Southern Connecticut State University

FACULTY SENATE

March 31, 2021 | 12:10 p.m. | WebEx

To join the meeting, please click here to be connected via WebEx.
Alternatively, copy and paste this link:
https://southernct.webex.com/southernct/j.php?MTID=mcb9940b322a45cbd0502f3eb6eb494df

Table of Contents

Southern Connecticut State University

FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA
March 31, 2021
12:10 p.m.

To join the meeting, please click here to be connected via WebEx.
Alternatively, copy and paste this link:
https://southernct.webex.com/southernct/j.php?MTID=mcb9940b322a45cbd0502f3eb6eb494df

I.   Announcements Relevant to the Faculty Senate
    a.   L. Eilderts: Faculty Senate Membership AY 2021-2022

II.   Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting held on March 17, 2021

III.   Faculty Senate President's Report

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

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

VI.   Unfinished Business
    a.   Proposed Revisions to the Faculty Senate Bylaws for the Elections Committee
    b.   Academic Policy (P. Petrie): Report on Simplifying the P&T Process (after 1:00 p.m.)

VII.   New Business
    a.   Resolution Regarding the Size of The Faculty Academic Strategic Plan Committee
    b.   Resolution Regarding the Robert E. Jirsa Service Award Committee
    c.   Faculty Senate Statement on Anti-AAPI Violence, Racism, And Hate Crimes

VIII.   Guest(s)

    Spring 2021 meetings: February 3, February 17, March 3, March 17, **March 31**, April 14, April 28, May 5.

Southern Connecticut State University

F A C U L T Y   S E N A T E

UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF March 17, 2021

https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings

The 12th Meeting of the Faculty Senate AY 2020-2021 was held on March 17, 2021, at 12:10 p.m. via WebEx.

Attendance

Dave Allen *Accounting* 12/12	Matthew Ouimet *Counseling* 12/12	Sandip Dutta *Finance* 8/12	Atul Kulkarni *Marketing* 12/12	Rex Gilliland *Philosophy* 12/12	Angela Lopez-Velasquez *Special Education* 8/12
William Farley* *Anthropology* 11/12	Natalie Starling *Counseling & School Psychology* 12/12	Lawrence Brancazio *Health & Movement Sciences* 12/12	Joe Fields *Mathematics* 12/12	Binlin Wu *Physics* 12/12	Douglas Macur *Theatre* 12/12
Jeff Slomba *Art* 12/12	Beena Achhpal *Curriculum & Learning* 12/12	Robert Gregory *Health & Movement Sciences* 12/12	Klay Kruczek *Mathematics* 12/12	Jonathan O'Hara* *Political Science* 2/3	Luke Eilderts *World Languages & Literatures* 12/12
Kevin Siedlecki *Athletics* 12/12	Maria Diamantis *Curriculum & Learning* 12/12	Troy Paddock *History* 11/12	Jonathan Irving *Music* 12/12	Michael Nizhnikov* *Psychology* 9/12	
Sean Grace *Biology* 12/12	Dushmantha Jayawickreme *Earth Science* 12/12	Darcy Kern* *History* 7/12	Frances Penny *Nursing* 8/12	Kate Marsland *Psychology* 12/12	Deborah Weiss *Faculty Senate President* 11/12
Mina Park *Business Information Systems* 12/12	Sanja Grubacic *Economics* 12/12	Yan Liu *Information & Library Science* 10/12	Kelly Martinez* *Nursing* 4/12	William Faraclas* *Public Health* 11/12	Cindy Simoneau *Undergraduate Curriculum Forum* 12/12
Jeff Webb *Chemistry* 12/12	Peter Madonia *Educational Leadership* 10/12	Cindy Simoneau *Journalism* 12/12	Obiageli Okwuka* *Part-time Faculty* 10/12	Michael Dodge *Recreation, Tourism & Sport Management* 11/12	Meredith Sinclair *Undergraduate Curriculum Forum* 12/12
Barbara Cook *Communication Disorders* 12/12	Mike Shea *English* 12/12	Patrick Crowley *Library Services* 11/12	Mary Ellen Minichiello *Part-time Faculty* 9/12	Sebatian Perumbilly *Social Work* 12/12	Cynthia O'Sullivan *Graduate Council* 12/12
Derek Taylor *Communication, Media & Screen Studies* 12/12	Paul Petrie *English* 12/12	Jacqueline Toce *Library Services* 12/12	Stephanie Fischer *Part-time Faculty* 8/8	Stephen Monroe Tomczak *Social Work* 12/12	Zainab Seyal *Student Government Association* 3/3
Alaa Sheta *Computer Science* 12/12	Matthew Miller *Environment, Geography & Marine Studies* 12/12	Carol Stewart *Management, International Business & Public Utilities* 9/12	Virginia Metaxas *Part-time Faculty* 7/8	Adam Pittman *Sociology* 10/12	Dr. Joe Bertolino* *SCSU President* 7/12
Guests:	R. Prezant C. Hlavac J. H. Kim	S. Bulmer T. Bennett T. Brolliar	T. Milburn T. Tyree		

*An asterisk denotes an absence. Overall attendance recorded below each member.

Faculty Senate President D. Weiss called the 12th meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 12:10 p.m.

I. Announcements
    A. M. Diamantis: UN Sustainable Development Goals Workshop on April 8th, 9th, and 10th. The theme for the event is The UN Sustainable Development Goals in the Local Community. Registration is free and open to everyone: https://www.sdgslaunch.com/scu
    B. Passing of Kathy Yalof.

II. Minutes of the previous meeting held on March 3, 2021 were accepted as distributed. https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings

III. Faculty Senate President's Report https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings

IV. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees
    A. Elections (C. Simoneau): Self-nominations for All-University Committees will be distributed soon.
    B. Personnel Policy (N. Starling): Reminder to participate in the advising survey: https://forms.gle/adpEYXsasLQsphe19.

V. Reports of Faculty Senate Special Committees
    A. UCF (M. Sinclair): Information on self-designation of courses with racial and intersectional justice themes. Call can be found by clicking here.
    B. Graduate Council (C. O'Sullivan): Nominations for chair, vice-chair, and secretary.

VI. Unfinished Business
    A. K. Marsland **moved to approve** The Resolution Regarding Course Incompletes for Spring 2021.
        i. Vote tally
            1. Yes 41
            2. No 0
                a. Motion **approved unanimously**.
    B. J. Fields **moved to approve** the Resolution Regarding Revisions to The Online Student Opinion Survey.
        i. P. Crowley **moved to amend** the resolution by adding the choice "other" with a fillable field to the question seeking information on the student's gender identification.
        ii. Motion **seconded.**
            1. M. Ouimet **moved to amend the amendment** by changing "other" to "otherwise identified".
            2. Motion **seconded**.
                a. Motion to **amend the amendment** was approved through universal consent.
            3. Motion to **amend the motion** approved through universal consent.

iii. M. Shea **moved to amend** the motion by inserting "(LEP)" after "General Education" in the question seeking ") Which of these best describes this course for you?"
            1. Motion to **amend the motion** approved through universal consent.
        iv. J. Webb **moved to amend** the resolution by moving the question "What approximate grade do you expect in this course? (A, B, C, D, F, Uncertain, Prefer not to answer)" from the demographics section into the group of questions whose results will be available to the instructor.
        v. Motion **seconded**.
            1. Motion **approved** through universal consent.
        vi. Vote tally for the resolution as amended
            1. Yes 35
            2. No 3
                a. Motion to approve the resolution as amended **approved**.

VII. New Business
    A. K. Marsland **moved to approve the** Resolution Regarding Undergraduate Pass/Fail Option for Spring 2021.
        i. Vote tally
            1. Yes 37
            2. No 5
                a. Motion to **approve** the resolution **approved.**
    B. K. Marsland **moved to approve** the Resolution Regarding Graduate Student Pass/Fail Option for Spring 2021.
        i. Vote tally
            1. Yes 36
            2. No 5
                a. Motion to **approve** the resolution **approved**.

VIII. Adjournment
    A. J. Webb **moved to adjourn.**
    B. Seconded.
        i. Meeting adjourned at 1:59 p.m.

_____

L. Eilderts
Secretary

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
RESOLUTION REGARDING COURSE INCOMPLETES FOR SPRING 2021

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;

Whereas, The extenuating circumstances caused by the on-going COVID-19 pandemic continue to present unprecedented challenges to students;

Whereas, Students may be disadvantaged by these challenges, resulting in poorer class performance that does not reflect their typical classroom performance;

Whereas, Faculty wish to provide students with increased flexibility to make critical decisions regarding their courses; and

Whereas, Revising the Incomplete Grade policy would provide students with increased flexibility; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the following policy be implemented for the Spring 2021 semester:

- A student who wants an Incomplete grade must request one from the instructor.
- Following the request, the instructor may grant a grade of Incomplete (I) if it is determined that the student has a valid reason for not meeting any particular course requirement(s) prior to the termination of the semester.
- If the Incomplete is granted, the Instructor and Student must complete and sign an Incomplete Grade Contract, in which the Instructor shall specify the remaining coursework to be completed by the Student and the provisional final grade the Student would earn if the remaining work is not completed.
- The Instructor shall submit a copy of the completed contract to the Chairperson of the department in which the course is offered by May 19, 2021.
- The Instructor shall enter a grade of "I" when submitting final grades. (Note: Instructors should not give an "I" unless the Incomplete has been requested by the Student and a contract has been completed.)
- The Instructor shall make all course materials available to students for the duration of the Incomplete period.
- The "I" grade shall automatically become an "F" 30 days after the start of the next semester, unless one of the following occurs earlier:
    - The Student completes the remaining coursework, and the Instructor enters a final passing grade;

- The Student has decided to not complete the remaining coursework and the Instructor enters the provisional grade specified in the Incomplete Grade Contract, or; the Student elects to submit a Late Withdrawal from the course for approval by the School or college Dean.
- The Instructor issues an extension for completion of the remaining work and enters a grade change to "I+" (Incomplete Extension); or
- For courses taken in the Spring 2021 semester only, at any point, a student who has been given an I or I+ may request a Late Withdrawal from the course for approval by the school or college Dean.

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTION REGARDING UNDERGRADUATE PASS/FAIL OPTION FOR SPRING 2021

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;

Whereas, The extenuating circumstances caused by the on-going COVID-19 pandemic continue to present unprecedented challenges to students;

Whereas, Students may be disadvantaged by these changes, resulting in poorer class performance that does not reflect their typical classroom performance;

Whereas, Faculty wish to provide students with every opportunity to achieve successful completion of their courses this semester, stay on track towards their graduation, and reduce the level of stress that they are likely experiencing;

Whereas, Allowing students to take courses on a Pass/Fail basis could provide them with an option that will help to achieve the above; and

Whereas, The current Pass/Fail option is not adequate to accomplish this given its restrictions and given the fact that Students would have needed to elect a course as Pass/Fail by the fourth week of the semester, which has already passed; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the following revised Undergraduate Pass/Fail policy be approved for the Spring 2021 semester:

- With the approval of their advisor, matriculated students are eligible to register for certain courses on a Pass/Fail basis.
- The Pass/Fail option may be used for electives, the Liberal Education Program, or the requirements of a major or minor (as decided by the department housing the major or minor).
- During the Spring 2021 semester, students may elect to take one course under the Pass/Fail option.
- After consulting with the student, the advisor (or Chair if the advisor is the instructor of the course in question) would complete and submit a Pass/Fail form for the student to then authorize by the deadline.
- The deadline for students to authorize the Pass/Fail contract shall be extended to May 9th (the last day of classes).
- The Pass/Fail option is non-reversable. Students will be advised that once they have selected the Pass/Fail option, it will not be possible to revert to a graded option.

- The Pass/Fail option is blind in that the instructor is not aware of the student's use of the Pass/Fail option until after the grades are submitted, except where the instructor is also the advisor or Chair.
- The final grade will be reported as "P" if the final grade earned is "D-" or higher. This grade earns zero quality points and has no effect on the GPA but does count as attempted credit. If the final grade earned is not passing, the final grade will be reported as "F." This grade earns zero quality points, but will impact the GPA, and does count as attempted credit. Courses taken for Pass/Fail might not be accepted for transfer credit when attending another institution; are excluded from GPA calculations which may impact a student's ability to meet certain GPA requirements needed for their major, graduation, or honors; and may not be satisfactory in meeting prerequisite requirements when applying to graduate programs.

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTION REGARDING GRADUATE STUDENT PASS/FAIL OPTION FOR SPRING 2021

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;

Whereas, The extenuating circumstances caused by the on-going COVID-19 pandemic continue to present unprecedented challenges to students;

Whereas, Students may be disadvantaged by these changes, resulting in poorer class performance that does not reflect their typical classroom performance;

Whereas, Faculty wish to provide students with every opportunity to achieve successful completion of their courses this semester, stay on track towards their graduation, and reduce the level of stress that they are likely experiencing;

Whereas, Allowing students to take courses on a Pass/Fail basis could provide them with an option that will help to achieve the above; and

Whereas, The current Pass/Fail option is not adequate to accomplish this given its restrictions and given the fact that Students would have needed to elect a course as Pass/Fail by the fourth week of the semester, which has already passed; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the following revised Graduate Pass/Fail policy be implemented for the Spring 2021 semester:

- On a department-specific basis, and with the approval of their graduate program advisor, matriculated students in some graduate programs are eligible to register for certain required or elective courses on a Pass/Fail basis. Undergraduate courses listed in any program that students are required to take to strengthen their academic backgrounds may not be taken under the Pass/Fail option.
- During the Spring 2021 semester, students may elect to take one course under the Pass/Fail option.
- After consulting with the student, the advisor (or chair if the advisor is the instructor of the course in question) would complete and submit a Pass/Fail form for the student to then authorize by the deadline.
- The deadline for submitting a Pass/Fail request shall be extended to May 9th, the last day of classes.
- The Pass/Fail option is non-reversible. Students will be advised that once they have selected the Pass/Fail option, it will not be possible to revert to a graded option.
- The process for electing the Pass/Fail option shall be automated to the greatest extent possible via a web form. This web form shall provide the student with information about

the policy, provide the students with a link to courses that have been designated as exempt by departments (i.e., are not available for Pass/Fail under this revised policy), require that the students indicate that they have read and understood the Pass/Fail policy, and shall direct students to their graduate program advisors or chairs for consultation.

- The Pass/Fail option is blind in that the instructor is not aware of the student's use of the Pass/Fail option until after the grades are submitted, except where the instructor is also the advisor or chair.
- The final grade will be reported as "P" if the final grade earned is "C" or higher. This grade earns zero quality points and has no effect on the GPA but does count as attempted credit. If the final grade earned is C- or below, the final grade will be reported as "F." This grade earns zero quality points, but will impact the GPA, and does count as attempted credit. Courses taken for Pass/Fail might not be accepted for transfer credit when attending another institution; are excluded from GPA calculations which may impact a student's ability to meet certain GPA requirements needed for their major, graduation, or honors; and may not be satisfactory in meeting prerequisite requirements when applying to other graduate programs.

STANDING COMMITTEES

ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE (APC)

APC MINUTES 3/24/2021
Present: Allen, Crowley, Gilliland, Jayawickreme, Kulkarni, Petrie (chair), Siedlecki

- Strategized responses to anticipated questions from senators re: P&T presentation and recommendations scheduled for 3/31 Senate meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Paul R. Petrie

Minutes Wednesday, March 24, 2021

Present: Klay Kruczek, Mina Park, Cindy Simoneau, chairperson.
Absent: Darcy Kern, Jonathan O'Hara.
(Note: Frances Penny, no longer available due to clincial assignment, second 8-week section)

1. Announcements

2. Old Business
   A. Continuing discussion on request for university resolution on free speech
   B. Recommendation for Senate Bylaws change on elections (held over from March 17 Senate meeting)

3. New Business
   A. Committee reviewed requests from committees on membership changes and unanimously approved resolutions for:
      1. Faculty Adademic Strategic Plan Committee – change size (see attached)
      2. Robert E. Jirsa Service Award Committee—change size (see attached)

Respectfully submitted,
Cindy Simoneau

**JOINT MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE FINANCE AND TECHNOLOGY
COMMITTEES**
Wednesday, March 24, 2021

Present: Lawrence Brancazio, Sandip Dutta, Bill Faraclas, Joe Fields, Stephanie Fischer, Sanja Grubacic, Jonathan Irving, Yan Liu, Douglas Macur, Obiageli Okwuka, Carol Stewart, Derek Taylor, Binlin Wu

Agenda: Review of IT report on expenditures for academic technologies for our university, provided by Edward L. (Rusty) May, Jr., Director of Technology Administration on October

The meeting began with the members of both committees expressing gratitude to Rusty May for his obvious and sincere effort and complimenting him on the forthcoming nature of the report.

Questions and concerns raised include:

1. The cessation of bond fund monies for academic technology.
2. The possibility of using Covid monies to offset technology costs.
3. Other grant funding that may be available to support academic technology.
4. How the technology needs of the academic community are assessed, and the extent of faculty engagement in decisions on how resources are allocated.
5. Similarities or differences between how our sister schools are dealing with technology budget cuts.
6. The excessive cost of paying for so many services/systems – some of which appear not to be working to the satisfaction of instructors (especially Blackboard, but also with concerns about MS Teams WebEx, Kaltura, etc.
7. The effect on students of using a variety of platforms, balanced with the needs of instructors to determine the best way to present curriculum.
8. Lack of focused support on faculty teaching needs causes student learning outcomes to suffer.
9. Changes happen very quickly in technology, making it difficult to develop competence.
10. The effort to develop Hyflex classrooms quickly was acknowledged, but it was noted that many HyFlex courses were not well attended.

Possible next steps:
1. Consider a faculty survey to collect data on needs, preferred platforms, etc.
2. Hold discussions in a Faculty Senate meeting or have the Senate sponsor a faculty forum for open conversation on the state of technology of the university with Rusty May.
3. Establish a special committee under the direction of the Senate Technology Committee to comprise faculty at large who are not in the senate to address these issues.
4. Ask Senators to get input from respective departments.
5. Reach out to sister universities to gain insight into their selection and fiscal support of resources.

6. Seek input from the University Budget Committee on how dollar amounts are allocated to the IT department, with emphasis on ascertaining the level of faculty input.
7. Distinguish the amounts spent by the system office and the University on academic technology, and find ways to assert our preferences and participate in the negotiation of prices.
8. Reduce spending on systems purchased, to increase monetary allocations for replacing classroom equipment.
9. Find ways to promote training for the faculty.

Action step: The chairs of the Technology and Finance committees will prepare a joint statement for the Faculty Senate from this discussion.

Recommendation: A structure be set in motion by September for the Faculty Senate to more fully address academic technology resource needs, priorities, redundancies and effectiveness, with particular emphasis on the role of the faculty in making decisions, and preferably with the involvement of the other CSU campuses.

3/24/2021

<u>Teams Meeting</u>

PPC Members: Toce, Jacqueline; Slomba, Jeffrey; Lopez-Velasquez, Angela; Tomczak, Stephen; Shea, Michael; Kelly Martinez; Pittman, Adam; Metaxas, Virginia; Starling, Natalie (chair)

12:11pm
<u>APPROVAL OF MINUTES</u>:   Meeting Minutes of March 10, 2021 - PPC Approved

<u>CONTINUING BUSINESS:</u>

In preparation for finalizing the work of the committee this semester, the PPC prioritized topics for this round of updates to the P & T, Renewal documents.

- Prioritized topics for this spring:
  - The improvement of wording throughout the documents (consistency across sections, clarity, inclusive language, grammar, etc.)
  - The parallelizing of the Renewal and P & T documents
  - The inclusion of letters of support
  - The candidate control over file – which includes the topic of adding information to the file, and candidate withdrawal of file
  - The candidate interview
  - The uploading of the P&T committee's letters to files
  - The eligibility to serve on P & T committee
- Topics to be moved to fall if not able to address this spring:
  - Advising
  - University level vs. College level P & T committees

The PPC also discussed the plan to present our recommendations to the Senate in the coming weeks. It was decided that the P & T document and Renewal document will be shared, each document will have two versions, a version showing all tracked changes and a version that is a clean copy. The PPC has not yet decided the format of a potential Resolution(s).

The PPC also discussed a desire to engage with members of the P & T committee as well as the Provost. Invitations to join the PPC at one of the April meeting dates will be forthcoming from the PPC chair to these stakeholders. The invitation will include the above list of priorities and a request for topics the stakeholders would like to discuss.

At 1pm, the PPC was joined by members of the Rules committee, as planned. Present members reviewed the following topics:

- Candidate interview

- Eligibility to serve on P & T committee

Adjourned 2:00pm

RULES COMMITTEE (RC)

Date: Wednesday, March 25, 2021

Time: 12:10 PM-1:00 PM (joint meeting w/Personnel Policy Committee from 1:00 PM-2:00 PM)

Attendees: Barb Cook, Maria Diamantis, Robert Gregory (chair), Matt Miller, Troy Paddock, & Jeff Webb

Agenda items:
1. Draft revisions to the Sabbatical Leave document.
2. Discuss revisions to the Promotion and Tenure document w/Personnel Policy Committee.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 PM.

Minutes prepared and respectfully submitted by Robert Gregory, SCSU Faculty Senate Rules Committee Chair

March 24, 2021
Minutes

Present: M. Dodge, B. Farley, K. Marsland, M. Nizhnikov, M. Ouimet

12:15 Meeting called to order via Webex

1. The committee discussed current revisions to the Academic Misconduct Policy (v13), including input from the Office of Research Integrity and feedback from Dean Tetreault, the Director of the Office of Student Conduct and the Co-Chairs of the UASC.
2. Old Business to be addressed at next meeting on April 7th
    a. Academic Misconduct Policy revision
    b. Potential revisions to permanent Incomplete, Course Withdrawal and Pass/Fail policies
    c. Students' access to course materials during Incomplete/Grade Appeal periods
    d. Access to feminine hygiene products

Meeting adjourned at 1:30
Respectfully submitted by K. Marsland

Minutes of meeting 3/24/2021

The Technology Committee met jointly with the Finance Committee. Please refer to the Finance Committee minutes for details of the meeting.

Respectfully,

J. E. Fields

Report to the Faulty Senate
Undergraduate Curriculum Forum
March 18, 2021 Meeting Actions

There were no motions considered.

The following new program was approved:
Minor in Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA)

Reminders to faculty:
- There is a new submission process for New Course Proposals, Revised Course Proposals, and Special Topics Courses (via DocuSign). Links and instructions can be found on the UCF Confluence page.
- Please be mindful of deadlines for proposal submissions (also on the UCF Confluence page). Notably:
  - W Courses on the Summer and Fall schedules that do not have approval will be removed after March 22 until the proposal is approved. Please consider submitted W courses not approved under the new guidelines for approval under those guidelines.
  - Special Topics courses must be submitted by March 29 for inclusion on the summer or fall schedule.

Respectfully submitted,
Meredith Sinclair (UCF Chair, Sp. 2021)
Mar. 19, 2021

REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE: POSSIBILITIES FOR IMPROVING THE P&T PROCESS

Possibilities for Improving the P&T Process
Report from the Academic Policy Committee, March 2021

1. Background:

The APC was charged by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee with investigating possibilities for simplifying the promotion and tenure process and reducing the size of P&T files and the time required of candidates and evaluators to assess them. The APC settled on focus groups as the best mode for soliciting opinions from a representative range of participants in the P&T process on a number of ideas and questions aimed at our charge. Focus groups were conducted in both semesters of AY 2019-2020 and in Fall 2020 using a uniform powerpoint that guided participants through the key ideas and questions. Seven focus groups were conducted, with representatives of the following groups: AAUP, DEC members, department chairs, recently hired faculty, newly tenured faculty, university P&T committee members, Provost and Deans.

2. Key findings:

Findings are organized according to the questions in the focus group powerpoint. They comprise a summary of areas of general (although not always unanimous) agreement among multiple participants across multiple focus groups. We have not attempted a comprehensive summary of all participants' comments.

a. Require a personal statement and/or introductory statement for each category of evaluation, and limit its page length.

- ☐ Size reduction is a good idea, but only if it preserves individual's right to self-presentation.
- ☐ Reasonable to limit, but length needs to be negotiated (not too short).
- ☐ Should be a philosophy and narrative, not just a list-style recap of info found in CV / CIF.
- ☐ Word limit would be useful—would force concision / better communication
- ☐ Content guidelines with clearer limits and definitions needed—lack thereof leads to "race to the top" (pressure to add more and more)
- ☐ Key lengths of statements to evaluation category weighting
- ☐ Word limits would lead to better dept-to-dept comparisons of candidate files

b. Limit file's inclusion of evidence to a specified number (2, 3, 4?) of the candidate's most representative achievements in each area of evaluation.

- ☐ Wide differences of opinion, within many and between some focus groups.
- ☐ A degree of agreement that a "highlights" strategy might be good *as a suggestion* but not as a hard limit.
- ☐ P&T committee most unanimous in wanting more documentation rather than less (complete articles, web links, proof that publications were peer reviewed, etc.).
- ☐ Other groups lean toward a "less is more" philosophy, based on trusting faculty to tell the truth in their CVs / CIFs.
- ☐ Kinds and numbers of evidence documentation should be keyed to importance and nature of each category of evaluation (e.g. more for Creative Activity; less for Service).

c. (Re)institute department guidelines specifying expected file documentation for each discipline.

- Yes: clarifies expectations for faculty.

- Problem: dept guidelines may conflict with Dean's or Provost's expectations.

- Success depends on guidelines not being overly prescriptive or limiting of candidate's self-presentation.

- Good to have, especially with respect to creative activity (what is considered creative activity varies widely between the disciplines).

- These could be beneficial to the P&T committee as they are not always familiar with discipline or department specific creative activity.

- Problematic for departments with internal divisions, lack of consensus. Need failsafe plan for dealing with such situations.

- Should include examples / sample guidelines for departments to emulate.

- Must be communicated to candidates from early in their SCSU careers and remain consistent (no retroactive application of new standards).

- Some complications need to be considered: subdisciplines within a dept; mismatches between different depts' expectations (quantification vs open-ended or qualitative measures); disagreements between depts' and dean's guidance and expectations; inherent subjectivity of process; dysfunctional DECs in some departments.

d. Create guidelines for expected content of DEC and department chairs' letters of evaluation

- Yes: clearer indication of what these letters should include, with models.

- Should be framed as suggestions and examples rather than prescriptions / requirements.

- Offer as floor, not ceiling; suggestive, not prescriptive (except to prohibit form letters).

- Frame as a means of empowering departments to define their own P&T expectations so that other actors in the process don't do it for them—requires culture shift in ways of thinking about P&T process in depts.

- DEC/Chair letters should address each category.

- DEC/Chairs should represent the candidates.

e. Provide training / oversight for DECs

- Generally, "yes" to training; "no" to oversight (primarily because it would be impractical).

- Problem: training sessions already exist, but those who need them most don't attend.

f. Revise and shorten (or combine) Senate's P&T Procedures document and P&T Guidelines documents

- Cannot be combined, because Senate document is an extension of the CBA while Guidelines have status of suggestions and examples rather than requirements.

- Guidelines in need of reconciliation with Senate document.

- Some feeling that Guidelines should not be controlled by P&T committee but by a body more representative of evaluators at all stages of the renewal, promotion, and tenure process.

g. What is the bare minimum of evidentiary documentation that each candidate's file should or must include?

Areas of general agreement:

- CIF and/or CV.
- Personal statements for all categories of evaluation.
- Items should be included in department guidelines, therefore discipline-specific.
- Reduce extensive piles of evidence; file should be "representative, not comprehensive."

Recurrent ideas:

- CV should replace CIF: redundant.
- 1 major exhibit per area of evaluation.
- Require course observations (not just student opinion surveys).
- Cite publications but don't include them.
- Want the candidate to have the best voice possible in the file.

Concerns:

- Fear that faculty would be negatively impacted by minimalist P&T option: faculty need opportunity to explain more fully, give examples, etc.
- Amount of evidence in file must ultimately remain in candidate's hands: contractual.
- Need discussion and agreement on the shared principles beneath and between the contract, the Senate procedures, and the P&T Comm recommendations.
- Fear that administration may want minimalist process in order to have leeway for subjective judgment.
- Speculation that P&T Comm wants more evidence in order to pursue objectivity—but more evidence doesn't eliminate subjectivity. Only a level playing field among all candidates is essential.

h. Other ideas: What works in our current system? What doesn't work? How could it be improved? (This is a list of the more unique, specific and actionable ideas suggested by individuals in various focus groups; it does not necessarily represent areas of widespread agreement among individuals or groups.)

- Add ability to add comments to a letter.
- P&T process needs to figure a better way to value non-traditional scholarship.
- Fear that P&T committee won't value the story a candidate has told about his/her work.

- One person said s/he would "trade some freedom for more certainty" about P&T standards (i.e. s/he'd accept a more limited and quantified delineation of "what counts" toward P&T), but majority said that clarifying the criteria needn't be in conflict with faculty freedom to shape their own self-presentation in P&T files.
- Teaching evaluations (OIR bubble sheets) are problematic as measures of teaching effectiveness.
- Useful to have a better understanding of administration's role in the process.
- Several participants defined P&T problems in terms of competing "cultures" of P&T in different departments and among different evaluators. P&T should be framed as constructive process that builds university community, not as competition. Need a greater institution-wide shared understanding of purposes and values of P&T process, not just procedures.
- Perceived bias toward quantitative measures of candidates' achievements undervalues work in many disciplines whose value is not readily quantifiable.
- Files should include all DEC letters during the period of employment.
- Files should include "external letters" from faculty and scholars from the same discipline attesting to the impact the candidate has created for their professional discipline/field and society.
- Files should demonstrate evidence of individual's professional growth.
- Files should emphasize what's new from year to year; repeating the same things again and again doesn't make sense.

3. Issues about which there was not consensus:

- How can the university develop a shared understanding of standards and values surrounding the P&T process?
- Should standards and criteria for promotion be different from those for tenure?
- Should standards and criteria for promotion from assistant to associate professor be different from those for promotion from associate to "full" professor?
- What can be done about widely variant departmental cultures surrounding renewal, promotion, and tenure?
- How can evaluators in the P&T process productively balance an ethos of faculty development, support, and trust with the legitimate interest in maintaining rigorous academic and professional standards of evaluation?

4. APC recommendations for P&T reform:

a. In order to reduce file size (without instituting hard limits on page length, number of evidentiary items, etc.), provide more guidance on expected / accepted kinds and number of items of documentation for each evaluation category. Include that information in department guidelines and university P&T Guidelines document.

b. (Re)institute, with Senate oversight, department guidelines specifying expected file documentation and standards / criteria for each discipline, including a 5-year review cycle.

c. Create guidelines and models for expected content of DECs' and department chairs' letters of evaluation.

d. Require and limit (by word length) candidate personal statements for the P&T file as a whole and for each area of evaluation.

e. To allay concerns from candidates and P&T members about reduced file size, allow the P&T committee to request more information from a candidate when committee members have further questions (as DECs already may), within defined limits and procedures to be determined.

f. Under Senate oversight, reconcile Senate P&T Procedures document with P&T Committee's Guidelines document to eliminate disagreements and confusing differences in emphasis.

g. Do not take action on these recommendations unless and until current CBA negotiations are concluded and current or similar contractual provisions governing P&T process are reconfirmed.

PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS FOR THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

Here is the current language in the Bylaws (IX.D.2.):

"All-University Committees are those that the Faculty Senate has established to perform specific ongoing tasks. The Faculty Senate shall determine the purpose of each All-University Committee, committee eligibility and length of term for its members. Faculty serving on All-University Committees shall be elected by the full-time faculty in elections administered by the Elections Committee. Elections for All-University Committee vacancies shall be held before the end of each spring semester. If necessary, special elections shall be administered by the Elections Committee to fill any vacancies that remain after the first election. School/College restrictions for All-University Committees shall be removed in special elections that are held after the first special election."

Here is proposed language:

"All-University Committees are those that the Faculty Senate has established to perform specific ongoing tasks. The Faculty Senate shall determine the purpose of each All-University Committee, committee eligibility and length of term for its members. Faculty serving on All-University Committees shall be elected by the full-time faculty in elections administered by the Elections Committee. Elections for All-University Committee vacancies shall be held before the end of each spring semester. A follow-up election, in the fall semester, shall be administered by the Elections Committee to fill any vacancies that remain after the spring election. During the self-nomination period in the fall semester, any School/College-restricted vacancy shall be dual listed as the original School/ College-restricted vacancy and a one-year at-large vacancy (indicated with an *). If any member from the respective School/College self-nominates, only the nominee from the School/College shall be listed on the ballot, and the other nominees shall be notified that their name(s) will not be on the ballot. Otherwise, the at-large nominees shall be listed on the ballot and shall serve for one year."

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE SIZE OF THE FACULTY ACADEMIC STRATEGIC PLAN COMMITTEE

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

Whereas, The SCSU Faculty Senate is the official representative body of the Academic Faculty;

Whereas, Within the context of shared governance faculty participation furthers such excellence;

Whereas, The Faculty Senate is charged with maintaining and filling All-University committees; and

Whereas, The Faculty Senate strives to maintain efficient All-University committees; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Faculty Academic Strategic Plan Committee's membership be reduced from (4) elected faculty delegates from each school/college to three (3) elected faculty delegates from each school/college; be it further

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate Elections Committee shall develop a mechanism for dealing with expiring terms on the committee that arise; affected SCSU documents shall be revised to conform to the new committee structure.

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTION REGARDING THE ROBERT E. JIRSA SERVICE AWARD COMMITTEE

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

Whereas, The SCSU Faculty Senate is the official representative body of the Academic Faculty;

Whereas, Within the context of shared governance faculty participation furthers such excellence;

Whereas, The Faculty Senate is charged with maintaining and filling All-University committees; and

Whereas, The Faculty Senate strives to maintain efficient All-University and full committees; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Robert E. Jirsa Service Committee's membership shall consist of one (1) member from each college/school and one (1) alternate from each college/school, instead of one (1) member from each college/school and one (1) at-large member; be it further

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate Elections Committee revise affected SCSU documents to conform to the new committee structure.

Southern Connecticut State University

SCSU

FACULTY SENATE

Faculty Senate Statement
on Anti-AAPI Violence, Racism, and Hate Crimes

Institutions of higher education exist to seek truth and promote understanding based on knowledge. Given the commitment of Southern Connecticut State University to social justice and human rights, the SCSU Faculty Senate expresses its outrage at incidents of discrimination, harassment and violence against Asian, Asian American and Pacific Island (AAPI) peoples in this nation and the senseless murders of eight victims on 3-16-21 in Atlanta. We condemn in the strongest terms demeaning and dehumanizing hate speech and acts of emotional and physical violence towards any individual or group based on national origin or culture, whether on our campus or anywhere in society.

Further, the Faculty Senate affirms its unconditional support for and solidarity with our AAPI colleagues and students. In alignment with SCSU's "Policy Statement on Pluralism," the Faculty Senate denounces discrimination, hate speech, and other forms of violence against all members of our community and seeks to nurture a culture on our campus that advances human rights and social justice for everyone. We will continue to foster an ongoing dialogue at our University that promotes the common sense of humanity that we all value so dearly.