its enrollment has increased significantly), and
2. the institution has documented that it has the "potential" to remedy all deficiencies within the extended period as defined by the Committee on Compliance and Reports; that is, that the institution provides evidence which makes it reasonable for the Commission to assume it will remedy all deficiencies within the extended time defined by the Committee on Compliance and Reports, and
3. the institution provides assurance to the Commission that it is not aware of any other reasons, other than those identified by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees, why the institution could not be continued for "good cause."

The SACSCOC Board of Trustees may extend accreditation for "good cause" for a maximum of one year. At the conclusion of the period, the institution must appear before the Board of Trustees at a meeting on the record to provide evidence of good cause as to why its period for remedying deficiencies should be extended again for good cause. If an institution was on Probation both years of its two-year monitoring period following initial action

on deficiencies, the institution is not eligible for good cause consideration because an institution cannot be on Probation for more than two consecutive years. Since continued accreditation for good cause imposes the sanction of Probation and a third year on Probation is against Commission policy, the institution is ineligible for consideration of good cause. (See above under "Probation.")

In all cases, the institution bears the burden of proof to provide evidence why the Commission should not remove it from membership.

**Document History**

*Approved: Commission on Colleges, June 2003*

*Revised for the Principles of Accreditation, December 2003*

*Revised: SACSCOC Board of Trustees, July 2005, June 2011,*

*December 2012, December 2013*

*Reformatted: April 2015*

**FACULTY ROSTER**  
**Instructions for Reporting the Qualifications of**  
**Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty**

**General Instructions for Completing the Faculty Roster Form**

1. These instructions apply to the use of the Faculty Roster Form\* for all institutions responding to Comprehensive Standard 3.7.1 (Faculty Competence) or as requested in relation to substantive change.

2. Information requested on the form should be provided for all full-time and part-time faculty teaching credit or developmental/remedial courses. Teaching assistants should be included only if they are the instructor of record.

3. Faculty should be grouped by department, academic program, or discipline (do not group by broad areas such as social sciences or humanities, or by broad degree categories like Associate in Arts or Bachelor of Science). Faculty with teaching assignments in more than one academic area should be listed in the primary department, academic program, or discipline in which they teach, along with all of the courses taught, to avoid repeated entries for the same person.

4. For the submission of the Compliance Certification, a Track A institution (offering only undergraduate degrees) should submit rosters for fall term of the current academic year and spring term of the previous academic year. A Track B institution (offering graduate degrees) should submit rosters for fall and spring term of the previous academic year.

**Providing Information That Establishes Qualifications**

1. Institutions completing the Faculty Roster Form should review Comprehensive Standard 3.7.1 and the Commission guidelines on "Faculty Credentials," which can be found on the Commission website under the Policies and Publications link. The guidelines represent commonly-accepted

good practice for the academic qualifications of faculty; however, the Commission recognizes that qualifications other than academic credentials (or combined with credentials) may be appropriate for teaching particular courses.

2. The Commission usually accepts common collegiate practice in recognizing an academic discipline, concentration, and/or field of study. Examples include history, mathematics, chemistry, English, sociology, finance, accounting, marketing, and management. For faculty teaching in these areas, it is expected that the institution will provide information that justifies and documents each faculty member's qualifications relevant to the specific courses they are assigned to teach. For faculty teaching interdisciplinary courses, it is expected that the institution will provide information that justifies and documents the faculty member's qualifications relevant to the disciplines that are components of the course.

3. When completing the Faculty Roster Form, it may become obvious that only one of the faculty member's degrees need be cited in order to justify his/her qualifications to teach a specific course. In that case, cite only that one degree. In other cases, it will be necessary to list two or more degrees and to list the specific course titles and number of semester hours in those degrees relevant to the courses assigned. It may also be necessary to indicate additional qualifications such as diplomas or certificates earned (with discipline indicated); related work or professional experience; licensure and certifications; continuous documented excellence in teaching; honors and awards; scholarly publications and presented papers; and other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. Indicate the dates for these additional qualifications and *clearly describe the relationship between these qualifications*

**FACULTY ROSTER**  
**Instructions for Reporting the Qualifications of**  
**Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty**

*and the course content and/or expected outcomes of the courses assigned to the faculty member.*

4. Institutions are expected to maintain appropriate justification and documentation in the files of all faculty that establish qualifications, including those listed in columns three and four of the Faculty Roster Form. These should be readily available for the consideration of On-Site Evaluators.

**Instructions for the Columns  
Of the Faculty Roster Form**

**Column One.** Provide the name of the instructor and indicate full or part-time status: (F) or (P). A full-time faculty member is usually defined as one whose major employment is with the institution, whose primary assignment is in teaching or research, and whose employment is based upon a contract for full-time employees. If a significantly different definition is used for full-time faculty, please provide that definition.

**Column Two.** List from the catalog the course prefix, course number, and course title of all credit courses taught by term during the requested time period. For each course indicate whether it is developmental (D), undergraduate transferable (UT) undergraduate non-transferable (UN) or graduate (G). Information should be provided—separate from the roster—summarizing the content of the courses listed on the roster. Appropriate information might be provided through a catalog or other description of the content of these courses.

**Column Three.** List the earned academic degrees, diplomas, and certificates that help qualify the instructor to teach the listed courses. Indicate the discipline (concentration or major) of each degree, the institution that awarded the degree. Listing

additional qualifications such as other specific course titles and number of semester hours awarded at the undergraduate or graduate level relevant to the courses assigned could also be helpful in building a case for qualified faculty.

**Column Four.** If necessary to establish adequate qualifications of faculty for courses assigned, list additional qualifications such as related work or professional experience, licensure and certifications; continuous documented excellence in teaching; honors and awards; scholarly publications and presented papers; and other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. Indicate the dates for these additional qualifications and *clearly describe the relationship between these qualifications and the course content and/or expected outcomes of the courses assigned to the faculty member.* As necessary, provide this information on additional pages.

January 2007  
Updated : January 2011

\* The Faculty Roster form can be found at [www.sacscoc.org](http://www.sacscoc.org) under Institutional Resources.

## Faculty Roster Form Qualifications of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty

Name of Institution: *ABC College*

Name of Primary Department, Academic Program, or Discipline: *XXXX*

Academic Term(s) Included: *Fall 20XX, Spring 20XX*

Date Form Completed: *mm/dd/yyyy*

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT Including Term, Course Number & Title, Credit Hours (D, UN, UT, G)	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK Relevant to Courses Taught, Including Institution & Major List specific graduate coursework, if needed	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS Related to Courses Taught,
Joe Alvarez (F)	<p><b>Fall 2009</b> BUS 1001 Fundamentals of Accounting, 3 (UN) BUS 2001 Principles of Accounting I, 3 (UT)</p> <p><b>Spring 2010</b> BUS 1001 Fundamentals of Accounting, 3 (UN) BUS 2002 Principles of Accounting II, 3 (UT)</p>	<p>MBA (General), Good University Included the following coursework: BUS 516 Cost Accounting (3) BUS 572 Federal Income Tax (3) BUS 573 Accounting Information Systems (3) Total: 9 Graduate Semester Hrs</p> <p>BBA (Accounting), Greenhill University</p>	<p>Current CPA license, NC</p> <p>1999-2009 Accountant, Big Four Accounting Inc., Durham, NC 3 years Auditing experience 7 years Income Tax experience</p>
Yolanda Bing (F)	<p><b>Fall 2009</b> HIS 101, Western Civilization I, 3 (UT) HIS 110, American Society and Culture, 3 (UT) GEO 222, Latin America, 3 (UT)</p> <p><b>Spring 2010</b> HIS 102, Western Civilization II, 3 (UT) KIN 103, Karate, 1 (UT)</p>	<p>MA (History), Good University Included the following coursework: GEO 512, Hist of Cartography GEO 516, Latin American Geography GEO 640, Geo Info Sys GEO 651, Migration GEO 670, Europe GEO 680, 20th Century US Total: 18 Graduate Semester Hrs</p>	<p>Holds black belt and was first alternate to US Olympic team in Karate</p>
Steig Cederholm (P)	<p><b>Spring 2010</b> Music Composition (UT)</p>	<p>BM (Music Composition), University of Louisville</p>	<p>Published composer, including four produced symphonies and one opera, which debuted last winter at the Houston Metropolitan Opera</p> <p>Formerly the composer in residence for the Atlanta Symphony Orchestra</p>

F, P: Full-time or Part-time; D, UN, UT, G: Developmental, Undergraduate Nontransferable, Undergraduate Transferable, Graduate