#### UGPC Approval \_\_\_\_\_ **NEW COURSE PROPOSAL** Approval \_\_\_\_\_ SCNS **Graduate Programs** Submittal \_\_\_\_\_ **FLORIDA Department** Accounting Confirmed \_\_\_\_ ATLANTIC Banner College Business UNIVERSITY Catalog (To obtain a course number, contact erudolph@fau.edu) (L = Lab Course: C = Prefix ACG Course Title Survey of Archival Accounting Research Combined Lecture/Lab: add if appropriate) Number 7886 Lab Code Grading Credits (Review Course Description (Syllabus must be attached; see Guidelines) Provost Memorandum) (Select One Option) This course is a survey of archival accounting research for Business Ph.d., executive concentration, doctoral candidates. The course includes basic archival accounting research methods and topics that Regular are likely to be of interest to students seeking a Ph.D., executive **Effective Date** (TERM & YEAR) concentration. Methods include simple regression and event Sat/UnSat studies. Topics include earnings quality, audit quality, audit fees and Spring 2018 executive compensation. **Prerequisites** Corequisites Registration Controls (Major, College, Level) Admission to Business PhD, Executive Concentration Prerequisites, Corequisites and Registration Controls are enforced for all sections of course

Approved by	Date
Department Chair	8/23/17
College Curriculum Chair Wm KMWWWW	10-31-2017
College Dean	
UGPC Chair / SM N. / O CM	*
Graduate College Dean	
UFS President	
Provost	

See Syllabus

List textbook information in syllabus or here

List/Attach comments from departments affected by new course

Email this form and syllabus to UGPC@fau.edu one week before the UGPC meeting.

GRADUATE COLLEGE

UFS

Posted

NOV 0 1 2017

Minimum qualifications needed to teach

Member of the FAU graduate faculty

Julia Higgs, jhiggs@fau.edu, 954-815-9396

and has a terminal degree in the subject area (or a closely related field.)

Faculty Contact/Email/Phone

1. Course title/number, number of credit hours		
100 700 6	2 11.1	
ACG 7886 Survey of	3 credit hours	
Archival Accounting		
Research		
2. Course prerequisites,	co-requisites, and where the course fits in the program of study	
Requirements : Admissi	on to the business PhD, Executive Concentration	
Requirements. Admissi	on to the business ind, executive concentration	
3. Course logistics		
or course registres		
TBA		
4. Instructor contact inf	formation	
Instructor's name	Julia Higgs, PhD	
Office address	Kaye Hall 124	
Office Hours	TBA	
Contact telephone	561-297-3663	
number	Jhigggs@fau.edu	
Email address		
5. TA contact informati	on	
TA's name	TBA	
Office address		
Office Hours		
Contact telephone		
number		
Email address		
6. Course description		
This saves is a surround	Combined and the combin	
	f archival accounting research for executive doctoral candidates. The	
	hival accounting research methods and topics that are likely to be of	
include earnings quality	ng a PhD. Methods include simple regression and event studies. Topics audit quality, audit fees and executive compensation.	
7 Course objectives/stu	dent learning outcomes/program outcomes	p.
7. Course objectives/stu	dent learning outcomes/program outcomes	
Course objectives	After taking this course, students will have the following skills	
com se cojecures	Ability to access the Warton Research Data Services (WRDS)	
	and obtain financial statement information from Compustat;	
	ability to create tables with descriptive statistics and	
	correlation matrices using the WRDS data.	
	Understanding measures of financial reporting quality and	
	ability to calculate abnormal accruals.	
	Use an event study methodology using CRSP to test an	
	accounting or auditing event. GRADUATE	COLLEGE

NOV 01 2017

- Use of regression to create and interpret an audit fee model using Compustat and Audit Analytics data. Access Boardex data and use it in a simple analysis.

  - Complete the Kinney three paragraphs on an archival topic.
- Write a literature review on an archival topic.

- Develop a research proposal on an archival topic.
- Develop a statistical model for testing the topic developed in the research proposal.
- Ability to critique an archival research workpaper.

### 8. Course evaluation method

Download of Compustat data from WRDS;	
completion of descriptive statistics and	
correlation analysis	10%
Calculation of Abnormal Accruals	10%
Calculation of Audit Fee model	10%
Event Study Assignment	10%
Boardex Assignment	10%
Participation	10%
Critique of research/working paper	10%
Literature review	10%
Kinney three paragraphs, Research proposal	20%
and survey/research instrument	

## 9. Course grading scale

Α	92-100
<b>A-</b>	90-91.99
B+	88-89.99
В	82-87.99
B-	80-81.99
C+	78-79.99
C	70-77.99
D	60-69.99
F	Below 60

## 10. Policy on makeup tests, late work, and incompletes

Late Work will only be accepted for a valid (sickness, extreme circumstances) and documented reason. Incompletes will only be given if the student is making a B or better at the time the incomplete is requested.

## 11. Special course requirements

## 12. Classroom etiquette policy

University policy requires that in order to enhance and maintain a productive atmosphere for

education, personal communication devices, such as cellular phones and laptops, are to be disabled in class sessions. Students should always be respectful of others and constructive in critiques of others' work.

## 13. Disability policy statement

In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), students who require special accommodations due to a disability to properly execute coursework must register with the Office for Students Accessibility Services (SAS) located in Boca Raton campus, SU 133 (561) 297-3880 and follow all SAS procedures.

# 14. Honor code policy

Students at Florida Atlantic University are expected to maintain the highest ethical standards. Academic dishonesty is considered a serious breach of these ethical standards, because it interferes with the university mission to provide a high quality education in which no student enjoys unfair advantage over any other. Academic dishonesty is also destructive of the university community, which is grounded in a system of mutual trust and place high value on personal integrity and individual responsibility. Harsh penalties are associated with academic dishonesty. See University Regulation 4.001 at

www.fau.edu/regulations/chapter4/4.001 Code of Academic Integrity.pdf

### 15. Required texts/reading

See Weekly Readings

## 16. Supplementary/recommended readings

## 17. Course topical outline, including dates for exams/quizzes, papers, completion of reading

## Week 1:

Kothari, S. P. "Capital markets research in accounting." *Journal of accounting and economics* 31, no. 1 (2001): 105-231.

Richard Frankel, and Charles Lee. 1998. Accounting valuation, market expectation, and crosssectional stock returns. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 25: 283-319.

Ohlson, James A. 2001. Earnings, book values, and dividends in equity valuation: An empirical perspective. *Contemporary Accounting Research* 18 (1): 107-120.

### Week 2: Discretionary Accruals

Kothari, Sagar P., Andrew J. Leone, and Charles E. Wasley. "Performance matched discretionary accrual measures." *Journal of accounting and economics* 39, no. 1 (2005): 163-197.

Becker, Connie L., Mark L. DeFond, James Jiambalvo, and K. R. Subramanyam. "The effect of audit quality on earnings management." *Contemporary accounting research* 15, no. 1

(1998): 1-24.

- Dechow, Patricia M., Richard G. Sloan, and Amy P. Sweeney. "Detecting earnings management." *Accounting review* (1995): 193-225.
- DeFond, M.L., and J. Jiambalvo. 1994. Debt covenant violation and manipulation of accruals. Journal of Accounting and Economics 17, 145-176.

WRDS and Compustat assignment due

### Week 3: Earnings Quality

- DeFond, M. 2010. Earnings quality research: Advances, challenges and future research. Journal of Accounting and Economics 50: 402-409.
- Cohen, D., A. Dey, and T. Lys. 2008. Real and accrual-based earnings management in the pre and post-Sarbanes-Oxley periods. *The Accounting Review* 83 (3): 757-787.
- McVay, S. 2006. Earnings management using classification shifting: An examination of core earnings and special items. *The Accounting Review* 81: 501 531.
- Bartov, E., D. Givoly, and C. Hayn. 2002. The rewards for meeting-or-beating earnings expectations. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 33, 173 204.

### Week 4: Event Studies

- Jan. 19 Week 2: Stephen Brown, and Jerold B. Warner. 1985. Using daily stock returns: The case of event studies. *Journal of Financial Economics* 14 (1): 3-31.
- Wayne R. Landsman, Edward L. Maydew, and Jacob R. Thornock, 2012. The information content of annual earnings announcements and mandatory adoption of IFRS. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 53 (1–2): 34-54
- Palmrose, Z.-V., V. Richardson, and S. Scholz. 2004. Determinants of market reactions to restatement announcements. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 37 (1): 59–89.
- Menon, Krishnagopal, and David D. Williams. "Investor reaction to going concern audit reports." *The Accounting Review* 85, no. 6 (2010): 2075-2105.

### Abnormal Accrual Assignment Due

### Week 5: Audit Quality

- DeAngelo, Linda Elizabeth. "Auditor size and audit quality." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 3, no. 3 (1981): 183-199.
- W. Robert Knechel, Gopal V. Krishnan, Mikhail Pevzner, Lori B. Shefchik, and Uma K. Velury (2013) Audit Quality: Insights from the Academic Literature. *AUDITING: A Journal of Practice & Theory*: 2013, Vol. 32, No. Supplement 1, pp. 385-421.

- Higgs, Julia L., and Terrance R. Skantz. "Audit and nonaudit fees and the market's reaction to earnings announcements." *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory* 25, no. 1 (2006): 1-26.
- Cao, Jian, Feng Chen, and Julia L. Higgs. "Late for a very important date: financial reporting and audit implications of late 10-K filings." *Review of Accounting Studies* 21, no. 2 (2016): 633-671.
- Carol Callaway Dee, Ayalew Lulseged, and Tianming Zhang (2015) Who Did the Audit? Audit Quality and Disclosures of Other Audit Participants in PCAOB Filings. *The Accounting Review*: September 2015, Vol. 90, No. 5, pp. 1939-1967.

### Critique of Working Paper Due

### Week 6: Audit Fees

- Whisenant, Scott, Srinivasan Sankaraguruswamy, and Kannan Raghunandan. "Evidence on the joint determination of audit and nonlaudit fees." *Journal of Accounting Research* 41, no. 4 (2003): 721-744.
- DeFond, Mark L., Kannan Raghunandan, and K. R. Subramanyam. "Do non-audit service fees impair auditor independence? Evidence from going concern audit opinions." *Journal of Accounting Research* 40, no. 4 (2002): 1247-1274.
- Blay, Allen D., and Marshall A. Geiger. "Auditor fees and auditor independence: Evidence from going concern reporting decisions." *Contemporary Accounting Research* 30, no. 2 (2013): 579-606.
- Dickins, Denise, and Julia Higgs. "Interpretation and use of auditor fee disclosures." *Financial Analysts Journal* 61, no. 3 (2005): 96-102.
- Gotti, Giorgio, Sam Han, Julia L. Higgs, and Tony Kang. "Managerial Stock Ownership, Analyst Coverage, and Audit Fee." *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance* 27, no. 3 (2012): 412-437.

### Event Study Replication due

### Week 7: Executive Compensation

- Healy, Paul M. "The effect of bonus schemes on accounting decisions." *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 7, no. 1 (1985): 85-107.
- Kannan, Yezen H., Terrance R. Skantz, and Julia L. Higgs. "The impact of CEO and CFO equity incentives on audit scope and perceived risks as revealed through audit fees." *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory* 33, no. 2 (2014): 111-139.
- Francesco Bova, Kalin Kolev, Jacob K. Thomas, and X. Frank Zhang (2015) Non-Executive Employee Ownership and Corporate Risk. *The Accounting Review*: January 2015, Vol. 90, No. 1, pp. 115-145.

Audit Fee Model Assignment Due

### Week 8: Corporate Governance

- DeFond, M., R. Hann and X. Hu. "Does the Market Value Financial Expertise on Audit Committees of Boards of Directors?" *Journal of Accounting Research* 43 (2005): 153-193.
- Julia L. Higgs, Robert Pinsker, Thomas Smith, and George Young (2016) The Relationship Between Board-Level Technology Committees and Reported Security Breaches. *Journal of Information Systems* In-Press.
- Matthew J. Beck and Elaine G. Mauldin (2014) Who's Really in Charge? Audit Committee versus CFO Power and Audit Fees. *The Accounting Review*: November 2014, Vol. 89, No. 6, pp. 2057-2085.
- Liesbeth Bruynseels and Eddy Cardinaels (2014) The Audit Committee: Management Watchdog or Personal Friend of the CEO? *The Accounting Review*: January 2014, Vol. 89, No. 1, pp. 113-145.

### Literature Review Due

Week 9: Sarbanes-Oxley

- John L. Campbell, James Hansen, Chad A. Simon, and Jason L. Smith (2015) Audit Committee Stock Options and Financial Reporting Quality after the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002. AUDITING: A Journal of Practice & Theory: May 2015, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 91-120.
- Jonathan S. Pyzoha (2015) Why do Restatements Decrease in a Clawback Environment? An Investigation into Financial Reporting Executives' Decision-Making during the Restatement Process. *The Accounting Review:* November 2015, Vol. 90, No. 6, pp. 2515-2536.
- Abernathy, John L., Michael Barnes, and Chad Stefaniak. "A summary of 10 years of PCAOB research: What have we learned?." *Journal of Accounting Literature* 32, no. 1 (2013): 30-60.
- Jacqueline S. Hammersley, Linda A. Myers, and Jian Zhou (2012) The Failure to Remediate Previously Disclosed Material Weaknesses in Internal Controls. *AUDITING: A Journal of Practice & Theory:* May 2012, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 73-111.

### **Boardex Assignment Due**

Week 10: Disclosures

- Anne Beyer, Daniel Cohen, Thomas Lys, Beverly Walther. 2010. The financial reporting environment: Review of the recent literature. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 50 (2–3): 296–343.
- Rogers, J., and P. Stocken. 2005. Credibility of management forecasts. *The Accounting Review* 80 (4): 1233–1260.
- Brochet, F., Faurel, L. and Mcvay, S. 2011. Manager-specific effects on earnings guidance: An analysis of top executive turnovers. *Journal of Accounting Research* 49: 1123–1162.
- Ali, Ashiq, Klasa, Sandy, and Yeung, P. Eric. 2014. Industry Concentration and Corporate Disclosure Policy. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 58 (2-3): 240-264.

Final Research proposal and instrument due

1. Students will be required to develop an original research idea into a workable proposal.

Research proposal: Motivate the topic, explain why it is important, develop a theoretical structure and hypotheses, and then describe in detail the model you would use to carry out a test of those hypotheses (focus on the basic setting and any key control variables).

Simplicity is a virtue in design. It is often the case that ideas sound great until one tries to implement them, so do not get overly complex or complicated. This project should provide insights into the problems that one faces when attempting to examine even simple ideas, and thus enhance your ability to understand and evaluate the literature. A quality proposal can be developed in 15 typed and double-spaced pages or less. Also include a 200-word abstract with your proposal. Key quality criteria are: creativity and innovation, strength of motivation, organization, and concern for validity in the experimental design.

## Critical analysis items to consider when reading articles

(Adapted from Dana Hermanson who adapted from Bud Fenema. Also see Ashton 1998)

## **Introduction and Motivation**

Is the research question clearly articulated?
Is the question interesting (does it pass the "so what" test)?

### Theory and Hypothesis

Does the literature review support the study? Is the theory clearly stated? Do the hypotheses flow from the theory? Are the hypotheses adequate to answer the research question?

### Method

What is the design?
Are the variables (IVs and DVs) operationalized in a way that will test the theory?
Are there any confounds?
Are there adequate control variables?
Are the subjects appropriate?
Is there external validity?

### Results

Were adequate statistical procedures used? Are the results able to allow for conclusions about the proposed hypotheses?

### Conclusion

Has the research question been answered? Is it clear what we have learned? Are there any limitations?

### Overall

Is the study clearly written?
Is the paper organized well?
Are the introduction and conclusion linked?