

Southern Connecticut State University

FACULTY SENATE

April 14, 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

AGENDA	2
UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF MARCH 31, 2021	3
DOCUMENTS TO ACCOMPANY MINUTES (MARCH 31, 2021 MEETING)	6
FACULTY SENATE STATEMENT ON ANTI-AAPI VIOLENCE, RACISM, AND HATE CRIMES.....	6
REPORT FROM THE ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE: POSSIBILITIES FOR IMPROVING THE P&T PROCESS	7
PROPOSED REVISIONS TO THE FACULTY SENATE BYLAWS FOR THE ELECTIONS COMMITTEE.....	12
RESOLUTION REGARDING THE SIZE OF THE FACULTY ACADEMIC STRATEGIC PLAN COMMITTEE.....	13
STANDING COMMITTEES	14
ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE (APC)	14
ELECTIONS COMMITTEE (EC)	15
FINANCE COMMITTEE (FC)	16
PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE (PPC).....	17
RULES COMMITTEE (RC)	18
STUDENT POLICY COMMITTEE (SPC)	19
TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE (TC)	20
SPECIAL COMMITTEES	21
UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM (UCF).....	21
GRADUATE COUNCIL	22
DOCUMENTS/RESOLUTIONS FOR REVIEW FOR THE APRIL 14, 2021 MEETING	23
RESOLUTION REGARDING THE ROBERT E. JIRSA SERVICE AWARD COMMITTEE	23
CURRENT GUIDELINES FOR ADDRESSING ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	24
RESOLUTION REGARDING REVISION OF THE ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY	33
KEY REVISIONS TO THE ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY V.15.....	43
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION REGARDING CBA TRAVEL FUNDS FOR 2021-2022	44
DRAFT PROPOSAL: AN IT FINANCES WORKING GROUP	46

Southern Connecticut State University
FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA

April 14, 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
- II. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting held on March 31, 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. Resolution Regarding the Robert E. Jirsa Service Award Committee
- VII. New Business
 - a. Resolution Regarding Revision of the Academic Misconduct Policy
 - b. Resolution Regarding CBA Travel Funds For 2021-2022
 - c. APC Follow up: Improvements to the P&T Process
 - d. Draft Proposal: an IT Finances Working Group
- 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

FACULTY SENATE

UNAPPROVED MINUTES OF March 31, 2021

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

The 13th Meeting of the Faculty Senate AY 2020-2021 was held on March 31, 2021, at 12:10 p.m. via WebEx.

Attendance

Dave Allen <i>Accounting</i> 13/13	Matthew Ouimet <i>Counseling</i> 13/13	Sandip Dutta <i>Finance</i> 9/13	Atul Kulkarni <i>Marketing</i> 13/13	Rex Gilliland <i>Philosophy</i> 13/13	Angela Lopez-Velasquez <i>Special Education</i> 9/13
William Farley <i>Anthropology</i> 12/13	Natalie Starling <i>Counseling & School Psychology</i> 13/13	Lawrence Brancazio <i>Health & Movement Sciences</i> 13/13	Joe Fields <i>Mathematics</i> 13/13	Binlin Wu <i>Physics</i> 13/13	Douglas Macur <i>Theatre</i> 13/13
Jeff Slomba <i>Art</i> 13/13	Beena Achhpal <i>Curriculum & Learning</i> 13/13	Robert Gregory <i>Health & Movement Sciences</i> 13/13	Klay Kruczek <i>Mathematics</i> 13/13	Jonathan O'Hara <i>Political Science</i> 3/4	Luke Eilderts <i>World Languages & Literatures</i> 13/13
Kevin Siedlecki <i>Athletics</i> 13/13	Maria Diamantis <i>Curriculum & Learning</i> 13/13	Troy Paddock <i>History</i> 12/13	Jonathan Irving <i>Music</i> 13/13	Michael Nizhnikov <i>Psychology</i> 10/13	
Sean Grace <i>Biology</i> 13/13	Dushmantha Jayawickreme <i>Earth Science</i> 13/13	Darcy Kern <i>History</i> 8/13	Frances Penny* <i>Nursing</i> 8/13	Kate Marsland <i>Psychology</i> 13/13	Deborah Weiss <i>Faculty Senate President</i> 12/13
Mina Park <i>Business Information Systems</i> 13/13	Sanja Grubacic <i>Economics</i> 13/13	Yan Liu <i>Information & Library Science</i> 11/13	Kelly Martinez <i>Nursing</i> 5/13	William Faraclas <i>Public Health</i> 12/13	Cindy Simoneau <i>Undergraduate Curriculum Forum</i> 13/13
Jeff Webb <i>Chemistry</i> 13/13	Peter Madonia <i>Educational Leadership</i> 11/13	Cindy Simoneau <i>Journalism</i> 13/13	Obiageli Okwuka* <i>Part-time Faculty</i> 10/13	Michael Dodge <i>Recreation, Tourism & Sport Management</i> 12/13	Meredith Sinclair <i>Undergraduate Curriculum Forum</i> 13/13
Barbara Cook <i>Communication Disorders</i> 13/13	Mike Shea <i>English</i> 13/13	Patrick Crowley <i>Library Services</i> 12/13	Mary Ellen Minichiello <i>Part-time Faculty</i> 10/13	Sebastian Perumbilly <i>Social Work</i> 13/13	Cynthia O'Sullivan <i>Graduate Council</i> 13/13
Derek Taylor <i>Communication, Media & Screen Studies</i> 13/13	Paul Petrie <i>English</i> 13/13	Jacqueline Toce <i>Library Services</i> 13/13	Stephanie Fischer <i>Part-time Faculty</i> 9/9	Stephen Monroe Tomczak <i>Social Work</i> 13/13	Zainab Seyal* <i>Student Government Association</i> 3/4
Alaa Sheta <i>Computer Science</i> 13/13	Matthew Miller <i>Environment, Geography & Marine Studies</i> 13/13	Carol Stewart <i>Management, International Business & Public Utilities</i> 10/13	Virginia Metaxas <i>Part-time Faculty</i> 8/9	Adam Pittman <i>Sociology</i> 11/13	Dr. Joe Bertolino* <i>SCSU President</i> 7/13
Guests:	R. Prezant C. Hlavac J. H. Kim	S. Bulmer T. Bennett J. Edstrom	T. Milburn		

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

Faculty Senate President D. Weiss called the 13th meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 12:10 p.m.

- I. Announcements
 - A. L. Eilderts: Faculty Senate Membership updates: Senators whose three-year term is ending at the end of the academic year should hold a department election and share results with FS secretary. Senators are also asked to transmit the number of full-time faculty, including emergency hires, in their department for AY 2021-2022.
- II. Minutes of the previous meeting held on March 17, 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>
 - A. Faculty Senate Executive committee **moved to endorse** the Faculty Senate Statement on Anti-AAPI Violence, Racism, and Hate Crimes.
 - i. Vote tally
 1. Yes 42
 2. No0
 - ii. Motion to endorse the statement **approved unanimously**.
 - B. ACME Report: Concerned faculty are encouraged to write to the BOR and David Levinson (Interim-President CT State CC) directly. FS Executive committee will look into sending a communication on behalf of the Senate.
- IV. Unfinished Business
 - A. C. Simoneau **moved to approve** the Proposed Revisions to The Faculty Senate Bylaws for The Elections Committee.

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.

Approved revisions

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.

- i. Vote tally
 - 1. Yes 42
 - 2. No0
- ii. Motion to **approve** revisions to the Faculty Senate Bylaws **approved unanimously**.

V. New Business

- A. C. Simoneau **moved to approve** the Resolution Regarding the Size of The Faculty Academic Strategic Plan Committee.
 - i. Vote tally
 - 1. Yes 45
 - 2. No1
 - ii. Motion to **approve** the resolution **approved**.
- B. M. Diamantis **moved to postpone** Resolution Regarding the Robert E. Jirsa Service Award Committee to the next full Faculty Senate meeting.
 - i. Motion **seconded**.
 - ii. Motion **approved** through universal consent.

VI. Unfinished Business (cont'd at 1:00 p.m.)

- A. P. Petrie presented Report from the Academic Policy Committee: Possibilities for Improving the P&T Process.

VII. Standing Committee Reports

- A. Student Policy Committee: K. Marsland shared that information for students on the P/F process has been distributed via email. Faculty should read the policy and procedures carefully. Please note: **the Faculty Advisor initiates the process** and the student completes the process. Deadline for completed submission is **May 9 at 11:59 p.m.** Should a student initiate more than one P/F contract under these guidelines, the Registrar's office will only honor the first request.

VIII. Adjournment

- A. Meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

L. Eilderts
Secretary



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.

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 DEC's 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 DEC's

- ☐ 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.

STANDING COMMITTEES

ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE (APC)

APC MINUTES 4/7/2021

- No meeting. Arranged work assignments via email for committee members to plan next steps toward implementation of P&T recommendations (should Senate approve the recommendations).

Respectfully submitted,
Paul R. Petrie

ELECTIONS COMMITTEE (EC)

Faculty Senate Elections Committee April 7, 2021

Present: Klay Kruczek, Jonathan O'Hara, Cindy Simoneau, chairperson.

Absent: Darcy Kern, Mina Park.

1. Announcements
2. Old Business
 - A. Continuing discussion on request for university resolution on free speech.
Committee wants to consult with Faculty Senate President Deb Weiss and university President Bertolino about possible legal entanglements before presenting for approval.
3. New Business
 - A. Discussion concerning Spring 2021 ballot.
Ballots due April 30 at 12 p.m.
There are 70 vacancies to fill:
 - 44 at-large (26 of these will be filled ... 18 vacancies going into Fall)
 - 6 A&S (6 of these will be filled ... 0 vacancies going into Fall)
 - 4 BUS (1 of these will be filled ... 3 vacancies going into Fall)
 - 9 EDU (2 of these will be filled ... 7 vacancies going into Fall)
 - 7 HHS (4 of these will be filled ... 3 vacancies going into the Fall)
 - B. Committee reviewed revised request from Robert E. Jirsa Service Award Committee—change size (see attached).
Based on March 31 discussion at Faculty Senate meeting, membership was revised to incorporate a representative from library, counseling, athletic training and coaching faculty.

Respectfully submitted,
Cindy Simoneau

FINANCE COMMITTEE (FC)

No report

PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE (PPC)

**FACULTY SENATE
PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE
4/7/2021**

Teams Meeting

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

12:00pm

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Meeting Minutes of March 24, 2021 - PPC Approved

CONTINUING BUSINESS:

In preparation for finalizing the work of the committee this semester, the PPC determined the final set of documents and files shall be:

1. A Resolution broadly summarizing the recommended changes
2. A set of powerpoint slides summarizing the recommended changes, with additional details
3. Two versions of the P & T Procedures Document: one with tracked changes, one clean copy
4. Two versions of the Renewal Procedures Document: one with tracked changes, one clean copy

At 12:30pm, the PPC was joined by members of the P & T committee, as planned. Present members reviewed the following topics:

- term limit for the P&T Chair
- sealing of the files
- candidate access to the file
- candidate interviews

Adjourned 2:00pm

SCSU Faculty Senate Rules Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: Wednesday, April 7, 2021

Time: 12:10 PM

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

Agenda item:

1. Discuss revisions to The Department Chairpersonship document.

Meeting adjourned at 1:45 PM.

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

STUDENT POLICY COMMITTEE (SPC)

Student Policy Committee March 24, 2021 Minutes

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

12:15 Meeting called to order via Webex

1. The committee finalized proposed revisions to the Academic Misconduct Policy (v15) and drafted the resolution.
2. Old Business to be addressed at next meeting on April 21st
 - Potential revisions to permanent Incomplete, Course Withdrawal and Pass/Fail policies
 - Students' access to course materials during Incomplete/Grade Appeal periods
 - Access to feminine hygiene products

Meeting adjourned at 1:50

Respectfully submitted by K. Marsland

TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE (TC)

Faculty Senate Technology Committee

Minutes of meeting 4/07/2021

The meeting convened at 12:15 via Microsoft Teams. Registrar Alicia Carroll was our guest. The committee was directed by the Executive Committee to investigate issues surrounding permanently switching to online course evaluations (in other words, eliminating paper surveys). An ongoing concern for online surveying (especially in this critically important area) is that response rates are typically quite low. We investigated – with input from the Registrar – the possibility of giving earlier access to grade results to students who have completed their surveys. We reached a consensus that this was not an approach that would work well at Southern. The Registrar suggested that it might be possible to use a landing page in BBL or Banner that would remind students if they have outstanding evaluations to complete. Ms. Carroll also suggested that an approach which is used at CCSU of entering students into a lottery for several \$200 “books scholarships” might improve results. We will continue these discussions at our next meeting and hope to have a concrete proposal by year’s end.

Respectfully,

J. E. Fields

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM FORUM (UCF)

Report to the Faculty Senate Undergraduate Curriculum Forum April 1, 2021 Meeting Actions

The following motions were approved:

Motion from LEPC to revise the language regarding “Competency Completion Deadlines” in the LEP Charter (p. 12 of the document) to the following:

To help students better prepare for instruction in Tier 2 courses and in their majors, the ideal situation is that students satisfy all of their Tier 1 competency requirements in their first year of study. However, students who need to take Tier 1 pre-requisite courses and/or whose programs require a heavy major credit load in the first year may require greater flexibility in completion of LEP Tier 1. In light of this caveat, each semester a student should register for at least three courses, or the number of remaining Tier 1 requirements if fewer than three courses, toward the completion of their remaining Tier 1 competency requirements until the competency requirements are completed. This recommendation is intended to help students successfully progress through the LEP as the student must complete 6 of the 8 Tier 2 courses and be enrolled in any remaining Tier 1 requirements before taking the Tier 3 capstone must be simultaneously registered for any remaining Tier 1 requirements in order to take the Tier 3 capstone.

This change was made to reflect current practice and to eliminate dated language.

Motion from UWIC to revise the catalog language for Degrees and Requirements: Curriculum.

This change was made to clarify definitions including “program”, “major”, and “cognate” and to clarify the current credit sharing policies. It does not represent a change in policy.

Notes 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.
-

Respectfully submitted,
Meredith Sinclair (UCF Chair, Sp. 2021)
April 5, 2021

GRADUATE COUNCIL

DOCUMENTS/RESOLUTIONS FOR REVIEW FOR THE April 14, 2021 MEETING

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 member from Library, Counseling, Athletic Training, or Coaching faculty; instead of one (1) member from each college/school and one (1) at-large member; be it further

Resolved, That there shall be one (1) alternate from each college/school and one alternate from Library, Counseling, Athletic Training or Coaching faculty; and be it further

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

CURRENT GUIDELINES FOR ADDRESSING ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Southern Connecticut State University

Guidelines for Addressing Academic Misconduct

Academic honesty is a fundamental requirement in higher education . Ethical behavior is expected of all members of the University community . This document provides guidelines for addressing allegations of student academic misconduct at Southern Connecticut State University, as defined in the Student Code of Conduct and other University graduate and undergraduate documents. Faculty members and students are responsible for knowing this definition upon which all claims of academic misconduct and defenses thereto shall be based. Graduate students are also responsible for additional expectations pertinent to graduate study, research and writing for publication, as officially defined by the University in the SCSU code of conduct document: <http://www.southernct.edu/offices/judicialaffairs/StudentCodeofConductrevised6.16.16.pdf>

These guidelines are based on the principle that the faculty has oversight over academic honesty, including the authority and responsibility to impose appropriate penalties when academic misconduct occurs. In instances where both academic and non-academic misconduct are alleged, only the academic portion shall be handled according to the disciplinary procedures for academic misconduct described here. The Student Conduct Office, whose action may precede any academic disciplinary action, shall address separately charges of non-academic misconduct.

These guidelines address

1. Instructor's Role and Responsibilities
2. Complaint by Person Other Than the Course Instructor
3. Student Conduct Office's Role
4. Faculty Hearing Board and Hearing Panels
5. Hearing Procedures
6. Student Rights and Responsibilities
7. Appeal of the Faculty Hearing Board Ruling
8. Annual Reporting
9. Revisions to this Academic Misconduct Guidelines
10. Time Line for Appeals

1. Instructor's Role and Responsibilities.

a. Instructors shall inform students in course syllabi of course-specific requirements related to academic misconduct and the penalties that may be imposed for academic dishonesty according to the guidelines in the Student Code of Conduct and professional judgment. Statements in course syllabi shall refer students to the definition of academic misconduct in the Student Code of Conduct and any other pertinent University documents.

b. Incidents of academic misconduct can range in severity from minor to major violations. Instructors determine sanctions according to their professional judgment of the severity of misconduct. Academic sanctions should be commensurate with the severity of misconduct and may include one or more of the following:

- a reduced grade for the assignment in question;
- the opportunity to revise the assignment in which the act of dishonesty occurred or complete additional course work;
- a grade of F for the assignment in question;
- a grade of F for the course;
- **the faculty member bringing the claim of academic misconduct may petition department for the student's dismissal from the major program per the department's policy when applicable.**

c. When an instructor determines that an act of academic misconduct has occurred, within three (3) University calendar days, the instructor shall inform the student in writing of the infraction and will provide an opportunity for the student to respond to the allegation in person or in writing within five (5) days. Instructors may decide to handle minor violations informally, according to their discretion, especially when there is no sanction imposed beyond requiring the revision of an assignment. For the purpose of discussing allegations and sanctions, the instructor may meet with the student alone or in the presence of the department chair or departmental committee assigned to review instances of academic misconduct. For all violations not deemed minor, instructors shall file an Academic Misconduct Report with the Department Chair and School Dean. The Dean shall forward a copy of the report to the Student Conduct Office in order to monitor repeat offenses, and also send a copy to the affected student. The Academic Misconduct Report must indicate academic sanctions imposed.

2. Complaint by Person Other Than the Course Instructor.

Any member of the University community may file a complaint against a student alleging academic misconduct. Accusations of alleged violations by a person other than the student's instructor must be reported in writing within ten (10) calendar days of discovery of the alleged violation either to the instructor or to the University Student Conduct Office, which shall inform the instructor in writing within three (3) University calendar days. Upon receipt of notification, the instructor shall assess the merit of the allegation. An instructor who decides to pursue a claim of academic misconduct shall follow the procedure outlined in Section 1.c. of these guidelines, acting within three (3) University calendar days of receipt of the complaint.

3. Student Conduct Office Role.

The Student Conduct Office shall have specific responsibilities regarding notification, record keeping and hearings relative to academic misconduct.

1. The Student Conduct Office shall retain records of all reported cases of academic misconduct, including Academic Misconduct Reports submitted by instructors and written complaints received from others. For any student who has complaints on file, the Student Conduct Office may report the number and nature of incidents and the disposition of hearings to an instructor seeking input on how to regard the severity of an incident and to hearing officers during the sanctioning phase of an academic misconduct hearing.
2. The Student Conduct Office shall notify instructors of academic misconduct complaints it receives from sources other than the course instructor, as described in Section 2 of these guidelines.
3. Upon receipt of an Academic Misconduct Report, the Student Conduct Office will review recommendations by the instructor for disciplinary action and determine whether or not the case merits a hearing based upon the approved criteria found in section 4c. The instructor

accusing the student can also request a hearing on the case as described in the reporting form found at the end of this document. In this case, director of Student Conduct Office shall review the request and determine merit for a hearing or the opportunity for administrative resolution in consultation with faculty chair of the department in which the class was taught. If warranted by the frequency and/or severity of academic misconduct infractions on the student's record (as described in 4c) the Student Conduct Office will call a hearing. It is then the role of the Hearing Panel to decide whether or not to bring charges against the student that could lead to disciplinary probation, suspension or expulsion from the University.

4. Faculty Hearing Panels.

a. A Faculty Hearing Panel made up of members of the University-wide Academic Standing Committee shall have the responsibility of reviewing allegations of academic misconduct.

b. In the adjudication of allegations of academic misconduct, three (3) members of the ASC, appointed by the Student Conduct Office on a rotational basis, shall constitute a Hearing Panel and be convened to address a specific academic misconduct complaint. A Hearing Panel shall have representation from three academic schools, and may not include a member from the student's home department nor from the department that houses the course in which the alleged misconduct occurred. A representative from the Student Conduct Office shall be the convener and a non-voting member of the Panel.

c. A Hearing Panel shall be convened when:

- a student seeks to appeal sanctions imposed by an instructor for academic dishonesty, and the faculty member did not already elect to pursue a SOC hearing;
- an accused student's record of prior academic misconduct reaches 2 or more instances while at Southern Connecticut State University
- Or the director of the Student Conduct Office determines that there has been an egregious violation as reported by the instructor.

d. A student may appeal an accusation of academic misconduct which was not referred to a full hearing. A student appeal shall automatically go in front of a Hearing Panel. When a student appeal is brought before it, a Hearing Panel shall determine the merits of the academic misconduct claim. In the case of an appeal the Hearing Panel shall not increase the punishment that was originally imposed by the accusing professor.

e. In the case of an appeal, the grade given for that class will not be considered final until the appeal process is complete. The grade shall be entered as an "I+" by the instructor until the end of the following semester or until the appeal is finalized.

5. Hearing Procedures.

When a Hearing Panel is convened, the Panel shall operate according to the following procedures and timeline:

- a. **Scheduling of Hearing.** Hearings are scheduled during the fall and spring semesters of the academic year, and will normally be conducted within ten (10) University calendar days of receipt by the Office of Student Conduct of an academic misconduct report or an accused student's request for a hearing, Notice of Hearing. An accused student shall be notified in writing by the Student Conduct Office that a hearing has been scheduled. The notice shall advise the student of: i) the specific allegation(s) of academic misconduct, ii) possible sanctions, iii) the date, time, and place of the hearing, iv) hearing procedures, including who may attend, and v) the student's rights. The student shall be afforded a reasonable period of time to prepare for the hearing, which shall be not less than three (3) University calendar days.
- b. **Right to Appear.** The accused student and the instructor shall have the right to be present at all stages of the hearing process except during the private deliberations of the Hearing Panel, which shall be closed to the accused student, the instructor, supporting persons, and any other accuser. The Hearing Panel may, at its discretion, admit any person into the hearing room. The Hearing Panel **by a majority vote** shall have the authority to remove any person whose presence is deemed unnecessary or obstructive to the proceedings.
- c. **Opportunity to Present Positions.** Both the instructor and the accused student shall have the opportunity to present their positions to the Hearing Panel, including the opportunity to present the testimony of witnesses and documents in support of their positions, according to the hearing procedures outlined in the Notice of Hearing communicated by the Student Conduct Office.
- d. **Support Person.** The accused student shall be allowed to have one person attend the meeting for the purpose of providing support. The support person must be someone who is available to attend at the scheduled date and time of the hearing. Delays will not be allowed due to the scheduling conflicts of a support person. The supporting person may not provide written or verbal testimony during the Hearing.
- e. **Record of Hearing.** The University shall make an audio recording of the hearing. The recording shall be the property of the University. No other recordings shall be made by any person during the hearing. Upon request, the accused student shall be allowed to review the recording in a designated University office in order to prepare for an appeal of the decision rendered by the Hearing Panel. Applicable state and federal law shall govern further disclosure of the recording.
- f. **Written Notice of Decision.** Within two (2) University calendar days after the hearing, the Student Conduct Office shall inform the accused student and the instructor of the Hearing Panel's action in writing, indicating whether the student has been determined to be "Responsible" or "Not Responsible" for the academic misconduct. The decision of the Hearing Panel, as well as any disciplinary sanction(s) imposed, generally will not be released to parties other than the student and instructor in question, Department Chair, Dean and Provost. **No other parties** will be notified without the prior written consent of the accused student. However, certain information may be released if and to the extent authorized by state or federal law.
- g. If, the Hearing Panel determines that the Instructor did not provide sufficient evidence to support the alleged misconduct, the Hearing Panel shall direct the Instructor to assign a grade based on the quality of the work as originally submitted. If the instructor declines to do so, the matter will be referred to the instructor's Department Chair or designee, who will select two (2) anonymous reviewers with sufficient expertise in the area to reevaluate the assignment. In this case, the final grade shall be the average of the two anonymous evaluations.

6. Student Rights and Responsibilities.

1. A student accused of academic dishonesty has the right to appeal an instructor's allegations. An appeal hearing is requested by completing and submitting an "Academic

Misconduct Appeal Form" to the Student Conduct Office. The appeal shall include substantial evidence supporting the student's innocence and will follow the guidelines laid out in section 4d.

2. An accused student may request that **any** faculty member on the convened Hearing Panel be replaced if the student believes that the faculty member chosen by the Student Conduct Office for the three-member panel may be unable to render an objective judgment. The final decision on the removal of the member shall be rendered by the head of the Student Conduct Office. If the chair deems that the member can be impartial they can refuse the request.
3. A student found to have violated the Academic Misconduct Policy by a Hearing Panel may appeal the decision, as described in Section 7.

7. Appeal of the Faculty Hearing Board Ruling.

- a. The student may appeal the decision of the Hearing Panel to the Provost or designee. An appeal shall be in writing and shall be delivered to the Provost or designee within three (3) University calendar days after receipt of the Hearing Panel's written decision. The Provost or designee shall review the record of the hearing, including any and all documents presented to the Hearing Panel, along with the student's written appeal.
- b. An appeal may be brought on four grounds: (a) a claim that error in the hearing procedure substantially affected the decision; (b) a claim that new evidence or information material to the case was not known at the time of the hearing; and / or (c) a claim that the academic sanction(s) imposed were not appropriate for the violation of the Code for which the accused student was found responsible and/or (d) a claim that the academic sanction imposed has resulted in a palpable injustice. The Provost shall have the right to deny an appeal not brought on proper grounds.
- c. The decision of the Provost or designee shall be rendered within ten (10) University calendar days of receipt of an appeal of the Hearing Panel's decision. The decision of the Provost or designee shall be final and there shall be no further right of appeal.

8. Annual Reporting.

At the end of each year, the Student Conduct Office shall notify the Faculty Senate and the Provost of the total number of academic misconduct cases reported for the year, the number of appeals filed, and the number and type of disciplinary sanctions imposed by the Faculty Hearing Board. No individual case decisions or outcomes will be identified in this report. Where necessary, the report will aggregate data over several years in order to maintain confidentiality.

9. Revisions to this Academic Honesty Guidelines.

The Senate, in agreement with the President of the University, shall establish revisions of the Academic Misconduct Guidelines.

10. **Timeline. Note:** The term "days" in this timeline refers to University calendar days.

1. An individual who witnesses misconduct shall report the incident to the instructor or to the University Office of Student Conduct...	As soon as possible but prior to the end of the semester in which the incident occurred.
2. The University Office of Student Conduct shall provide the instructor with a copy of the written complaint...	within 3 days of receipt of complaint by an individual other than the instructor.
3. The instructor shall notify the student in writing of the infraction...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • within 3 days of an instructor's identification of misconduct, or • within 3 days of receipt of a written complaint from the University Student Conduct Office.
4. A hearing shall take place...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • within 10 days of receipt of complaint by the University Office of Student Conduct, or • within 10 days of an accused student's

	request for a hearing, or <input type="checkbox"/> within 10 days of the Office of Student Conduct bringing charges against a student.
5. Students shall have time to prepare for the hearing...	not to be less than 3 days.
6. The decision of the Hearing Panel shall be sent in writing to the accused student and the instructor...	within 2 days after the hearing.
7. The student may file an appeal in writing to the Provost	within 3 days after receipt of the Hearing Panel's written decision.
8. The Provost (or designee) shall render a final decision to any student appeal of a Hearing Panel ruling...	within 10 days of receipt of that appeal.

Flow Chart

Approved 12/5/12

Academic Misconduct Report

Academic misconduct, also called academic dishonesty, includes cheating, plagiarism and other academically dishonest acts. Examples of what constitutes academic misconduct are presented in Faculty Senate document on academic misconduct and appear in the Student Handbook.

Instructions

1. When academic dishonesty occurs, this form must be completed and submitted to the Dean of the School and the Chair of the Department in which the course resides.
2. A copy of the form must be sent to the affected student.
3. Instructors may request no further action, or that disciplinary charges be brought by the Office of Judicial Affairs.

Instructor's
Name _____ Department _____

Office _____ Phone _____

Email _____

Course _____ Section _____
Term _____

Student Name _____ Student ID# _____
Describe Alleged Misconduct:

Sanction(s) taken By Instructor: _____ Reduced Grade for Assignment
_____ Opportunity to Revise Assignment _____ Grade of F for Assignment
_____ Grade of F for the Course

_____ I Request No Further Action

_____ I Recommend Separate Disciplinary Actions be Initiated by the Office of
Judicial Affairs.

Instructor's Signature Date

Copies

Sent To: Department Chair_____Dean_ _ _

Approved 12/5/12

Academic Misconduct Student Request for Hearing Form

Student Name _____

Course _____ Term _____

Instructor's Name _____ Department _____
Explain the basis of your appeal. Be specific.

(Please attach any additional materials that support your case.)

This completed form must be sent to the Office of Judicial Affairs within 5 days following department's or instructor's sanction(s).

Note: Academic Misconduct can include cheating, plagiarism, and other issues. The descriptions of misconduct are described in the Student Handbook and in an instructor's syllabus.

Approved 12/5/12

Revised and Approved by the FS 2/21/2018

RESOLUTION REGARDING REVISION OF THE ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

RESOLUTION REGARDING REVISION OF THE ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY

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; and

Whereas, Revisions to the Academic Misconduct Policy have been recommended by the Faculty Senate Student Policy Committee; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the following documents be approved:

I. Guidelines for Addressing Academic Misconduct

Academic honesty is a fundamental requirement in higher education. Ethical behavior is expected of all members of the University community. This document provides guidelines for addressing allegations of student academic misconduct at Southern Connecticut State University, as defined in the Student Code of Conduct (available on the University website) and other University and departmental documents relevant to academic misconduct. Faculty members and Students are responsible for knowing this relevant information upon which all claims of academic misconduct and defenses thereto shall be based.

These guidelines are based on the principle that the faculty has oversight over academic honesty, including the authority and responsibility to impose appropriate penalties when academic misconduct occurs. In instances where both academic and non-academic misconduct are alleged, only the academic portion shall be handled according to the disciplinary procedures for academic misconduct described here. The Office of Student Conduct (OSC), whose action may precede or follow any academic disciplinary action, shall address separately charges of non-academic misconduct. In instances when alleged academic misconduct includes component(s) of research misconduct the SCSU Office of Research Integrity (ORI) may be consulted as appropriate.

Throughout this document, “days” means University Calendar weekdays when the University is open.

These guidelines address:

1. Instructor's Role and Responsibilities
2. Complaint by Person Other than the Course Instructor
3. Role of University Office of Student Conduct
4. Faculty Hearing Panels
5. Hearing Procedures
6. Student Rights and Responsibilities
7. Appeal of the Faculty Hearing Panel Ruling

8. Annual Reporting
9. Revisions to these Academic Misconduct Guidelines
10. Timelines

1. Instructor's Role and Responsibilities.

Instructors are responsible to address the commission of acts of academic dishonesty.

a. When there are course-specific requirements for academic conduct that may not be self-evident in the Student Code of Conduct, the Instructor shall inform Students of those requirements in the course syllabus. The Instructor shall inform Students of penalties that may be imposed for academic dishonesty according to the guidelines in the Student Code of Conduct and their professional judgment. Instructors are strongly encouraged to refer Students to the Student Code of Conduct and other relevant University documents pertaining to academic misconduct in their course syllabi.

b. Incidents of academic misconduct can range in severity; Instructors determine sanctions according to their professional judgment of the severity of misconduct. At the discretion of the Instructor, this determination may be made in consultation with the OSC (e.g., regarding patterns of past academic misconduct by an individual student and clarification of the Hearing and Appeals processes). Academic sanctions imposed by the instructor shall be related to performance in the course and be commensurate with the severity of misconduct and may include, but are not limited to, one or more of the following:

- ☐ a reduced grade for the assignment in question;
- ☐ the opportunity to revise the assignment in which the act of dishonesty occurred;
- ☐ the opportunity to complete additional course work;
- ☐ a grade of F for the assignment in question;
- ☐ a grade of F for the course.

c. Instructors may decide to handle minor violations informally, according to their discretion, especially when there is no sanction imposed beyond requiring the revision of an assignment. When an Instructor determines that a more serious act of academic misconduct has occurred, within three (3) days, the Instructor shall inform the Student in writing of the infraction and shall provide an opportunity for the Student to respond to the allegation in person or in writing within five (5) days.

d. When an Instructor determines that a more serious act of academic misconduct as described in Section 1c has occurred, the Instructor shall file an Academic Misconduct Report with the Department Chairperson and College/School Dean within three (3) days of the response from the Student. Within seven (7) days, the Dean shall forward a copy of the report to the OSC and also send a copy to the Student. The Academic Misconduct Report from the Instructor must indicate the academic sanction(s) imposed and whether they recommend that additional disciplinary actions be initiated by the OSC.

e. In the case of a Student appeal, the grade given for that class shall not be considered final until the appeal process is complete. The grade shall be entered as an "I+" by the Instructor until the end of the following semester or until the appeal is finalized.

2. Complaint by Person Other Than the Course Instructor.

Any member of the University community may file a complaint against a Student alleging academic misconduct. Accusations of alleged violations by a person other than the Student's Instructor must be reported in writing within ten (10) calendar days of discovery of the alleged violation either to the Instructor or to the OSC, which shall inform the Instructor in writing within three (3) University calendar days. Upon receipt of notification, the Instructor shall assess the merit of the allegation. An Instructor who decides to pursue a claim of academic misconduct shall follow the procedure outlined in Section 1 of these guidelines, acting within three (3) University calendar days of receipt of the complaint.

3. Office of Student Conduct Role.

The Office of Student Conduct (OSC) shall have specific responsibilities regarding notification, record keeping and hearings related to academic misconduct.

- a. The OSC shall retain records of all reported cases of academic misconduct, including Academic Misconduct Reports submitted by Instructors and written complaints received from others.
- b. The OSC shall report the number and nature of incidents and the disposition of prior hearings to an Instructor seeking input on how to regard an incident.
- c. The OSC shall report the number and nature of incidents and the disposition of prior hearings to hearing officers during the sanctioning phase of an academic misconduct hearing.
- d. The OSC shall notify Instructors of academic misconduct complaints it receives from sources other than the course Instructor, as described in Section 2 of these guidelines.
- e. Within ten (10) days of receipt of an Academic Misconduct Report, the OSC shall review recommendations by the Instructor for further action and determine one of the following: a) the case requires no further action; or b) the case is eligible for an administrative resolution in consultation with the student, the reporting faculty and, if the faculty member is unavailable, the Chairperson of the Department in which the class was taught; c) the case merits a hearing with the University-wide Academic Standing Committee (UASC). The Student shall be notified of the determination within this 10-day period.
- f. When no further disciplinary action is requested by the faculty member, but the student has a previous academic misconduct record that may warrant further action, the OSC shall consult with the UASC and determine whether to convene a hearing.

4. Faculty Hearing Panels.

- a. A Faculty Hearing Panel made up of members of the University-wide Academic Standing Committee (UASC) shall have the responsibility of reviewing student appeals and/or referrals from the OSC.
- b. A Faculty Hearing Panel shall be convened when one or more of the following conditions are satisfied:
 - ☐ a Student seeks to appeal the Instructor's finding of misconduct;
 - ☐ a Student seeks to appeal sanctions imposed by an Instructor for academic misconduct;
 - ☐ a Student seeks to appeal sanctions based on an Instructor's failure to follow the procedures set forth in this policy;
 - ☐ a Student's record of prior academic misconduct reaches two reported instances of academic misconduct while at Southern Connecticut State University;

- the Director of the OSC determines that there has been an egregious violation as reported by the Instructor.
- c. The OSC shall notify the UASC of the need to constitute a hearing panel. Within five (5) days of notification by the OSC, the UASC shall form a hearing panel comprising a minimum of three (3) members to be convened to address a specific academic misconduct complaint. A Faculty Hearing Panel may not include a member from the Student's home Department nor from the Department that houses the course in which the alleged misconduct occurred. A representative from the OSC shall be the convener and a non-voting member of the Panel
- d. UASC members shall be available to hear appeals during the first and last week of each academic semester per the academic calendar to address end-of-semester appeals as they arise.
- e. In the case of a Student appeal, the Faculty Hearing Panel shall determine the merits of the Student appeal or OSC referral. The Faculty Hearing Panel shall not increase any academic sanctions that were originally imposed by the Instructor alleging the misconduct.

5. Hearing Procedures.

When a Faculty Hearing Panel is convened, the Panel shall operate according to the following procedures and timeline:

- a. **Scheduling of Hearing.** Hearings normally are held during the fall and spring semesters of the academic year. When the criteria set forth in section 4b have been satisfied, Faculty Hearing Panels shall be conducted within ten (10) days of receipt by the OSC of an academic misconduct report or a Student's request for a hearing during the fall and spring semesters.
- b. **Summer Hearing Panels.** If a penalty imposed for academic misconduct in a course in the spring semester would prevent a Student from continuing in a program or major, the Student is eligible to have a hearing held during the summer on a schedule determined by the UASC.
 - i. Instructors are strongly encouraged to participate in Summer Faculty Hearing Panels either in person or remotely.
 - ii. Insofar as a Summer Faculty Hearing Panel would not take place during the Academic/Contract year, the Instructor and the members of the UASC shall be compensated for their participation according to the following formula unless they are employed under a full-year contract. The members of the UASC shall receive 4 hours of non-teaching credit load for each hearing panel; the Instructor shall receive 2 hours of non-teaching credit load for each hearing panel.¹
- c. **Notice of Hearing.** A Student shall be notified in writing by the OSC when a hearing has been scheduled. The notice shall advise the Student of: i) the purpose of the hearing, ii) relevant report(s) of academic misconduct, iii) the date, time, and place of the hearing, iv) hearing procedures, including who may attend, and v) the Student's rights. The Student shall be afforded a reasonable period of time to prepare for the hearing, which shall be not less than three (3) days.
- d. **Right to Appear.** The Student and the Instructor shall have the right to be present at all stages of the hearing process except during the private deliberations of the Faculty Hearing Panel, which shall be closed to the Student, the Instructor, supporting persons, and any other person alleging misconduct. The Faculty Hearing Panel may, at its discretion, admit any

¹ See CSU-AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement, article 10.12.1: Duties with No Load Credit. "Bargaining unit duties involving no load credit that are within the University but other than normal assignments may be offered to full-time members up to a total of 135 hours per semester (prorated for intersession or summer session as appropriate). Compensation for each 45 hours of work shall be one load credit at the compensation rates listed in Article 11."

- person into the hearing room. The Faculty Hearing Panel, **by a majority vote**, shall have the authority to remove any person whose presence is deemed unnecessary or obstructive to the proceedings.
- e. **Opportunity to Present Positions.** Both the Instructor and the Student shall have the opportunity to present their positions to the Hearing Panel, including the opportunity to present the testimony of witnesses and documents in support of their positions, according to the hearing procedures outlined in the Notice of Hearing communicated by the OSC.
 - f. **Support Person.** The Student shall have the right to be accompanied by an advisor or support person, who is a silent non-participant in the hearing, and who may not provide written testimony. Delays shall not be allowed on the basis of an advisor or support person's scheduling conflicts.
 - g. **Record of Hearing.** The University shall make an audio recording of the hearing. The recording shall be the property of the University. No other recordings shall be made by any person during the hearing. Upon request, the Student shall be allowed to review the recording in a designated University office in order to prepare for an appeal of the decision rendered by the Hearing Panel. Applicable state and federal law shall govern further disclosure of the recording.
 - h. **Written Notice of Decision.** Within two (2) days after the hearing, the OSC shall inform the Student and the Instructor of the Hearing Panel's determination in writing. The decision of the Hearing Panel shall be released to the Student and Instructor in question, Department Chair, Dean, and Provost. **No other parties** shall be notified without the prior written consent of the Student. However, certain information may be released if and to the extent authorized by state or federal law.
 - i. If the Hearing Panel determines that the Instructor did not provide sufficient evidence to support the alleged misconduct or academic sanctions, the Hearing Panel shall direct the Instructor to assign a grade based on the quality of the work as originally submitted. If the Instructor declines to do so, the matter shall be referred to the Instructor's Department Chairperson or designee, who shall select two (2) anonymous reviewers with sufficient expertise in the area to reevaluate the assignment. In this case, the final grade shall be the average of the grade given by the two anonymous evaluations.

6. Student Rights and Responsibilities.

- a. A Student has the right to appeal an Instructor's finding of academic misconduct or sanctions issued within five (5) days of being notified of sanctions by the Instructor or the Department. A student also has the right to appeal sanctions based on procedural violations.
- b. An appeal hearing is requested by completing and submitting an "Academic Misconduct Appeal Form" to the OSC. The appeal shall include evidence supporting the Student's position and shall follow the guidelines laid out in Section 4e.
- c. A Student accused of misconduct has the right to be heard by an impartial Hearing Body. Any concern surrounding the impartiality of the Hearing Body or any member thereof will be referred to the Vice President for Student Affairs or their designee, who will review the matter and make a determination.
- d. A Student found to have violated the Academic Misconduct Policy by a Hearing Panel may appeal the decision, as described in Section 7.
- e. When the timeline established by this document would result in a delay of the Student's progress towards degree completion, all parties shall expedite the hearing process with all due procedural promptness.

7. Appeal of the Faculty Hearing Panel Ruling.

- a. The Student may appeal the decision of the Hearing Panel to the Provost. An appeal shall be in writing and shall be delivered to the Provost within three (3) days after receipt of the Hearing Panel's written decision. The Provost or designee shall review the record of the hearing, including any and all documents presented to the Hearing Panel, along with the Student's written appeal.
- b. An appeal may be brought on four grounds: (a) a claim that an error in the hearing procedure substantially affected the decision; (b) a claim that new evidence or information material to the case was not known at the time of the hearing; (c) a claim that the academic sanctions imposed were not appropriate for violation of the Code for which the Student was found responsible; d) a claim that the academic sanction imposed has resulted in palpable injustice. The Provost shall have the right to deny an appeal not brought on proper grounds.
- c. The decision of the Provost shall be rendered within ten (10) days of receipt of an appeal of the Hearing Panel's decision. The decision of the Provost shall be final and there shall be no further right of appeal.

8. Annual Reporting.

At the end of each year, the OSC shall notify the Faculty Senate and the Provost of the total number of academic misconduct cases reported for the year, the number of appeals filed, and the number and type of disciplinary sanctions imposed by the Faculty Hearing Panel. No individual case decisions or outcomes shall be identified in this report. When necessary, the report shall aggregate data over several years in order to maintain confidentiality.

9. Revisions to this Academic Misconduct Policy.

The Senate, in agreement with the President of the University, shall establish revisions of this Academic Misconduct Policy.

10. Timelines.

Report of Academic Misconduct by Instructor:

	Time Frame	Action To Be Taken
Step 1	Within 3 days from incident	Instructor notifies Student in writing (Section 1c)
Step 2	Within 5 days from receipt of notification	Student response in person or writing (Section 1c)
Step 3	Within 3 days from response from Student	Instructor files an Academic Misconduct Report with the Department Chairperson and College/School Dean (Section 1d)
Step 4	Within 7 days from receipt of report	Dean forwards Academic Misconduct Report to Office of Student Conduct & sends copy to the affected Student (Section 1d)
Step 5	Within 10 days of receipt of Academic Misconduct Report	Office of Student Conduct makes determination (hearing or administrative resolution) and notifies Student (Section 3e)
Go to Hearing Timeline		

Complaint by Person Other Than the Course Instructor:

	Time Frame	Action to be Taken
Step 1	Within 10 days of discovery	Written Report of Academic Misconduct to either the Instructor OR to Office of Student Conduct (Section 2)
Option A: If to the Instructor, then		Instructor follows <i>Report of Academic Misconduct Timeline Step 1</i>
Option B: If to Office of Student Conduct, follow Step 2 below:		
Step 2	Within 3 days of reporting	Office of Student Conduct notifies Instructor of complaint (Section 2)
Step 3	Within 3 days of Instructor's notification	Instructor follows <i>Report of Academic Misconduct Timeline Step 1</i>

If a Hearing is Determined by the Office of Student Conduct or is Requested by the Student:

	Time Frame	Action To Be Taken
Step 1	Within 10 days of receipt of the report of Academic Misconduct or Appeal by the Student	A hearing must be scheduled, typically during the Fall or Spring semester of the academic year (Section 5a)
Step 2	Within five (5) days of notification by the Office of Student Conduct	UASC forms a hearing panel comprising a minimum of three (3) members to be convened to address a specific academic misconduct complaint (Section 4c)
Step 3	At least 3 days prior to the scheduled hearing	Student notification to include: date, time, place of hearing, specific allegation, possible sanctions, hearing procedures, attendees, Student's rights (Section 5c)
Step 4	Within 2 days after the hearing	Office of Student Conduct informs Student and Instructor of Hearing Panel's action in writing (Section 5h)
Step 5	Within 3 days of the receipt of the written decision from the Hearing Panel	Student may submit a written appeal of the decision to the Provost (Section 7a)
Step 6	Within 10 days of receipt of the written appeal	Provost shall render a decision (Section 7c)

Academic Misconduct Report

Instructions

- ☐ When any instance of academic dishonesty occurs, this form must be completed and submitted to the Dean of the College/School and the Chairperson of the Department in which the course resides along with evidence necessary to substantiate the claim.
- ☐ A copy of the form must be sent to the affected Student.
- ☐ Instructors may request no further action, or may request that disciplinary charges be brought by the Office of Student Conduct.

Instructor's Name _____ Department _____

Office _____ Phone _____ Email _____

Course _____ Section _____ Term _____

Student Name _____ Student ID# _____

Describe Alleged Misconduct:

Sanction(s) taken By Instructor:

_____ Reduced Grade for Assignment

_____ Opportunity to Revise Assignment

_____ Opportunity to Complete Additional Course

_____ Grade of F for Assignment

_____ Grade of F for the Course Work

_____ Other: Please specify: _____

To be completed for all allegations of Academic Misconduct:

_____ I Request No Further Action

_____ I Recommend Separate Disciplinary Actions be Initiated by the Office of Student Conduct.

Instructor's Signature

Date

Copies Sent To: Department Chairperson _____ Dean _____

Copy Sent to: Office of Student Conduct _____

Academic Misconduct Student Request for Hearing Form

Student Name _____ Student ID# _____

Course _____ Term _____

Instructor's Name _____

Department _____

Explain the basis of your appeal. Please be specific.

Please attach any additional materials that support your case.

Student's Signature

Date

Copy Sent to: Office of Student Conduct _____

Note: Academic Misconduct can include cheating, plagiarism, and other issues. Examples of what constitutes academic misconduct are presented in the Student Code of Conduct and other University graduate and undergraduate documents, including the Instructor's syllabus.

II. Revisions to Academic Misconduct Text on SCSU website

Academic misconduct includes all forms of cheating, plagiarism, **fabrication and falsification**. Academic misconduct includes but is not limited to, providing or receiving assistance from another, in a manner not authorized by the instructor, in the creation of work to be submitted for academic evaluation (including papers, projects and examinations).

Plagiarism is defined as presenting, as one's own, the ideas or words of another person, for academic evaluation, without proper acknowledgment. Plagiarism includes, but is not limited to: (i) copying sentences, phrases, paragraphs, tables, figures, or data directly or in slightly modified form from a book, article, or other academic source without using quotation marks or giving proper acknowledgment to the original author or source; (ii) copying information from Internet Web sites and submitting it as one's own work; (iii) buying papers for the purpose of turning them in as one's own work; and (iv) selling or lending papers to another person for submission by that other person, for academic evaluation, as his or her own work.

Fabrication includes but is not limited to making up data or results of a research assignment and recording or reporting them. Falsification includes but is not limited to manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in a submitted research paper.

Procedures for handling cases of alleged academic misconduct have been approved by the Faculty Senate and can be found by clicking [here](#).

KEY REVISIONS TO THE ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY V.15

- Addresses Research Misconduct and consultation with Office of Research Integrity
- Creates mechanism for Summer Hearing Panels a penalty imposed for academic misconduct in a course in the spring semester would prevent a Student from continuing in a program or major
- Clarifies possible sanctions imposed by instructors
- Clarifies the conditions under which a report of academic conduct must be filed
- Clarifies the role of Office of Student Conduct
- Clarifies the role of the University-wide Academic Standing Committee
- Clarifies the timeline associated with reporting of academic misconduct by instructors and other persons.
- Clarifies the timeline for hearings and appeals
- Addresses issues of clarity and internal consistency
- Updates Academic Misconduct form and Academic Misconduct Student Request for Hearing form

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE
FACULTY SENATE RESOLUTION REGARDING CBA TRAVEL FUNDS FOR 2021-2022

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, The CSU-AAUP CBA Travel Fund [“Travel Fund”] supports Faculty attendance at professional seminars, workshops, conferences or educational exchanges (CSU-AAUP Contract Article 9.5.1);

Whereas, Participation in such conferences and academic gatherings enhances the ability of SCSU Faculty members to achieve excellence as scholars in their particular disciplines;

Whereas, The Collective Bargaining Agreement (9.5.1) specifies that the President or designee shall consult with the cabinet and the Senate President in assigning travel funds, and each full-time member normally shall not be allowed more than \$1,500 reimbursement per contract year toward the cost of fees, and each part-time member not more than \$750 from the Travel Fund;

Whereas, Reduced frequency of travel during the coronavirus pandemic has resulted in a significant amount of residual monies in the Travel Fund at the end of 2020-2021;

Whereas, Residual monies will remain in the Travel Fund and be added to the 2021-2022 CBA-determined Travel Fund allocation, leading to an unusually large pool of funds for travel;

Whereas, The Faculty Senate and the Provost have identified a mutual desire to use available travel funds to support Faculty attendance at professional seminars, workshops, conferences or educational exchanges and also to promote active participation;

Whereas, Cost increases for travel and conference fees have significantly affected faculty members’ opportunities to participate in national and international professional seminars, workshops, conferences and educational exchanges; and

Whereas, Through this resolution the Faculty Senate is acting to fulfill its responsibility in conferring with the President on the establishment of a maximum annual SCSU funding limit on travel funds provided by the CBA for 2021-2022; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recommends that the travel fund reimbursement caps for 2021-2022 be set as \$1,750.00 for tenured full-time faculty members and non-tenured faculty members on special appointment (non-tenure track), \$2,000.00 for non-tenured full-time faculty members on tenure track, and \$750.00¹ for part-time faculty members; and be it further

¹ The CBA (Article 9.5.1) sets the maximum travel fund reimbursement cap for part-time members at \$750.

Resolved, That for full-time members of the Faculty traveling to a professional seminar, workshop, conference or educational exchange shall have the travel cap raised by \$250 for one of two circumstances:

- a) for travel that requires trans-ocean travel, OR
- b) if the member is Faculty traveling to attend a professional seminar, workshop, conference or educational exchange as an invited keynote speaker², and whose expenses are not covered in full by the sponsoring organization

; and be it further

Resolved, That according to the foregoing, the maximum total travel reimbursement cap for tenured full-time faculty members and non-tenured faculty members on special appointment (non-tenure track) shall be \$2,000.00, and the maximum travel reimbursement cap for non-tenured full-time faculty members on tenure track shall be \$2,250.00.

² For the purposes of this document, an invited keynote speaker is the person “headlining” or serving as the main speaker during an opening meeting or other plenary session at an event covered by CBA-provided travel funds. A faculty member applying for an increased travel fund cap based on having been invited to give a keynote address, must provide a copy of a formal, written invitation, which states the amount of expenses paid by the sponsoring organization and the stipend awarded by the sponsoring organization to cover expenses. A faculty member who attends a professional seminar, workshop, conference or educational exchange as a participant in any other capacity (e.g., to present a paper, poster session, experiential learning activity, professional development workshop, attend committee or governing group activities) is not an invited keynote speaker.

DRAFT PROPOSAL: AN IT FINANCES WORKING GROUP

Draft Proposal: an IT Finances Working Group

In October of 2020 Rusty May (Edward L. May, Jr.) responded to a request from the Faculty Senate Finance Committee by submitting a written report on the state of spending on academic Information Technology (IT) at SCSU. Mr. May is to be commended for providing us with a thorough, clear, and professionally executed high level overview of IT spending for academic support at Southern.

On March 24, 2021, the Finance and Technology committees of the Faculty Senate held a joint meeting to discuss Mr. May's report. We were particularly struck by the following important elements of the report.

1. The expense for licensing Blackboard (BBL) has been shifted from the System Office to the individual CSU campuses.
2. Bond fund monies for IT capital improvements are coming to an end, and the report states that "there is no reasonable prospect of a new bond funded technology program in the future" and further that "there will likely be a significant impact in the loss of these bond funds."
3. There is a troubling practice wherein the System Office buys products and/or services for a specific term, typically 3 years, and then transfers the cost of those products and/or services to the constituent institutions after the initial term.
4. Funding for IT has remained relatively flat over the last 5 years — a period of time which has seen tremendous growth in the demands on our campus IT staff and the technological expectations on our faculty. In particular, "the funding for part time staff has remained flat between FY15-FY21 without any accommodation for inflation or the change in the minimum wage."

A question that naturally arises is: If the cost of some components of our IT landscape is being borne at the campus level, should we not have agency to make decisions about selection of those elements? For example, if we are now paying for BBL out of SCSU's IT budget, should we be able to opt to switch to some other learning management system (LMS)?

We find that a pattern is developing wherein decisions are made by fiat at the System level and expenses are borne at the campus level. We have full faith and confidence in our local IT personnel, and note the purposefully collaborative nature of IT governance at SCSU. There is a concern that the voices of our local experts, including IT staff and faculty end-users, are not being heard at the System Office. In a time of greater demands for academic technology and diminishing local and system resources, remote decision making and taxation-without-representation financing have little hope of strengthening academic effectiveness. It is therefore proposed that the Faculty Senate takes the following steps:

1. Work with the other CSU campus Faculty Senates to empanel a four-campus CSU working group to study academic technology needs, available and other required

resources, current acquisition and financing strategies, and options for improving the influence of the faculty on guiding the direction of technology adoption and support.

2. From each campus, include on the working group a) members of the faculty appointed by the respective Senates, b) an IT staff representative, appointed by respective campus administrations, c) a representative of the AAUP appointed by respective union chapters.
3. Conduct individual campus faculty forums to identify technology priorities.
4. Conduct a four-campus faculty forum to focus technology priorities.
5. Set a report deadline to the four campus Faculty Senates of March 7, 2022.