Southern Connecticut State University

FACULTY SENATE

[December 3, 2025] | 12:10 p.m. | via Zoom

To join the meeting, please click here to be connected via Zoom. Alternatively, copy and paste this link:
https://southernct-edu.zoom.us/j/7847828474?omn=86729842970

Table of Contents

AY 2025-2026
Full Faculty Senate Meetings: 8/27, 9/17, 10/1, 10/15, 10/29, 11/12, 12/3, 1/28, 2/11, 2/25, 3/11, 4/1, 4/15, 4/29, 5/6
Standing Committee Meetings: 9/3, 9/10, 9/24, 10/8, 10/22, 11/5, 11/19, 1/21, 2/4, 2/18, 3/4, 3/25, 4/8, 4/22

The AI tool Fireflies.ai is used to facilitate note taking and the writing of the minutes. For more information, please reach out to the Secretary of the Faculty Senate.

Southern Connecticut State University

FACULTY SENATE

The Faculty Senate has as its goal a University community that promotes to the fullest the free transmission of knowledge and pursuit of truth. *Faculty Senate is the representative body of the faculty. Its primary function is to serve as the agency by which the faculty can actively participate in the governance and policy-making decisions of the University on the basis of the principle of shared authority.*

AGENDA

11/12/25
12:10 p.m. | via Zoom
To join the meeting, please click here to be connected via Zoom. Alternatively, copy and paste this link:
https://southernct-edu.zoom.us/j/7847828474?omn=86729842970

I.   Announcements Relevant to the Faculty Senate

II. Approval of Minutes of the Previous Meeting held on November 12, 2025

III. Faculty Senate President's Report

IV. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees
   a. Academic Policy
   b. Finance
   c. Personnel Policy
   d. Rules
   e. Student Policy
   f. Technology

V. Reports of Faculty Senate Special Committees
   a. UCF
   b. Graduate Council
   c. Elections Officers

VI. Reports from Faculty Senate Representatives

VII. Report from SCSU-AAUP Representative

VIII. Report from FAC Representative

IX.. Unfinished Business

IX. New Business

a. Resolution for the Continuation of Faculty Participation in the Oversight of the Faculty Evaluation Digital Processes & Coordination

b. Resolution Regarding Revisions to Procedures for Forming a Department Evaluation Committee

c. Disapproved Resolutions- Revisions to Sabbatical Leave Document, Revisions to FCARG Document

X. Guests
  a. Provost Irwin
  b. Meredith Sinclair
  c. Kari Swanson

Southern Connecticut State University

FACULTY SENATE

UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF [11/12/2025]

https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings
The 1st Meeting of the Faculty Senate AY 2025-2026 was held on 08/27/25, at 12:10 p.m. via Zoom.

Attendance

FIRST	LAST	DEPARTMENT	TERM ENDS (SPRING)	ATTENDANCE	TOTAL
Dave	Allen	Accounting	2028	x	4/4
Valerie	Andrushko	Anthropology	2026	x	5/6
Jeff	Slomba	Art & Design	2027	x	6/6
Jessica	Case	Athletics	2026	x	5/5
Nicholas	Edgington	Biology	2026	x	6/6
Kate	Toskin	Business Information Systems	2028	x	6/6
Jeff	Webb	Chemistry & Biochemistry	2026	x	6/6
Shawneen	Buckley	Communication Disorders	2027	x	6/6
Melanie	Savelli	Communication, Media & Screen Studies	2028	x	6/6
Aashma	Uprety	Computer Science	2028	x	6/6
Matthew	Ouimet	Counseling	2027	x	5/6
Laurie	Bonjo	Counseling & School Psychology	2026	x	4/6
Maria	Diamantis	Curriculum and Learning	2027	x	6/6
Jennifer	Cooper Boemmels	Earth Science	2027	x	6/6
Yu	Jia	Economics	2028	x	6/6
Peter	Madonia	Ed Leadership	2027	x	3/6
Paul	Petrie	English	2026	x	6/6
Mike	Shea	English	2026		4/6
Eric	West	Environment, Geography, & Marine Sciences	2027	x	5/6
Sandip	Dutta	Finance & Real Estate	2028		2/6
Amanda	Strong	Healthcare Systems and Innovation	2028	x	6/6
Matthew	Rothbard	Health & Movement Sciences	2028	x	6/6
Daniel	Swartz	Health & Movement Sciences	2028	x	5/6
Christine	Petto	History	2028	x	6/6
Troy	Rondinone	History	2026	x	6/6
Yan	Liu	Information & Library Sciences	2026	x	5/6
Cindy	Simoneau	Journalism	2028	x	6/6
Amy	Jansen	Library Services	2028		5/6
Zheni	Wang	Management & International Business	2028	x	6/6
Melvin	Prince	Marketing	2026		0/6

First	Last	Department	Year	Present	Attendance
Seon	Kim	Marriage & Family Therapy	2026	x	4/4
Leah	Sturman	Mathematics	2027	x	6/6
Danial	Cicala	Mathematics	2027	x	6/6
Natalie	Starling	Mental Health Services	2026	x	6/6
Sameer	Ramchandra	Music	2028	x	4/4
Deborah	Morrill	Nursing	2026	x	6/6
Elizabeth	Hurlbert	Nursing	2027	x	6/6
Selin	Doganalp	Part-Time Faculty	2025	x	2/2
Noah	Goldsher	Part-Time Faculty	2025	x	2/2
Shenira	Billups	Part-Time Faculty	2027	x	4/6
Mike	Sanger	Part-Time Faculty	2027		2/6
Rex	Gilliland	Philosophy	2026	x	6/6
Evan	Finch	Physics	2027		5/6
Jonathan	Wharton	Political Science	2028	x	6/6
		Psychology	2025		
Patricia	Kahlbaugh	Psychology	2025	x	6/6
John	Nwangwu	Public Health	2027	x	6/6
Michael	Dodge	Recreation, Tourism, & Sport Management	2027	x	5/5
Isabel	Logan	Social Work	2028		2/4
Stephen Monroe	Tomczak	Social Work	2028	x	6/6
Gregory	Adams	Sociology	2026	x	4/6
Kristy	Hynes	Inclusive Education & Behavior Science	2027	x	5/5
Douglas	Macur	Theatre	2027		2/6
Tricia	Lin	Women's & Gender Studies	2028		5/6
		World Languages & Literatures	2026		
Joan	Weir	SCSU Faculty Senate President	2026	x	6/6
Sandra	Bulmer	Interim SCSU President			3/6
Venezia	Michalson	Chair, Graduate Council			4/6
Tricia	Lin	Chair, Graduate Council			5/6
Meredith	Sinclair	Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Form		x	4/6
William	Moroz	SGA			4/6

GUESTS

Anastasia Sorokina
Trevor Brolliar
Virginia Metaxas
Karla Jones
Nina Cote
Jessica Paquette
Dale Bodyk
John Maduko
Robert Yanez
Kari Swanson
Dyan Robinson

The following senators are empowered by the Faculty Senate to represent the Faculty Senate and thereby represent the faculty body in their role and contributions to the respective committee/group in which shared governance of business is being conducted with a duty to report back to the Faculty Senate minimally once per semester (additional reports determined by the respective representative or upon request by the Faculty Senate). It is recommended that representatives also seek the Faculty Senate's support and endorsement for matters determined by the respective representative or upon request by the Faculty Senate.

Faculty Senate Representation	Faculty Senate Representative(s)
Ad Hoc Committee on AI Use for Faculty	Amy Jansen Elizabeth Hurlbert
Ad Hoc Committee for Formalizing Faculty Advising	Michael Shea Stephen Monroe Tomczak Virginia/Ginny Metaxas Jeffrey Webb
Administrative Faculty Senate	1 Representative needed.
Commencement Planning Committees	Maria Diamantis
DEI Advisory Council	Laurie Bonjo
Early College Experience	1 Representative needed
Faculty Development Advisory Committee (FDAC)	1 Representative needed
Search: Blackboard Administrator Search Committee	Doug Macur
Search: Chief Information Officer (CIO) Search Committee	Matt Rothbard
Search: Chief Marketing and Communications Officer	1 Representative needed.
Search: Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs	1 Representative needed.
Search: Vice President of Institutional Advancement	1 Representative needed.
University Space Committee	1 Unfilled
Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF) liaison	Cindy Simoneau
University Budget Committees	Cindy Simoneau Jennifer Cooper-Boemmels
University Library Committee (ULC)	Amy Jansen 1 Representative Unfilled
Use of Independent Study Committee (need correct name)	Rex Gilliland Natalie Starling

<div align="center">**Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes**</div>

November 12th, 2025

Faculty Senate President Joan Weir called the meeting to order at 12:10 p.m. Quorum Confirmed by Shawneen Buckley, Secretary.

Announcements: None

Minutes review/approval

- Minutes of the previous meeting held on October 29, 2025 were accepted as distributed. **https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings**

Faculty Senate President's Reports:
- Please access at: **https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings**

Presidents Report:
- No comments/questions

Standing Committees

Academic Policy:
- None

Finance:
- Note that there is still a backlog with travel but if anyone is experiencing delays, please reach out to the travel department.

Personnel Policy:
- None

Rules:
- None

Student Policy
- None

Technology:
- None

Special Committees:

UCF:
- Comment from Cindy Simoneau: Meredith agreed to continue leading UCF this fall, but they are looking for a new UCF Co-Chair to then transition to Chair on this committee. This comes with academic credit.

Grad Council:
- No update

Elections:

- Announcement seeking P&T Committee member needed. Someone had to drop from the Committee so please consider being on this committee

AAUP:
- Kari Swanson noted that tomorrow's bargaining session was cancelled. Next sessions are Thursdays; December 4 and 18. For more info, see the "table talk" or the contract website. Save the date: Holiday party: Thursday 11:30 – 1 December 11.
- Question: Patty Kahlbaugh is on the agenda to update her department about bargaining. You can discuss bargaining with AAUP members but not with the press.

Guests:

Chancellor Maduko, CSU Interim Chancellor joined the meeting.
- The role of the system of office is to promote, advocate, and elevate their institutions.
- Trust building is needed.
- Compliance with key areas such as p-cards and overall numbers is critical, not to the mission of the institutions but as a foundation for functioning, so there is clarity, continuity, and collaboration.
- He has been meeting with the presidents to learn what they are focusing on to bring to the system office and board.
- A couple of workgroups/committees have been established, including the HR-1 to ensure they gather insight and concerns. And to identify financial needs when the federal government requirements do not align with the state.
- Transparency Council: repair credibility and trust issues. Internal and external stakeholders will be included to lend knowledge to help dispel the mistrust that may be present both internally and externally.
- What is happening in DC is averse to higher education. Lots still being figured out. There are many areas in higher ed that are not ready. However, at the state level, no cuts etc. have been brought up at this time. The threat to Medicaid is 24% of the state budget which is very significant. The effect of significant cuts to this program will result in monetary challenges to the state. The domino effect of this will be significant.
- Our collective colleges/universities are essential second to no one. 90% of our students are from CT and stay in CT. We need to emphasize this. We do not focus on excluding people, we emphasize including folks. UConn and the independent colleges in CT are focused on CT residents, therefore, we do not need to prop up students from other states, we need to keep students in CT. Everything is academic and workforce preparation. Mentioned Students and engineers as critical to future workforce as we look at baby boomers retiring in large numbers. There needs to be a working relationship in CT with the state schools.
- Question: In the transparency council, who might the external stakeholders be that are included. One example includes people in the media.
- Question: How will people be selected for the committees/councils. He will reach out to a diverse group of people: he noted that he wants these groups to be active and effective so will not have too many people. More to come by the end of the year.
- Question: people who did nothing wrong are 'suffering" so is there something that can be done at the system office to help this situation. He noted that this caused a great deal of harm of trust with legislators. Therefore, they are putting very tight procedures in place. They are required to report to the state on the provisions that have been put in place. Presidents take the lead at the universities, and he has the responsibility at the system level. We are being mandated to put systems in place, and must demonstrate compliance.

- Question: Are you structuring the processes so they are set up at the institutional level? He mentioned that there are compliance officer and that person and the Chancellor are responsible for making sure this is done. The universities then put the systems in place at their institutions.
- Comment: Dave Allen indicated that he appreciates how the Chancellor is going about these solutions.
- Question: NECHE standards are in draft form regarding changes that have resulted in many reactions in New England. We have the autonomy to submit our reasons as individuals, institutional bodies, etc. The voting members of NECHE will decide ultimately but it is important to hear from everyone. Voice concerns directly to NECHE.
- Question: The last BOD meetings were at our sister universities- is the BOR planning to have one of their meetings at Southern. The next meeting is set for Central but he thinks the meeting after that may be at SCSU.
- Question: Anticipatory Compliance concept- people are concerned about "what ifs" Is there discussion about a planned response if and when that occurs from the system office in the event that a directive comes from the federal level, even if the details of a plan cannot be shared but is a plan if this does occur. There has been nothing from the Federal level at this time. All six institutions are in different places with regard to some of these issues. There is not consensus at this time so it is hard to have a specific stance from the System office. He emphasized that we need to be consistent with our values, but these vary by institution. There have been conversations about these issues with representatives at the state government. The reality is we are funded by state and federal dollars so there are various views on how to proceed. Harm has been inflicted by the Federal Administration that harmed students as a result of challenges to the Federal government in other states. He continues to encourage people to speak up, stay informed. Federal legislators are also unsure what the best path is going forward. There is no pre-comply charge at this time. The power of academic freedom is strong and he values this ideal. He emphasized that he serves the system and not the other way around. Let him know what we expect of him to cultivate the greatness of our institutions.

Nina Cote and Dale Bodyk from the Travel Office joined the meeting.
- They have been giving trainings which are all posted online.
- They are hiring for a new person in Travel.
- Currently with that void, several of the employees are sharing the work
- They have been continuing the drop in sessions each Friday where people can have their requests be reviewed in person.
- Timeline for Reimbursements: 8 weeks to process, 1-2 weeks to send payments.
  - Enroll in direct deposit for travel to speed up receipt of payments.
  - This is a separate process and separate from payroll.
  - Vendors can enroll as well.
- Backlog: Fastest way to process is for submissions to be error free that includes ONLY necessary information without extra info. For example, mileage- they need to see the mileage, and not every turn taken. Nina and Dale are very accessible so reach out!
- Question: What is the status of automation of all forms? AAUP members have access to Docusign currently. From there, she is not sure where it will go from there. They are considering a new system they are implementing now called Jaggar and hope to use that system for travel. In the meantime, They will revert back to paper. Docusign is still working and enabled for AAUP. One person mentioned that the link is disabled. Nina will look into this.
- Question: If one uses "Sandits" as your travel agent but now, you will still need to pay. There is no method for payment to go directly from Sandits. The system is looking into preferred partners but no decisions have been made as yet.

Unfinished Business:
    <u>**Rules Committee Resolution:**</u>

Paul Petrie summarized changes in detail for all recommended changes and made two amendments to the document included in the packet. The following is a brief summary of the proposed changes and discussion:

- *Committee Make-up*

Change to the make-up of the FCARG committee regarding the number of members required for the committee. Question raised regarding requiring an odd number of members versus an even number however it was decided to stay with the language as proposed.

⇒ **Amendment:** Vote on Amendment to this FCARG language: voice vote held with no objections.
- *Performance Period:*

Change to remove the specific dates in the document and inform Deans of the application.

- Procedures for Review of Proposals section was reviewed.

The current system has a level one review with a yes/no vote on each application with no stated criteria. The Rules Committee suggested this was unnecessary. Question noted as to whether that first step might have been related to the application conforming to the requirements of the application. It was noted that this is not what that level was used for and that that step is included in the newly proposed process. It was noted that you can apply for different types of funds via FCARG. Concerns were voiced regarding including the budged information in the application since it is not supposed to be considered when awarding these grants.

Also, previously, the university paid the fringe associated with the grant. The budget information is therefore removed from the application process and is provided later in the process. Question: if grant is spent on equipment, the university owns the monies.

Similarly, concerns were raised about the distribution of awards to determine if there was bias toward/against on segment of the university or other. The Procedures for Reporting Award Competition Results section was added so that the data may be publicly available and examined over a period of years. This information will be posted on the Faculty Development Website. This information will also be shared with the applicants including their ranking regarding all of the applicants. Question raised regarding the removal of the 1-5 rating system that was used internally in the past. This person will not get specific information about what was specifically weak or strong about the process.

⇒ **Amendment:** Discussion regarding where the information should be posted to remove the requirement to add to the university website. Proposed removing the specific language as to where the information will be posted.
   o **Amendment** to remove the language related to where the information is be posted was ***approved*** via voice vote.

- *Summary of other changes:*

Moved several items in the document to insure alignment with the process as defined within said document.

- **Discussion** regarding the public sharing of rankings. Clarification provided that the rankings would not be shared publicly. Instead, an individual's ranking would only be shared in the letter to the applicant.

Motion to approve the FCARG resolution as amended made and seconded.
Vote conducted. Motion to approve the resolution was unanimously approved.

New Business:
None

Adjournment: The meeting adjourned at 1:56 pm.

Dr. Shawneen Buckley
Secretary

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Resolution Regarding:
Revisions to the Change to the Faculty Creative Activity Research Grants (FCARG)
document and forms

Whereas,	Southern Connecticut State University exists for the primary purpose of furthering academic excellence,
Whereas,	The SCSU Faculty Senate is the official representative body of the Academic Faculty; and
Whereas,	The Faculty Senate is responsible for making changes to the Faculty Creative Activity Research Grants (FCARG) document and forms; now, therefore, be it

Resolved,	That the following revisions to the FCARG document and forms become effective for academic year 2026-27:
	
	 1. Provision allowing understaffed committee (p.1).
	 2. Applications made available to Deans, for informational purposes only (p.1).
	 3. Revisions to University Grants Committee's applicant ranking process:
	      a. Eliminate Level One Review (criteria-less yes/no vote on applications before they enter the pool of applications to be evaluated and ranked by the committee) (p.2);
	      b. Eliminate prescribed points system for ranking applications, leaving it to the committee to determine internally its own methods for ranking applications in accordance with the published evaluation criteria (p.2);
	 4. Specified information to be included in notification of FCARG awards to applicant and to university (p.3).
	 5. Standardization of terminology referring to applications having multiple co-applicants (p.3 ff.)
	 6. Modification of award types, restoring $2500 award regardless of type of award (stipend-only, equipment-only ("spending account"), combination (p. 4).
	 7. Modification of budgetary information reporting process, moving it out of evaluation stage to after applicant ranking (p. 4).
	 8. Moved "proposal checklist" and "final report" instructions out of "Proposal Components" section to appropriate later sections of document (p. 5).

Final Draft with revisions made during 11/12 Senate Meeting

Project Performance Period: July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026
Submit in Kuali Build

General Provisions

These guidelines are intended to guide application and distribution of the research grant fund created by Faculty Senate Resolution S-10-03, Proposal Concerning University Support of Creative Activity, approved April 26, 2010/revised November 9, 2011, and March 26, 2020.

Composition of the University Grants Committee

Faculty Creative Activity Research Grants (FCARG) are screened by a University Grants Committee, comprising 7 elected faculty members: three 3) from the College of Arts and Sciences; one (1) from the College of Education; one (1) from the College of Health and Human Services; one (1) from the School of Business, and one (1) at-large member.

There shall be three alternate members elected by the faculty. Alternates shall take the place of voting members under the following circumstances:
      a. when a voting member is applying for a FCARG that year; or,
      b. when a voting member resigns; or,
      c. under other circumstances, such as prolonged absence, as evaluated by the committee.

In the event that, at the time the committee must begin its work, an insufficient number of faculty members have been elected to fully staff the committee, the committee shall be empowered to conduct its work with fewer than 7 members but no fewer than 5 members.

Statement on Applicant Eligibility

FCARG applicants must be tenured or tenure-track members of the faculty and should intend to remain on the faculty for the duration of the grant-supported activity, including the project reporting phase. If the position is vacated during the period of the grant-supported activity, the awardee will be required to repay the grant to the University. Faculty receiving or applying for CSU-AAUP Research Grants are eligible to apply, as are faculty planning sabbatical leaves. A member of the University Grants Committee may not serve on the committee during a year when applying for a FCARG.

A faculty member may apply for a grant while on unpaid leave. However, an awardee who takes unpaid leave for more than one semester during the performance period must apply to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to be approved to retain the grant. If the member does not apply, or if the Executive Committee denies the request, the member must repay any amount of the grant already received.

Performance Period
Application is made in the fall semester of each *academic* year for grant funding in the *following fiscal* year. The fiscal year is the *performance period*). ~~Applications will be made in the spring AY2024-2025 semester for application for FY2026 funding.~~

Application Availability

Applications shall be made available to the school/college deans for informational, non-evaluative purposes at the time they become available to the FCARG committee.

Guidelines

These guidelines detail the following aspects of the competition: Funding Priorities; Proposal Review Criteria; Procedures for Review of the Proposals by the University Grants Committee; Proposal Components and Rules for Submission; Final Report from awardees and Calendar.

Funding Priorities

The program seeks quality proposals that enhance the educational mission, visibility, and research stature of Southern Connecticut State University. For the purposes of this grant competition a broad definition of research is adopted. Research is defined as any scholarship activity which results in one or more of the following: 1) the creation of new knowledge in a particular discipline, including making connections across traditional fields (i.e., multidisciplinary research); 2) the application of disciplinary/multidisciplinary knowledge, methodologies, and/or insights to problems of individuals or groups in the broader society; 3) the production of creative works in the arts; and 4) research in student learning within a discipline or area of learning. Curriculum development and faculty development projects will not be funded by the FCARG program; projects in those areas are best suited for programs supported under sections 9.6 and 10.6.5 of the CSU-AAUP contract.

In addition, proposals submitted to this research program should take into account one or more of the following aspects of faculty research:
1. Establish new research (in the broad definition of the previous paragraph) at the university;
2. Support faculty in the continuation and completion of meritorious research;
3. Encourage the development of projects with potential for external funding.

Proposal Review Criteria

The University Grants Committee shall use the following criteria to rate the quality and completeness of the proposals submitted:
1. Significance: Presentation of a well-focused and worthy purpose in the context of previous research.
2. Work Plan: An appropriate and feasible methodology and a plan of action and/or conditions that will result in the accomplishment of the objectives of the project in the context of the particular area of research. The plan must be appropriate to the nature and area of research described in the proposal and may include a timeline accordingly.
3. Outcomes: Likelihood of achieving significant outcomes such as publications in refereed journals, conference presentations, performances, exhibitions, or other means of dissemination of research results. Submission of a proposal to an external agency for funding is a legitimate and encouraged outcome.

Procedures for Review of the Proposals by the University Grants Committee

Faculty Creative Activity Research Grant proposals are reviewed by the University Grants Committee in a ~~three-level~~ process that includes ~~screening, scoring,~~ evaluating and ranking the proposals according to the proposal review criteria listed above. ~~evaluating the budget.~~ To ensure that decisions are made based on merit, and not on financial impact, the Committee shall complete ~~screening and scoring~~ evaluation and ranking of applications ~~and then rank them in descending order~~ without considering the award type and budget (if any) submitted as part of the application (see below). Evaluation of budgets for applications with spending accounts shall not take place until after the ranking of applications has been completed, and shall be used only for the purpose of determining how many awards can be granted within the available FCARG funding for the current application cycle.

~~LEVEL-ONE REVIEW (SCREENING)~~

~~After full discussion and deliberation on grant applications using the criteria in Funding Priorities and Proposal Review Criteria, the committee shall conduct an initial yes/no vote on each grant application via secret ballot. Applications receiving a majority "yes" vote in the level-one review ballot shall constitute the pool of applications to be scored and ranked in the level-two review process (described below); applications receiving a majority "no" vote in the level-one review ballot shall be eliminated from further consideration.~~

~~LEVEL-TWO REVIEW (SCORING)~~

~~For each application remaining in the pool of active applications after level-one review, each member of the grants committee will be asked to assign a score from "1" for weak to "5" for excellent for each of the items 1 to 3 listed in the~~

~~Proposal Review Criteria section. The combined scores should produce a total proposal score ranging from a low of 21 to a high of 105. The University Grants Committee will meet to review and discuss these applications and scores as the basis for determining the final ranking according to which proposals are recommended for funding.~~

LEVEL-THREE REVIEW (BUDGET EVALUATION)

After applications have been ranked, the committee shall calculate the cost of each proposal according to the direct expenses listed and the fringe charged for stipends. The fringe rate will be obtained from the Office of the Provost ~~prior to the level-three review~~. The number of awards will be determined by how many applications, in order of rank, can be funded by the amount of the FCARG allocation established annually by the Provost in consultation with the Faculty Senate President.

Procedures for Reporting Award Competition Results

Deans of colleges/schools whose faculty are applying for an FCARG shall have access to the FCARG applications via Kuali Build, for non-evaluative informational purposes only.

The University Grants Committee shall include the following information in the letters to applicants indicating whether or not they have been awarded an FCARG, and the Committee shall report this information to the Faculty Senate, the Provost, and the Faculty Development office:
- number of applicants;
- distribution of applications by school/college and department;
- number of recommended awards;
- distribution of awards by school/college and department;
- the applicant's ranking among all applicants.

The Faculty Development office shall post ~~to its website, or an alternative accessible location,~~ annual and aggregated information concerning the first four items in the list above: number of applicants, distribution of applications by school/college and department, number of recommended awards, distribution of awards by school/college and department.

Proposal Components and Rules for Submission:

To be considered, grant proposals shall be submitted electronically via the Kuali Build Platform and must contain the following components and adhere to the following rules:

1. **Cover sheet with abstract**: Please use the exact format shown in Appendix A.1., which is also a guide for completing the Kuali Build application. This form will route electronically to the attention of each participating faculty member named as a ~~Co-Proposer~~ co-applicant.
2. **Proposal narrative**: The narrative shall be organized using headings 1 to 3 of the Proposal Review Criteria (Significance; Work Plan; Outcomes). The narrative should be limited to 1200 words in up to five pages of printed text using Times New Roman 12-point (or equivalent) font, in double-spaced paragraphs and one-inch page margins. For added space allocation permitted in joint proposals please see number 7 below. Cover page, curriculum vita(e), and other appendices do not count towards the narrative word and page limits. To maintain the page limit, appendices with graphics and similar elements are recommended only for cases when they are considered a crucial and necessary part of the application. Additional appendices may be attached at the writer's discretion and should be labeled Appendix B, C, etc. Optional appendices will not be scored, and reviewers will be free to judge their relevance in support of the narrative. Submissions are scored by a group of peer faculty who are not necessarily specialists in the specific discipline of the proposal. Therefore, the proposal should give enough specific information on the significance of the research and the soundness of the methodology in the context of the particular discipline to allow a reasonable review. A brief outline of related research undertaken by the applicant and/or others will help the reviewers understand the significance of the project.
3. **Award type and budget, where appropriate:**

   Award type. Awards are given in the amount of $2,500 per proposal. Awards may be received in one of three ways:
   a. as a stipend to support research time,
   b. as a spending account to support research materials, services and/or travel, or
   c. partly as a stipend and partly as a spending account, divided according to figures presented in the proposal.

The proposal must indicate which of the three types of awards is being sought.

Budget. Budgetary information required in the proposal is dependent on the type of award to be received:
a. For a stipend-only proposal, budgetary information is not required.
b. For a spending account-only proposal, a simple budget totaling no more than $2,500 is required. The budget must specify item(s) to be purchased, a brief rationale for each item, and the amount to be spent on each item.
c. For a combined stipend-spending account proposal, a budget, as described above, is required only for the spending-account portion of the requested award.

4. **Two-page curriculum vita(e)**: Please include brief vita(e) of no more than two pages highlighting educational background, professional experiences, and scholarly accomplishments of participant(s). Curriculum vita(e) in excess of the two-page limit per faculty will be disregarded.

5. **Human subjects and vertebrate animals**: Research involving either human subjects or the use of vertebrate animals must be indicated on the proposal cover sheet. Once a project is funded, the awardee(s) must seek approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for human research subjects or the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) for vertebrate animals. The appropriate committee should be contacted for information on submission procedures and timing. In no case should work with human beings or vertebrate animals as research subjects be undertaken until the proper approval is obtained. The review of the proposal will include notification to the university regarding the need for compliance according to the procedures mandated by the IRB or IACUC. Failure to obtain the proper approval may result in termination of the award and recovery of funding. Letters of approval from the IRB or IACUC must be attached to the final report.

6. **Joint proposal conditions**: A joint proposal may be submitted by two or more ~~members of the faculty~~ applicants and may be funded at the standard limit of $2,500 per proposal under the conditions specified above, including the stipulations in the Statement on Applicant Eligibility. A stipend awarded for a joint proposal shall be divided equally between or among the faculty who filed it. Joint proposals must specify the individual contributions and adequate level of participation by each of the faculty members participating in the collaboration. In order to allow space for this description, the five-page proposal limit is increased by one additional page (up to 240 additional words of double-spaced printed text) per additional faculty member participating in the collaboration.

7. **Number of proposals in which a given faculty participates: A faculty member may submit only one proposal (individually or collaboratively) during each application year.**

8. **Eligibility note: A faculty member receiving a CSU-AAUP Research grant is eligible to receive a FCARG.**

9. ~~**Proposal checklist: For your convenience, a proposal checklist is provided in Appendix A.2. Do not submit this form with your application.**~~

10. ~~**Final report: A final report highlighting the scholarly accomplishments resulting from the grant is due 90 days after the completion of the performance period for a funded project. Reports of joint projects must reflect the individual contributions of participating faculty members. Please submit using the reporting form in Kuali Build.**~~

Post-Grant-Completion Reporting:

Final report: A final report highlighting the scholarly accomplishments resulting from the grant is due 90 days after the completion of the performance period for a funded project. Reports of joint projects must reflect the individual contributions of participating faculty members. For a grant that included spending account expenditures (as opposed to a stipend), the final report must include an accounting of expenditures on the items specified in the proposal. Please submit using the reporting form in Kuali Build.

Important Notices

- **Proposals failing to adhere to any of the items, 1 ~~10~~ 8 above, will not be reviewed. Proposals may not be submitted via email.**

- **For your convenience, a proposal checklist is provided in Appendix A.2. Do not submit this ~~form~~ checklist with your application.**

- **Proposals will not be returned.**

- **Funded proposals may be made available for examination by interested parties.**

- **Please note that these awards must have a performance period of July 1, 2025 to June 30, 2026; please do not propose activities that will take place before or after these dates.**

- **A lack of compliance with programmatic or fiscal reporting requirements related to this program will be handled in accordance with University procedures.**

Academic Policy Committee (APC)

FS - Minutes of the Academic Policy Committee (APC)

Wednesday, November 19, 2925
12:10 – 2:00 pm - Online meeting via zoom
Meeting called to order at 12:14 by Maria

In attendance:

First Name	Last Name	Attendance	Total
Maria	Diamantis		**5/5**
Greg	Adams		**5/5**
Evan	Finch		**5/5**
John	Nwangwu		**5/5**
Rex	Gilliland		**5/5**
Zheni	Wang		**5/5**
Debbie	Morrill		**4/5**
Jia	Yu		**5/5**
Sandip	Dutta		**1/5**
Goldsher	Noah	•	**1/5**

Updates to Academic Misconduct – timeline, connect with ASC

- Chairperson to be determined. Guest visit- to be arranged- still pending

Develop Templates for Evaluation Letters from DECs & Department Chairpersons

- Templates for Evaluation Letters from DECs & Chairpersons bullet format of recommendations to be shared with DEC and Chairpersons to assist in the development of evaluation letters.
- Recommendations to be brought forward on its completion to the Senate as was the Statement for Service was presented as a Resolution for Information.

Bookstore & Textbook

Committee for the bookstore RFP work has been formed, and Maria Diamantis is representing the faculty. The group has not met but should be meeting soon.

Early College Credit

- Trudy was unable to attend the 11/19/25 meeting. Maria D will invite Trudy to a future meeting to give the APC an update on the FS revision approval process that occurred over the summer.

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Morrill

APC Co-Chair

11/09/25 Finance Committee Meeting:
Attendees: Nick Edgington BIO, Jennifer Cooper-Boemmels ESC, Jeff Webb CHE (Chair), Selin Doganalp (BUS-MKT)

We did not officially meet with a few members held up with other commitments. We did discuss via email who would represent the committee on the upcoming SCSU budget meeting Monday December 1st.

The chair also informed the committee of our new charge to explore a possible exception for International travel in cases where travel is limited and faculty cannot travel the day after the work has finished and has asked Administration about this issue with no word back received.

Travel $ update as of 11/28/25 -

FULL TIME		Budget	Expenses	Encumbranc	Balance
FY2026	AUP770	633,037.74	43,555.38	-	589,482.36
			11/28/2025		
PART TIME					
		Budget	Expenses		Balance
FY2026	AUP773	59,989.78	6,263.99	-	53,725.79
			11/28/2025		

1. Budget includes carryover as well as current year allocation.

----Dr. Jeffrey Webb --- FS Treasurer

FACULTY SENATE
PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE
Minutes

November 19, 2025

FIRST	LAST	DEPARTMENT	ATTENDANCE	TOTAL
Daniel	Cicala	Mathematics	X	6/6
Amy	Jansen (Co-Chair)	Library Services	X	6/6
Patricia	Kahlbaugh	Psychology	X	6/6
Tricia	Lin	Women's & Gender Studies	X	6/6
Mike	Shea	English	X	5/6
Natalie	Starling	Mental Health Sciences	X	6/6
Stephen Monroe	Tomczak (Co-Chair)	Social Work	X	5/6

12:13 pm
Minutes of November 5, 2025
Approved unanimously

OLD BUSINESS

- Discussion and further revisions to resolution to address faculty participation in Interfolio administration
    - o Committee made revisions and edits to language of resolution
    - o Established an alternate Coordinator role, which would allow for recusals or unforeseen circumstances
    - o Decision to hold off on revisions to updated Coordinator job description, will be a collaborative effort between Faculty Senate and Provost
    - o Resolution approved by PPC members

- Evaluator Responsibilities
    - o The committee crafted language for DEC procedures document and has conferred with AAUP with each new version of the procedures document.
    - o Language reviewed with AAUP: Co-chairs followed up with Gary Winfield and adjusted language to ensure that the newly revised language is clearer and still in agreement with the CBA.
    - o Resolution and procedures were combined and approved by members.
    - o Co-chairs will pass draft by AAUP once more before bringing to Senate Floor.

NEW BUSINESS
- Member requested that co-chairs bring forward universal rating system additions that have been proposed to Renewals & P&T procedures documents to Senate leadership.

Tabled for Future Meeting
- Working meeting scheduled on Wed., Jan. 7 with some members of the PPC to address the following agenda items:
  - o Renewal procedures document
    - ♣ P&T documents are more clear and detailed about the contents necessary for the file, may need more specific examples of types of documents for renewal
    - ♣ Ambiguous language around disciplinary action- should a statement be added if there is not a record?
    - ♣ Re: renewal docs, it would be helpful to have expectations about statements to write, word counts, what they should address.
  - o Professional Assessment document
    - ♣ clarify what should be in the file, including the category of disciplinary action.

Meeting Adjourned at 2:01 pm

RULES COMMITTEE MINUTES 11/19/2025 (12:10-1:25 pm via Teams)

Attendance:

FIRST	LAST	DEPARTMENT	ATTENDANCE	TOTAL
David	Allen	Accounting	x	3/3
Jessica	Case	Athletic Training	x	3/3
Kristy	Hynes	Inclusive Ed & Behavior Science	x	4/4
Seon	Kim	Marriage & Family Therapy	x	4/4
Paul	Petrie	ENG	x	4/4
Mike	Sanger	Adjunct Faculty (Women's & Gender Studies)		1/3

- Discussion of Department Chair Document: consider advisability and mechanisms for allowing non-AAUP faculty to participate in department chair preferential poll process (for departments with significant numbers of SUOAF-ACSME professional staff in addition to AAUP faculty).
    - Need more information about status and work of non-AAUP department members
    - Need consultation with AAUP for CBA implications

—Paul R. Petrie 11/20/2025

Student Policy Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: November 19, 2025
Time: 12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.
Attendance
Present: Amanda Strong, Leah Sturman, , Elizabeth Hurlbert, Troy Rondinone, William Moroz, Matt Ouimet, Jonathan Wharton, Valerie Andrushko
Absent: Laurie Bonjo
1. Approval of Minutes
Approval of previous meeting minutes occurred via email.

2.Old Business
- **Student Opinion Survey (SOS) Updates**
  - Want to make sure that any changes to survey or issues surrounding the survey are in agreement with the CBA. **Survey information in CBA 4.11.8.**
  - Joan Weir reached out to her faculty senate president colleagues in the system and Chul Lee reached out to IR colleagues. Reports of department specific surveys and practice at Western and Central. Eastern was willing to share survey and also report that there was some anecdotal evidence of discrimination brought forward from a first year renewal who did not get renewed because survey results were "very bad." Some departments at WCSU & CCSU give extra credit for survey completion. Some are back to paper and pencil while others have electronic surveys. There did not seem to be university-wide consistency or knowledge regarding the specifics.
  - **Continuing review of issues raised in the AAUP Committee on Gender and Sexuality's letter regarding disparities in the SOS. The committee requested that faculty senate emphasize examining universities recognized for innovative approaches to addressing survey bias. ß NOTE: Laurie forgot to mention this during the meeting.**
- Discussion on Departmental Evaluation Committees (DECs):
  - Consideration of how departments use SOS data in faculty evaluation files.
  - Clarified that SOS administration is overseen by Chul Lee.
  - The committee agreed to avoid duplicating the AAUP Committee on Gender and Sexuality's ongoing efforts while using their letter as a key reference document.
  - Focus remains on how Student Evaluation Instruments/Student Opinion Surveys (SOSs) are used at the departmental level.

Next Steps
- Confirm whether the Faculty Senate Executive Council plans to conduct a **new campus climate survey**. No plans for a climate survey currently, as the current administration is in interim positions
- Maintain focus on improving trust, participation, and inclusivity in faculty and student feedback mechanisms. Invite the AAUP (letter writers re. discrimination) to a meeting in early spring to discuss collaborating on making changes to the current survey. The invitation was extended to Amy Jansen who agreed that collaboration was a good idea.
- Work in the spring on the survey edits, as well as seeking further information on how departments use survey results in the DEC process. as well as specifics from P&T committee.

Meeting Minutes:

<u>Guests:</u> Trever Brolliar & Vu Trieu

Vu Trieu reported on 'classroom refresh' plans and computer refresh

-EN A120, hopeful that the room will be available (in some form) for Spr 2026

-Other classrooms slated for 'refresh' will be on-going through Spr 2026

Note: budget constraints have impacted the # of rooms slated for refresh such that the 16-17 planned room refresh may not all be completed by Spr 2026

-change in policy for computer refresh from 4 to 6 years (decision, Spr 2024) means this spring has few computers eligible, but faculty with computer issues are being addressed on an individual basis. Note: Computer standards can be found [here](#).

Trever Brolliar reported on questions about accessibility for courses in Blackboard and reminded about the Ally tool (Accessibility Report LTI 1.3) which can guide faculty through the process. Online programs can reach out to Trever and Bogdan Zamfir regarding program guidance.

<u>On-going Issues:</u>

Blackboard Ultra Pilot
- AI tools will be available for members of the pilot

Accessibility Questions
- FLC has sought guidance from IT
- Senate Tech Committee questions whether faculty will need to report their accessibility 'score' to a specific office.

LTECH & IT GOV
- IT TEC (November meeting cancelled, next meeting December 16th)
- IT GOV (November meeting upcoming)

Grade Appeal Processes & OnBase
- Creating workflow process continues & report will be sent to UASC by the end of the semester.

Zoom
- still likely that Zoom will not longer be supported for use

Date of meeting: 11/19/2025

Undergraduate Curriculum Forum
November 20, 2025
The following is a report of actions of the UCF to date in Fall 2025.
Curricular Proposals from Nov. 20, 2025
New Program Proposals
BS Business Administration – Accounting
BS Biotechnology
BS Biology
BS Biology – Pre-Medicine
BS Biology – Secondary Education
BA Biology
BS Liberal Studies
BS Mathematics – Teacher Certification
BS Mathematics – Applied
BS Mathematics – Pure
BS Mathematics – Statistics
BS Social Work
BS Data Science
BS Healthcare Studies – Speech-Language Pathology Assistant
Early Childhood Education
Revised Course Proposals
MUT – multiple courses
CSC 400 – Computer Science Project Seminar
CSC 443 – Internet Programming
CSC 461 – Fundamentals of Deep Learning
CSC 461 – Gen AI for Language Modeling
CSC 481 – Artificial Intelligence
CSC 490 – Research in Computer Science I
DSC 333 – Cloud Services for Data Science
ESC 105 – General Meteorology → Introduction to Meteorology
ESC 111 – Life Through Time
NUR 355 – Nursing Interventions Lab
New Course Proposals
PHI 333 – Ethics of AI
AAC 425 – The Art Museum
W-Course Proposals
CDS 226 – Disability Literature
CDS 250 – Claiming Disability: Histories, Narratives, and Social Change
CDS 334 – History of Madness
Curricular Proposals from Nov. 6, 2025
New Program Proposals
Minor in Digital Marketing
Minor in Professional Selling
Revised Course Proposals
MAT 120 – College Algebra → Precalculus: Algebra (T1QR)
MAT 150 – Calculus I
MAT 320 – Mathematical Statistics I

MAT 326 – Regression Analysis
MAT 328 – Time Series Analysis
MAT 329 – Bayesian Analysis and Decision Making
MAT 429 – Modern Nonparametric Statistics
CSC 152 – CS1: Programming Fundamentals
CSC 207 – Computer Systems
CSC 212 – CS2: Data Structures
CSC 341 – Digital Imaging
ECO 270 – Applied Business Statistics
DSC 100 – Data Science I → Python Programming for Data Science
DSC 101 – Data Science II → Intro to Machine Learning for Data Science
New Course Proposals
MAT 118 – Extended Precalculus: Algebra (T1QR)
MAT 121 – Precalculus: Trigonometry
ART 319 – History of Graphic Design
ART 325 – Global Arts of the Renaissance
ART 425 – The Art Museum
BNS 470 – Research Experience in Behavioral Neuroscience
CDS 227 – Disability Art & Resistance
CSC 462 – Generative AI for Images and Videos
CSC 457 – Deep Learning for Computer Vision
Revised Program Proposals
BS Computer Science – General
BS Computer Science – Business Information Systems
BA Physics
BS Physics – Secondary Education
BS Physics – Engineering
BS Physics – General
BS Behavioral Neuroscience
BA & BS Earth Science – All Concentrations
BS Health Science
BS Healthcare Studies – STEM Foundations for Nursing
BS Healthcare Studies – General
BS Healthcare Studies – Clinical Trials
Minor Psychological Science → Applied Psychological Science
W-Course Proposals
AAC 465 – Entrepreneurship for Musicians
ANT 312 – Medical Anthropology
JST 298 – Immigration: Jewish Views and Values
MUT 435 – Theoretical Foundations of Music Therapy
PCH 352 – Health, Disease, and Culture
PSY 307 – Motivation & Self-Regulation
SOC 322 – Sociology of the Family
SOC 415 – Contemporary Feminist Theory
WGS 415 – Contemporary Feminist Theory
LEP Course Proposals
MAT 120 – College Algebra → Precalculus: Algebra (T1QR)
MAT 118 – Extended Precalculus: Algebra (T1QR)
Special Topics Courses
MUS 298 – Introduction to Black American Music (SP 26, 1st time offered)
Curricular Proposals from Oct. 23, 2025

Revised Programs

BS Communication Disorders

BS Rehabilitation (RT-OT)

Revised Courses

CMD → SLH – Multiple course changes

CMD 201 → SLH 201 – Introduction to Communication Disorders

CMD 418 → SLH 318 – Neurological Bases of Communication

CMS 336 – Writing Copy for Integrated Media

HMS 392 – Conditioning for Strength and Human Performance

MGT 285 – Management and Organization

PCH 230 – Foundations in Health Coaching

New Courses

ANT 111 – Cultures of the Internet (T1TF)

CMS 211 – Voices and Power: Communication in a Changing World (T2ISIV)

ENG 130 – Video Game Stories

ENG 222 – Human/Machine/World: Literary Representations of Technologies

REC 215 – Leisure Education and Society (T2ISIV)

SLH 421 – Speech and Language Disorders: Birth through School-Age

SLH 422 – Introduction to Hearing and Balance Disorders

THE 370 – Club and Resort Management

W-Courses

JST 101 – Jewish Life and Civilization

MGT 285 – Management & Organization

RSP 445 – Respiratory Care Seminar

WGS 226 – Claiming Disability: Histories, Narratives, and Social Change

PSY 333 – The Mysteries and Science of Sleep

JST 300 – The Hebrew Bible as Literature

Other Motions from Oct. 23, 2025

Steering: Move review of LEP courses to LEPC (temporary until Spring 2026 unless made permanent).

Curricular Proposals from Oct. 9, 2025

Revised Courses

BIO 450 – Undergraduate Research Methods in Biology

CHE 445 – Chemical Hazards and Laboratory Safety

SOC 352 – Special Topics in Criminology

THR 310 – Playwriting

THR 320 – Acting: Classical Techniques

WGS 226 – Disability Pride and Crip Joy → Claiming Disability

PSC 230 – War

CSC 321 – Algorithm Design & Analysis

New Courses

SOC 369 – Sociology of Policing

W-Courses

ENG 352 – Medical and Health Writing

MUS 300 – Beethoven & Revolution

RSP 440 – Evidence-Based Practice & Research in Respiratory Care

ANT 211 – Writing Culture: Ethnographic Writing

ANT 376 – Anthropology of Education

Special Topics Courses

CHE 398 – Chemical Forensics (Spring 2026 – 1st time)

NUR 498 – Introduction to Neonatal Nursing Care II (Spring 2026 – 2nd time)

NUR 498 – Contemporary Pediatric Nursing (Spring 2026 – 1st time)

HLS 398 – Medical Decision Making (Spring 2026 – 1st time)
MKT 398 – Intro to AI in Marketing (Winter 2025–26 – 3rd time)
Additional Motions
StAR: Accept interim report from Communication, Media & Screen Studies
UWIC: Amend Undergraduate Catalog policies on
Credit for Prior Learning
Independent Studies
Steering: Approve Honors Program voting representation at UCF
Curricular Proposals from Sept. 25, 2025
W-Courses
ART 398B – The Art Museum
Special Topics
ART 398 – The Art Museum (approved to run as W)
ART 398 – The History of Graphic Design
CSC 398 – Sports Performance Analytics
Curricular Proposals from Sept. 11, 2025
W-Courses
JRN 240 – Race and the News
PHI 408 – Existentialism

Resolution Regarding

Revisions to Procedures for Forming a Department Evaluation Committee

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

Whereas, The Faculty Senate is the official governing body for shared governance;

Whereas, The Faculty Senate recognizes that, to further academic excellence, procedures for forming a department evaluation committee (DEC) need periodic review and revision; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That effective beginning in the Fall semester of 2026, the Faculty Senate establish the attached revisions to the *Procedures for Forming a Department Evaluation Committee* document (dated August 26, 2019):

PROCEDURES FOR FORMING A DEPARTMENT EVALUATION COMMITTEE

C. Recall of a Department Evaluation Committee Member

1. Members of the Department Evaluation Committee (DEC) shall be subject to recall if they do not meet the expectations of the position as described **in the beginning of this document and as described in the individual documents governing the respective types of evaluation**.

2. Initiation of Recall Procedures by the Department
   a. Following concerns expressed by one or more department members to the Department Chairperson, the Department Chairperson shall, in consultation with the Faculty Senate president or their designee, determine whether there are substantial concerns and/or acts of malfeasance in the evaluation procedures established under the Collective Bargaining Agreement and relevant Faculty Senate documents that warrant the recall of the DEC member.
   b. Once the recall process has been initiated, a DEC alternate or a Hardship DEC member shall be called to serve in the capacity of the DEC member undergoing the recall process for that evaluation in question. The DEC member shall be allowed to continue their role in other evaluations in progress. The Department Chair shall keep the remaining members of the DEC informed throughout the process.
   c. If the Department Chairperson, after this consultation, determines there is evidence supporting substantial concerns and/or acts of malfeasance[1], they shall discuss the nature of these concerns with the DEC member.
      2) If the Department Chairperson, in consultation with the Faculty Senate president or their designee, accepts the DEC member's explanation and refutation, the process is discontinued, and the DEC member shall return to their duties on that committee.
      2) If the Department Chairperson, in consultation with the Faculty Senate president or their designee does not accept the DEC member's explanation and refutation, then the Department Chairperson shall not reinstate that DEC member and the alternate or Hardship DEC replacement shall remain for the remainder of the evaluation period.

If the Department Chairperson, in consultation with the Faculty Senate president or their designee, determines that the concerns and/or acts of malfeasance are not sufficiently supported by the evidence provided, and/or do not rise to the level of a serious deviation from the procedures established under the Collective Bargaining Agreement and relevant Faculty Senate documents, the process shall be discon

---

[1] For purposes of this section, "evidence supporting substantial concerns and/or acts of malfeasance" means there is evidence indicating that the conduct was more likely than not to have occurred, and that the determination is consistent with the procedures and standards outlined in the Senate evaluation documents.

Resolution for the Continuation of Faculty Participation in the Oversight of the Faculty Evaluation Digital Processes & Coordination

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

Whereas, The Faculty Senate is the official governing body for shared governance; and

Whereas, The Faculty Senate is responsible for procedural documents related to faculty evaluation; and

Whereas, Beginning in AY 2020-2021, all submissions and subsequent reviews of faculty evaluation files followed a digital process (Resolution S-2020-15); and

Whereas, Since the advent of digital submission of evaluation files, the university community has both recognized and involved a faculty member's participation in coordinating the digital process for file submission and review; the faculty member's role has included shared oversight of implementation of and adherence to Faculty Senate procedural documents and the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA) as evidenced by

- formal announcements that directed faculty with questions and concerns to contact such individuals
- formal meetings between the Faculty Leadership Council (FLC) and administration in AY 2022-2023 (Faculty Senate President's Reports 12/7/2022; 4/26/2023) wherein it was shared that "*The Faculty Senate Executive Committee and FLC are aware of issues related to digital files and discussion began and remains underway regarding the organization, process, and roles for those involved in the digital file coordination. While reassurances were provided by administration that issues are or will be resolved, faculty leadership requested that a faculty member with reassigned time join the Academic Affairs team alongside the Blackboard facilitator*"
- the creation of and subsequent active role of the Interfolio Faculty Coordinator (8/14/2023; see attached/below); and

Whereas, The role of Interfolio Faculty Implementation Project Coordinator will sunset "one and a half (1.5) years from the date of appointment"; and

Whereas, Interfolio is just one potential digital platform for evaluation and could be replaced or renamed in the future; and

Whereas, A faculty member's participation in coordinating the digital process for faculty evaluation ensures that 1) both faculty and administration have a representative with oversight on the process each cycle, 2) faculty candidates have a faculty contact for questions and concerns, and 3) the digital process adheres to the most recent version of each relevant senate procedures document; and

Whereas, Timely execution of digital evaluation processes is critical and interruptions in this process have serious consequences; and

Whereas, Contingencies may arise that prevent the faculty member in this position from discharging their duties; therefore, be it

Resolved, That effective beginning in the Fall semester of 2026, a formal role for a faculty member to participate in the oversight of the faculty evaluation digital processes and coordination shall be established; and

Resolved, That this position shall be entitled Faculty Evaluation Digital Coordinator; and

Resolved, That an alternate Faculty Evaluation Digital Coordinator shall also be established; and

Resolved, That the descriptions of these positions shall be created through a collaborative process between the Faculty Senate and the Administration.

<div align="center">**Southern Connecticut State University**
Interfolio Faculty Implementation Project Coordinator
2024-2026</div>

In accordance with university policy for leadership positions for which full-time faculty receive reassigned time from the administration, the Provost is soliciting applications from individuals who are interested in serving as Interfolio Faculty Implementation Project Coordinator.

Duties and Responsibilities:
The university is engaging with Interfolio (software-as-a-service) to set up their product "Review, Promotion and Tenure" to ensure the success of our electronic evaluation process. The Coordinator will work in close partnership with Human Resources and all academic departments. The Coordinator will report to the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Specific responsibilities include, but are not limited to the following:
- Work collaboratively with relevant Senate evaluation committees to translate our policies into the SCSU Interfolio set-up
- Work collaboratively Human Resources and AAUP to ensure that the set-up adheres to our employment contracts
- Work collaboratively with departments, school deans, and the Office of Faculty development to provide training and support faculty users
- Maintain updated training guides for use on the AA and Senate web pages
- Ensure work is completed within the designated timeline for implementation
- Test and respond to inquiries from faculty about use of new tools
- Provide overall administrative leadership for and oversight of the Interfolio Project

Persons seeking this position must have the following qualifications:
- Tenured or tenure-track faculty member
- Strong knowledge of technology implementations
- Excellent communication and organizational skills
- Willing and able to manage ambiguity

Preference will be given to those applicants with the following:
- Demonstrated ability to work with staff on multi-phase implementation process
- Ability to consider diverse range of technology abilities and comfort with change and foresee ways to ensure smooth adoption

Application and Selection Process:
Persons interested in seeking the position should apply using the online application between **August 15-Oct. 1, 2023.**

The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs will review the materials of all applicants and will interview selected finalists from among the applicants for the position. The Provost will announce the choice for the position after the successful applicant notifies the AVP AA and the Provost of their acceptance of the position.

Reassigned Time, Effective Date, and Term of Appointment:
The Coordinator will receive two (2) hours of reassigned time during each of the fall and spring semesters.

This appointment will be effective the first day of the spring semester 2024. The term will be one and a half (1.5) years from the date of appointment. Due to the contingent nature of the work, this position will sunset after this term.

Revised August 14, 2023 tm

Southern Connecticut State University
Faculty Academic Strategic Plan (FASP) Committee

27 October 2025 (1:10-2:00) Virtual

Meeting Minutes

Present: Krista Prendergast (co-chair), David Pettigrew (co-chair)
Punit Anand, Alberto Cifuentes, Abigail Bamberger

Absent: Alaa Sheta, Patrick C. Heidkamp, Wafeek Abdelsayed

Approval of the minutes from 10/13/25: Minutes were unanimously approved.

The committee continues to work on achievement of Goal 6 of the FASP Strategic Vision for Academic Excellence: Achieve an equitable restructuring of Faculty credit load on the model of the School of Business 3+1 program to support Faculty Creative Activity across the institution, in consideration of the maintenance of the university's R2 status. The committee is also investigating course cancellation policies for programs across the university related to number of students registered.

Punit has developed a list of R2 peer institutions. This list will be uploaded to the FASP Teams site. The list of schools R2 colleges found on the Carnegie site has been filtered for characteristics such as public vs private, size, focus, etc. Additional filters will be applied as needed. Once the list is finalized, the next step is to look at sample teaching loads for professors at the institutions.

David reached out to the university Deans on behalf of the University Wide Impact Committee (UWIC) to inquire about the course enrollment expectations and course cancellation policies in their programs and about the impact that these policies have on student graduation.

Next meeting: **November 17, 2025**

Meeting adjourned at: 2:00pm

Respectfully submitted: Krista M. Prendergast