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AGENDA
March 30, 2022
12:10 p.m.

To join the meeting, please click here to be connected via Zoom. Alternatively, copy and paste this link:
https://southernct-edu.zoom.us/j/83888278575?pwd=MUhrUWdiOEVKWFdHTmNjQk9ZMGFzZz09

I. Announcements Relevant to the Faculty Senate

II. Approval of Minutes of Previous Meeting held on March 9, 2022

III. Faculty Senate President’s Report

IV. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committee
   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

VII. New Business
   a. Department Proposal: Women’s and Gender Studies
   b. Resolution Regarding the Awarding of Latin Honors
   c. Resolution Regarding COVID Policy

VIII. Guest(s)
   a. Ombudsperson updates: Steve Larocco and Audrey Kerr

Spring 2022
Full Faculty Senate Meetings:
1/26, 2/9, 2/23, 3/9, 3/30, 4/13, 4/27, 5/4
Standing Committee Meetings:
1/19, 2/2, 2/16, 3/2, 3/23, 4/6, 4/20
The 11th Meeting of the Faculty Senate AY 2021-2022 was held on March 9, 2022, at 12:10 p.m. via Zoom.

### Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Department/Position</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dave Allen</td>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Ounet</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandip Dutta</td>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>6/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shibiao “Bill” Ding</td>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Gilliland</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Lopez-Velasquez</td>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>8/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Farley</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>8/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalie Starling</td>
<td>Counseling &amp; School Psychology</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Brancacio</td>
<td>Health &amp; Movement Sciences</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Fields</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Broadbridge</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Macur</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>8/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanie Uribe</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helen Marx</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Learning</td>
<td>10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Gregory</td>
<td>Health &amp; Movement Sciences</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klay Kruczek</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan O’Hara</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>8/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Elderts</td>
<td>World Languages &amp; Literatures</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Siedlecki</td>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>6/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Diamantis</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Learning</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troy Paddock</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonathan Irving</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Budnick</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>¾</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Grace</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>9/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dushmantha Jayawickrem</td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen Couy</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Adimando*</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>7/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate Marsland*</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Weiss</td>
<td>Faculty Senate President</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mina Park</td>
<td>Business Information Systems</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jia Yu</td>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yan Liu</td>
<td>Information &amp; Library Science</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly Martinez*</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Faraclas</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Webb</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Madonia</td>
<td>Educational Leadership</td>
<td>8/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cindy Simoneau</td>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obiageli Okwuka</td>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Dodge</td>
<td>Recreation, Tourism &amp; Sport Management</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meredith Sinclair</td>
<td>Undergraduate Curriculum Forum</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Cook</td>
<td>Communication Disorders</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Shea</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick Crowley</td>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>8/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michele Delucia</td>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>8/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian Perumbilly</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia O’Sullivan</td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
<td>9/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wes O’Brien</td>
<td>Communication, Media &amp; Screen Studies</td>
<td>10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Petrie</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline Toce</td>
<td>Library Services</td>
<td>10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Sormrude</td>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>6/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Monroe</td>
<td>Tomczak</td>
<td>10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyle Mashia-Thaxton</td>
<td>Student Government Association</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaa Sheta</td>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Miller</td>
<td>Environment, Geography &amp; Marine Studies</td>
<td>11/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Stewart*</td>
<td>Management, International Business &amp; Public Utilities</td>
<td>10/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia Metaxas</td>
<td>Part-time Faculty</td>
<td>9/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Adams</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>9/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joe Bertolino*</td>
<td>SCSU President</td>
<td>7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guests:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Brodliar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Henderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Hlavac</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Robin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Smyth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Zamfir</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An asterisk denotes an absence. Overall attendance recorded below each member.
Faculty Senate President D. Weiss called the 11th meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 12:10 p.m.

I. Announcements
   A. B. Cook: Reminder to encourage students to complete the Wellness survey.
   B. C. Simoneau: Student leadership positions are open for campus media outlets.
   C. C. Simoneau: Shared disturbing developments regarding a member of the faculty and his family receiving threatening anonymous letters. A brief discussion ensued regarding recent highly inappropriate activity and what steps faculty might be able to take to address them.
   D. K. Mashia-Thaxton: SGA will debate the requirement that future student club leaders will need to have a minimum 2.5 GPA to be on the executive board.

II. Guest(s)
   A. SCSU Early College Experience Program (ECE): P. Madonia (Finance), B. Johnson (Coordinator First Year Composition), T. Milburn (AVP Academic Affairs)
      i. P. Madonia provided an overview of the Finance committee's engagement with the ECE at the request of the Faculty Senate Executive Committee Fall 2021. Eligible high school students apply and enroll to earn college credit while they are in high school; they work with teachers in the schools who are certified to deliver the course, or with university professors who are assigned to teach the course. Some questions/topics brought forth by the committee include standards, quality, instructor qualifications, student eligibility, grading, university credits.
      ii. T. Milburn: Five-year agreements with high schools in our area. Tuition is waived for partner high school students. Has been in place since 2019. Currently we have 15 agreements with our top feeder schools, with 26 partnerships with schools and districts throughout the state. Dept. chairpersons make the decision whether an instructor will continue to teach an ECE course, and the offer to teach can be revoked at any time. Demand has been growing. Last year we had 42 high school students enrolled in courses on our campus and 131 in high schools. This spring, we have 100 on campus and about 200 in high schools. Concern has been raised over students who receive failing grades in these courses since it will be on their permanent transcript. The number of students who have received failing grades or less than a C- are as follows: 2018-1; 2019-4; 2020-6; 2021-22. This is proportional to the increase in enrollment. She said that chairpersons are alerted when there is a high school student enrolled in a course, and any time a student is in a course that has a prerequisite, chairpersons are notified, and the student must demonstrate s/he has the prerequisite. She advocates for 100/200-level courses and asks that chairpersons share with her the courses that are recommended for the ECE program.
      iii. B. Johnson: Has had many conversations with T. Milburn, and states that the program is in its early days. ECE is three different things: 1) ECE Southern course taught in a high school by high school faculty to high school students; 2) Southern faculty teaches a Southern class at a high school to high school students; 3) Southern faculty teach a Southern course with qualified high school students on our campus. For him, the third option is the one he would like to encourage: it brings more and more students to campus, and it sets our
program apart from other programs (e.g., UCONN). We also have a geographical advantage compared to UCONN. Some concerns/questions raised are those P. Madonia mentioned earlier: oversight, grading, quality, and fit. He would like us to consider what our program should be: a service program or a recruitment program?

III. Minutes of the previous meeting held on March 9, 2022, were accepted as distributed.
https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings

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

V. Reports of Faculty Senate Standing Committees
A. Reports of the Standing Committees were received.
B. K. Kruczek (Elections): Self-nominations for all-University committees will be distributed soon. Deadline to self-nominate is Friday April 1.

VI. Reports of the Special Committees
A. M. Sinclair (UCF): Report of the UCF was received. Reminded faculty to participate in the LEP poll regarding recommended changes to the LEP.
B. L. Eilderts, on behalf of C. O’Sullivan (Grad Council): Graduate Commencement will be May 19, 2022 in the Lyman Center at 2:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m.

VII. New Business
A. W. Faracis (Finance) moved to approve the resolution regarding CSU-AAUP Travel Funds for the AY 2022-2023.
   i. With no objection, the motion to approve the resolution was approved by unanimous consent.
B. K. Kruczek (Elections) moved to approve the resolution regarding the Faculty Scholar Award.
   i. With No objection, the motion to approve the resolution was approved by unanimous consent.
C. On behalf of the Faculty Academic Strategic Plan Committee (FASP), the Faculty Senate Executive Committee moves to approve the resolution regarding course caps in “W”, “Inquiry”, “Critical Thinking”.
   i. M. Shea moved to insert “and that ENG 112 courses be set at 18” into the first resolved statement so that it reads:
   1. Resolved, That enrollment caps for “W”, “Inquiry”, and “Critical Thinking” courses be set at 20 and that ENG 112 courses be set at 18 on a pilot basis for six years, effective September 2022; and be it further
   2. M. Diamantis moved to call the previous question.
      a. With no objection, the motion to amend goes to a vote.
      i. Vote tally for the amendment to the resolution.
         1. Yes ...............32
         2. No .................8
      a. The motion to amend the resolution was approved.
ii. W. Farclas moved to continue the meeting as long as quorum was maintained.
   1. With no objection, the meeting continued.

iii. W. Farclas moved to call the previous question.
    1. The motion was seconded.
       a. The motion to call the previous question failed.

iv. With no more discussion, the body moved to a vote on the revised resolution.
    1. Vote tally
       a. Yes ...................................... 20
       b. No ....................................... 12
       i. The motion to approve the resolution as amended passed.

VIII. Adjournment
    A. Meeting adjourned at 2:14 p.m.

_______________________________________
L. Eilderts
Secretary
SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Resolution Regarding CBA Travel Funds for 2022-2023

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 2021-2022;

Whereas, Residual monies will remain in the Travel Fund and be added to the 2022-2023 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;

Whereas, The SCSU Administration and the CSU AAUP have signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) allowing an exemption from the $750 limit for 2021-2022 travel funds for part-time Faculty; 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 2022-2023; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recommends that the travel fund reimbursement caps for 2022-2023 be set as $2,000.00 for tenured full-time faculty members and non-tenured faculty members on special appointment (non-tenure track), $2,250.00 for non-tenured full-time faculty members on tenure track; and be it further

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 speaker, and whose expenses are not covered in full by the sponsoring organization;

and be it further

Resolved, That the Faculty Senate recommends that the travel fund reimbursement cap for 2022-2023 be set at $875 for part-time Faculty members; and be it further

Resolved, That part-time members of the Faculty traveling to a professional seminar, workshop, conference or educational exchange shall have the travel cap raised by $125 for one of two circumstances:

a) for travel that requires trans-ocean travel, OR

b) if the member is traveling to attend a professional seminar, workshop, conference or educational exchange as an invited keynote speaker 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 shall be $2,250 for tenured full-time faculty members and for non-tenured faculty members on special appointment (non-tenure track); $2,500.00 for non-tenured full-time faculty members on tenure track; and $1,000 for part-time Faculty members.

---

1 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.

2 This provision is not intended to change any other terms and conditions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN
SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY
AND
SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

This agreement is entered into by and between Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU) and the Southern Connecticut State University American Association of University Professors (SCSU-AAUP).

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 unique and one-time event (the coronavirus pandemic) has resulted in a significant amount of residual monies in the Travel Fund at the end of 2021-2022;

Whereas, Residual monies will remain in the Travel Fund and be added to the 2022-2023 CBA determined Travel Fund allocation, leading to an unusually large pool of funds for travel;

Whereas Faculty Senate Resolution S-2022-12 agreed to allow the full-time faculty more than the limited $1,500 reimbursement for the 2022-23 academic year via CBA (9.5.1), and were prohibited by the same CBA article to authorized increased amounts for the part-time faculty; therefore be it

Resolved, that each part-time faculty member may be allowed more than $750 reimbursement from the Travel Fund in accordance with the Faculty Senate and University President.

The parties further agree that this agreement is due to unusual circumstances and is with prejudice but without precedent except in matters involving the part-time faculty applying for 2022-2023 travel funds and is not intended to change any other terms and conditions of the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

[Signatures]

For SCSU

3/8/2022

Date

For SCSU-AAUP

3/7/2022

Date
Resolution Regarding Course Enrollment Caps in Writing Intensive ("W"), “Inquiry”, “Critical
Thinking”, and ENG 112 Courses

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE

Resolution Regarding Course Enrollment Caps in Writing Intensive ("W"), “Inquiry”,
“Critical Thinking”, and ENG 112 Courses

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

Whereas, Senate Resolution F-09-01 was approved by the University President on November 24, 2009,
recognizing that the Liberal Education Program (LEP) required “smaller classes,” and agreeing to “provide
the necessary resources” for the implementation of the program;

Whereas, LEP Tier I enrollment caps for “Inquiry” and “Critical Thinking” courses, which were expected to
address “written communication,” were originally capped at 20 students;

Whereas, Writing Intensive ("W") courses were capped at 20 students;

Whereas, These classes typically involve the close reading and interpretation of selected passages, dialogical
interactions, and extensive discussions of the revisions of written assignments as part of their pedagogical
design;

Whereas, The abovementioned enrollment caps, resulting from our processes of shared governance, were
established to support and enhance the academic engagement and achievement of our students;

Whereas, The Council of Academic Chairs, and the Office of the Provost and Vice President of Academic
Affairs agreed, in March 2011, to a temporary increase in enrollment caps for “Inquiry,” “Critical
Thinking,” and “W” courses from 20 to 23;¹

Whereas, In the Fall 2011 semester, the Faculty Senate passed a “Resolution on Adverse Educational
Impacts of Increased Course Limits” (Resolution F-11-01/November 14, 2011), in response to the
increase, in Fall 2011, of the enrollment caps from 20 to 23 in LEP Tier I “Inquiry” and “Critical Thinking”
classes as well as in “W” classes;²

Whereas, In the Fall 2013 semester, the Faculty Senate approved an Undergraduate Curriculum Forum
“Resolution on Class Caps” (F-13-03/November 20, 2013), a Resolution that suggested that the increases
in enrollment caps may have “serious impact on effective instructional delivery and student success”;³

Whereas, Faculty Senate Resolution S-16-13 sought to restore course enrollments for “W”, “Inquiry” and
“Critical Thinking” classes to 20;⁴

Whereas, The Undergraduate Curriculum Forum approved a motion September 28, 2017, to restore “W”
classes to an enrollment cap of 20 by Fall Semester 2019;⁵

Whereas, Goal 7 of the SCSU Faculty Academic Strategic Plan Committee’s (FASP)
“A Strategic Vision for Academic Excellence, 2018” sought to “Promote the academic achievement of our
students by establishing appropriate class sizes of no more than 20 students per section for courses that

¹
²
³
⁴
⁵
emphasize written communication, including “W” (Writing Intensive), as well as Tier I LEP courses, “Inquiry” and “Critical Thinking”;

Whereas, The enrollment of writing intensive classes at Eastern Connecticut State University are limited to 20 students;

Whereas, In 2015, the College Conference on Communication and Composition (CCCC), the leading organization for postsecondary teaching of writing, resolved that “No more than 20 students should be permitted in any writing class,” and “Ideally, classes should be limited to 15”;

Whereas, Our students have been negatively impacted by the disruption of on-ground class attendance and increased anxiety caused by the Covid-19 pandemic;

Whereas, Setting the enrollment caps of 20 in “W”, “Inquiry”, and “Critical Thinking” courses, and 18 in ENG 112 courses, will enable our faculty to better support our students as we emerge from the pandemic;

Whereas, The university no longer receives data on the writing ability of all entering students that would have previously been provided by the SAT;

Whereas, Numerous scholarly inquiries reiterate the realization that writing courses that emphasize revisions benefit from smaller enrollments that allow teachers to provide meaningful individual support to each of their students; and

Whereas, As a social justice university, SCSU is cognizant of the potential of such personalized support for student writing for closing the achievement gap for students who have been socio-economically disadvantaged; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That enrollment caps for “W”, “Inquiry”, and “Critical Thinking” courses be set at 20 and that ENG 112 courses be set at 18 on a pilot basis for six years, effective September 2022; and be it further

Resolved, That during the course of the pilot implementation of enrollment caps for the designated courses, information be gathered regarding teaching, learning, and undergraduate student achievement, as well as retention and graduation rates, such that the impact of the pilot enrollment caps can be assessed.

---

¹ See Faculty Senate Resolution S-16-13, http://www2.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/F-17-06%20W%20Course%20Enrollment.pdf
² Faculty Senate Resolution F-11-0, http://s3.amazonaws.com/areas.southernct.edu/old-wysiwyg/facultysenate/uploads/textwidget/wysiwyg/documents/F-11-01_Adverse_Educational_Impacts_of_Increased_Course_Enrollment_Limits.pdf
³ Faculty Senate Resolution F-13-03, http://www2.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/F-03%201%203%20Resolution%20UCP%20Hon%20Class%20Caps.pdf. The UCF Resolution supported by the Faculty Senate established that a range of professional organizations, including National Education Association (NEA), National Council of Teachers of English (NCTE), Associated Writing Programs (AWP), National Communication Association (NCA), American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL), Association of Departments of Foreign Languages (ADFL) and Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET) have guidelines for establishing class caps and/or faculty/student ratio based on pedagogical concerns.
⁴ Faculty Senate Resolution S-16-13, http://www2.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/AY%2016%20AY%2013%20Restore%202016%2013%20Restr%20Class%20Caps%20for%20Inquiry%20Critical%20Thinking%20And%20Writing%20Intensive%20Classes.pdf
See Faculty Senate Resolution F-17-06, http://www2.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/F-17-06%20W%20Course%20Enrollment.pdf

Faculty Senate Resolution S-18-11, http://www2.southernct.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/S%202018%20ResolutionEndorsingFSAcademicStrategicPlanCommitteeVision.pdf

"Proposing a Writing-Intensive Course," Eastern Connecticut State University, https://www.easternct.edu/writing-program/proposingawritingintensivecourse.html#


Resolution Regarding the Faculty Scholar Award

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 the role of the Faculty Scholar Award Committee;

Whereas, The Faculty Senate strives to recognize the diversity of high-quality creative activity of the faculty; and

Whereas, The Faculty Senate wishes to increase the number of quality applications for the Faculty Scholar Award and ensure equity in making the awards available to faculty of all disciplines; now, therefore, be it

**Resolved**, That the process for selecting the recipient of the Faculty Scholar Award be modified as follows:

Funding allocated for the Faculty Scholar Award shall be equally distributed each year among the categories below:

1. Monograph
2. Textbook
3. Journal Article(s): A series of related journal articles can be considered as one product
4. Technology/Art/Performance/Invention;

and be it further

**Resolved**, That all documents related to this change be modified accordingly by the appropriate committee.
STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic Policy Committee (APC)

MINUTES—APC—03/23/2022
Present: Allen, Crowley, DeLucia, Ding, Gilliland, Jayawickreme, Petrie (chair), Uribe

• News:
  o Latin Honors issue (60-credit residency requirement and its implications for transfer students) passed by Exec Board to Elections Committee. APC notes forwarded to EC.
  o Proposed correction to Senate P&T document (evaluation category weights for all classes of faculty) passed to Personnel Policy Committee to be bundled with PPC’s additional proposed corrections.
  o Noted: APC’s increasing number of proposed revisions / additions to P&T Guidelines document should probably be made to PPC’s forthcoming revised version rather than to existing version. Entails minor (we hope) delay.

• APC assessed and confirmed that, except for proposed length-limited professional statement requirements for Senate P&T document, all other reforms currently in progress will be revisions to the P&T Guidelines.

• Extensive discussion and revisions to draft Guidelines additions specifying kinds and amounts of evidentiary material P&T candidates should (and should not) include in their files. To be continued next meeting.
Elections Committee (EC)

Elections Committee
Minutes for March 23, 2022

Attendees: Carmen Coury, Klay Kruczek, Mina Park, Cindy Simoneau

New Business:
Latin Honors Resolution
Based on the comments from faculty, including Jessica Kenty-Drake, there are concerns about how difficult it is for transfer students to earn Latin Honors at graduation. The current requirement is 60 credits at Southern to be considered for Latin Honors, while many institutions (similar to SCSU) require fewer credits. Below is a table comparing SCSU to other institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Local School Requirements (in credits)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WCSU: 30, ECSU: 45, CCSU: 60, UConn: 54, Montclair State: 51, William Paterson: 64, SUNY: 45 – 60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We created a resolution to lower the number of credits to 45 credits (roughly 3 semesters of full-time status).
Finance Committee (FC)

March 23, 2022
Present: William Faraclas (chair), Peter Madonia, Obiageli Okwuka, Sebastian Perumbilly, Jia Yu
Not Attending: Carol Stewart

The Committee acted to approve the Minutes of March 3, 2022, meeting as distributed, with thanks to Peter Madonia for substituting for Carol Stewart.

The committee reviewed the presentation it made to the Faculty Senate at its March 10 meeting and concluded it was a successful and informative endeavor.

The committee decided that it would be premature to change the grading system for high school students taking EC courses because a) we are aware that UConn just eliminated a similar grading mechanism because it was not compatible with accreditation standards; b) it would necessitate establishing a permanent grade on transcripts, when we are attempting to solve a problem on a temporary basis; and c) we do not have sufficient information to ensure that we would not disadvantage our university students taking courses together with high school students. To better understand options and limitations, the committee will reach out to Registrar Alicia Carroll to continue the conversation.

The committee also focused on the EC as a curriculum matter and concluded that the advisory committee to the EC program should be composed entirely of faculty members elected through the FS election process. A recommendation will be made to the FS Executive Committee.

In its consideration of internal grants provided by the University and the CSU and CSCU systems, the Committee formed two conclusions:
1. Internal grants provided by the University should maintain consistent parameters for applications. Special foci should not be added as conditions for grant applications, nor should they be established to give incentives or advantages to conforming topics. Only with the consent of the Senate should a special focus be established for any of these grants.
2. To ensure that members of the faculty have timely access to information about conditions, time frames, and links for application materials for internal grants, the committee recommends a table containing full details related to internal grants be posted on the Faculty Senate website, with annual updating.

Normally, at this time of year, the Finance Committee would be working on a resolution for travel funding caps for next year. The members of the committee were pleased to note that this task was completed early this year and the corresponding resolution was approved at the most recent meeting of the full Faculty Senate.

It was noted that the Finance Committee will not meet on April 6 because of schedule conflicts of committee members. The next and final AY 22 meeting of the Finance Committee will take place on April 20.

Respectfully submitted,
William Faraclas
FACULTY SENATE
PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE
Minutes
3/23/2022

Teams Meeting

**PPC Members:** Adams, Gregory; Toce, Jacqueline; Lopez-Velasquez, Angela; Marx, Helen; Tomczak, Stephen; Shea, Michael; Martinez, Kelly; Sormrude, Michael; Metaxas, Virginia; Starling, Natalie (chair)

Guests joined at 12:30pm: Cunningham, Linda; Diamantis, Maria; Paddock, Troy; Pettigrew, David; Gregory, Jess; Cameron, Mark; Brown, Mary; Harry, Chelsea

**CONTINUING BUSINESS:**

1. P&T Guidebooks
   a. The committee met with invited representatives from AAUP and the P & T committee to share/discuss updates to the guidebooks thus far
   b. The committee will discuss the option to extend another invitation to the invited guests to return to share additional information, if and when feasible for the PPC
   c. The committee will review the shared information along with the draft of revisions to the Teaching Faculty P & T Guidebook to begin finalizing recommended revisions
   d. The committee will use this progress to make revisions to the other P & T Guidebooks (Library, Counseling, etc.) beginning at the next meeting (moved to next meeting agenda)

2. P&T/Renewal Procedures documents
   a. The committee will review progress and plan a Resolution as a future agenda item

3. Updating Professional Assessment Procedures Document – to match updates to the other documents (moved to next meeting agenda)

4. Academic advising re P&T (moved to next meeting agenda)
Rules Committee Notes: 3/22/22

Committee starting on new topic of policies surrounding student complaints:

Guest: Associate Dean Dr. Craig Hlavac, Sara Gossman (SGA President)

The meeting started with a discussion with Dr. Hlavac about the issue and what he has seen about student complaints in the Dean’s office. (see below for a formal request Dr. Hlavac made for the senate to look into this issue)

I am writing to request an ad hoc committee be formed to discuss the development of a unified policy surrounding student complaints. In each of our roles, we have heard from students and faculty with thoughts on how student concerns are either collected or addressed – and often not in a positive light. Most students are not well-informed about the specific levels of our organization and thus do not know where to turn should they have a concern. In many cases, this means students come to administrative offices when their issue might be better dealt with at the department level. On the other hand, on occasion there are instances in which a student concern is serious enough that the administration should be alerted and be part of the resolution process. Unfortunately, in my experience, these processes are not well-defined.

Dr. Hlavac remarked that he sees Chair’s (of various department’s) regularly ask why is the dean’s office involved in things that the chair should be responsible for, when it was a student who approaches the Dean’s office first. This is especially an issue when student go to the President or the Dean of Students, since these referrals need to be acted upon by that office. Dr. Hlavac also discussed how he felt with some of the complaints there was a need for the student to be heard and responded to in a timely manner.

A committee member suggested the Ombudsman as a possible place for complaints to go and get routed.

Another committee member suggested that polices or language for this should also be included for students as part of maybe an FYE or INQ class. This was mainly because one of the primary issues is students who are unaware of where / who to go to with complaints.

Another member suggested that this committee needs to take care to stay in our lane and develop policy for academic complaints/issues.

Another member suggested that this should go on a one stop website where students can access it easily.

Sara then addressed the committee about this issue from the student point of view: She talked about how this should be mainly academic complaints, she advocated for some streamlined ways to submit concerns to the right office…. Maybe a website where students could find the right place to go for concerns, whether they be tech, academic, or other…. Because the problem as she sees it is that students regularly are NOT aware of the process and where / who to talk too. She also advocated to keep the information/policy clear and concise for 1st generation students to be able to easily read and understand, since in her opinion policy language often gets confusing and is left unread when students get confused or frustrated.
As the meeting was wrapping up several members discussed possibly building of the structure in the grade appeal policy or academic misconduct policies as we construct this academic complaint policy / procedure. The committee also discussed with the guest’s about anonymity with the complaints. This led to a broader discussion of the power dynamic inherent to the student/teacher relationship and a member suggested that the policy also mention the end of semester student survey’s as a possible (additional) route for students to maintain their anonymity with complaints.

Respectfully submitted,

Dr. Jeffrey A. Webb
Student Policy Committee Meeting Minutes  
Wednesday March 23, 2022  

In Attendance: Wes O’Brien, Matt Ouimet, Bill Farley, Kyle Thaxton, Christine Broadbridge, Kate Marsland, Mike Dodge, Barbara Cook (chair), and Alicia Carroll (Guest)  

Incomplete Policy Discussions  

1. Given new updates to the Banner system, we discussed with Alicia Carroll the two additional mechanisms to implement our existing Incomplete Policy. 

The first is related to the contract and the indication of a default grade should the student not complete the remaining work. The exact language in the policy states, “The contract will specify the remaining coursework to be completed by the student and the final grade the student will earn if the remaining work is not completed.”  

Alicia shared that Banner now allows faculty entering an ‘I’ to also enter a default grade (other than F) and that this aligns to the current contract entered into with the student. This can be implemented as soon as Spring 2022 final grade collection. The default final grade is a replacement grade for the incomplete grade that will be rolled automatically if no manual intervention (final grade change) occurs by the time the extension end date is reached.  

**SP Committee agreed to approve:** Support Registrar to implement using this Banner mechanism that will allow faculty entering an ‘I’ to indicate the default grade stated on the contract that the student will earn if the remaining work is not completed.  

The second is related to the default date of completion of the Incomplete of “no later than 30 days into the next semester.” Alicia shared that Banner now allows faculty entering an ‘I’ to also enter a custom deadline. This is already accounted for in the policy, but not expressly listed as a field on the contract. The contract can be updated, and this can be implemented as soon as Spring 2022 final grade collection.  

Following discussion, the committee agreed that providing a specific date of completion may support the student to complete the required work at a time that would be “no later than 30 days into the next semester.”  

**SP Committee agreed to approve:** Support Registrar to implement using the Banner mechanism that will allow faculty entering an ‘I’ to also enter a custom deadline that is also indicated on the contract.  

It is noted that the students and faculty members can see this Incomplete Default Grade and Extension Deadline information in the Banner Web Final Grades for transparency.  

Alicia will work with Helen Marx to make changes to the Incomplete Contract and to share these Banner options via Chairs/Deans meeting, at UCF, Grad Council, Council of Academic Chairs, etc.  

2. Incomplete policy and the indication of ‘no later than 30 days after the next fall/spring semester begins’ was discussed. The committee will continue to explore alternate default timelines that will be beneficial for the student and faculty.  

a. Discussion thus far revealed the following concerns:  

i. Current policy gives an inconsistent extension between Fall-to-Spring (60 days) and Spring-to-Fall (135 days).  

ii. Students and faculty are often unclear about the language ’not later than 30 days into the next fall/spring semester’ and how that should translate to a deadline.  

iii. Students would benefit by completing outstanding work before adding more coursework to their plate when the next term starts, it encourages timely completion while the course content is still not too far in the distant past, and they may also need to complete the course if it is a prerequisite, else they may be dropped, or if it may impact their financial aid SAP standing/aid awarded.  

iv. Setting a shorter default date would still allow faculty discretion to enter a longer deadline as described above.  

v. A course incomplete that is a prerequisite for a course the student plans to take in the next semester. Students are given a warning that they have not met pre-req to take the next class, however, they may lose
their spot in the course. The same is true for students who receive a temporary override if they do not complete the work in time. If the default date was prior to the add/drop period, this may reduce impact to these students.

vi. Is it possible that the 30 days was determined when we did not have the ability to share assignments via technology, thus a student would need to wait to be able to deliver their assignment in person to faculty?

vii. Is it possible that the longer students are given to complete the work, the increased likelihood of not completing the remaining work?

b. Possible options to investigate:

i. An indication of a number of days past the current semester to which the ‘I’ is given, or

ii. An indication of 1 or 2 weeks past semester start date, or

iii. An indication of 15 days instead of 30 days, or

iv. A hard default date is possible but would need to be monitored by the Registrar’s office

c. Note: continue to have the option of continuing an incomplete with the ‘Incomplete Plus’ option.

d. Committee will seek input from faculty and continue discussion.

3. New federal regulations for the disbursement of financial aid related to Incomplete policies require us to create a new policy. In collaboration with Alicia Carroll, the committee will work to draft a resolution for this new policy and share at a future Faculty Senate meeting.

Discussion regarding necessity to include % of attendance as a requirement to request an incomplete. Per Alicia, we currently do not have a ‘no completion percentage’ in the Incomplete policy, therefore, the Registrar will need to start collecting LDA (last date of attendance) for all ‘I’ grades entered to comply, and students will be subject to withdrawal for the semester and/or a return of federal funds (R2T4) if no credit is earned for the semester. This will require additional work for faculty and potential negative impact on students. Therefore, the committee will work to develop a % of attendance policy that supports faculty and students.

4. Incomplete +: discussion regarding this policy and unlimited option. The committee will continue discussion regarding the use of Incomplete + and implications. Some questions to consider: Is it possible to use the new Banner mechanism to keep the ‘I’ and change the due date of the assignments? and Should there be a time limit to the ‘I +’ or would there be a benefit to defining use of ‘I+’ when the grade is P/F as may occur with internships or capstone projects?

SGA request regarding course syllabi:
The committee clarified that we would speak to the Faculty Senate Executive Council to strongly encourage faculty to present syllabi in advance of the semester. This strong recommendation would include the rationale provided by SGA which included opportunity for students to learn more about the content/topic of a course and expectations. This would increase the students’ ability to drop a course within the drop/add period to reduce impact on finances and increase capability of adding a different course.

New item:
Strict attendance policies in course syllabi:
The SGA held meetings with deans and chairs regarding the strict attendance policies for some departments and classes. The request from SGA is that Faculty Senate engage in a discussion regarding these policies and their link to final grades. The SGA is concerned that these policies may be outdated, and at times appear illogical and/or unfair. There is concern that a student’s grade may be based on attendance rather than on knowledge gained relative to the course content. One example given was a syllabus that indicated that 4 unexcused absences would result in failing the class.

Respectively submitted, 3-24-22
Barbara Cook
The meeting convened at 1:00 via Zoom.
We continued the discussion about ways to incentivize students to complete Student Opinion Surveys. In particular, we discussed the “make it an assignment” approach, and whether we could do a pilot of this approach in the current semester. Two approaches have been suggested:

1. Telling the class that everyone will receive some extra credit if the response rate for the course exceeds some predetermined level (90%, 75%, ?).
2. Give individuals extra credit if they complete the survey.

The second approach may be difficult to implement quickly as it would require some programming in EvaluationKit, and there are concerns about maintaining student anonymity in smaller sections. We will be seeking volunteers who are willing to use approach 1.

Respectfully,
J. E. Fields
SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF)

Report to the Faulty Senate
Undergraduate Curriculum Forum
March 10, 2022 Meeting Actions

Actions
Motion from StAR: Approve the revised guidelines for academic program review
These revised guidelines were approved and have been updated in Confluence.

Motion from LEPC: Minor revisions to the LEP Charter
LEPC brought forward minor revisions to the LEP Charter that clarify the LEP revision process. Meeting time ran out before discussion was concluded and the motion was tabled.

Motion from Steering to Revise the UCF Constitution, Bylaws, and Flow of Proposals
The UCF Steering Committee has brought forward minor revisions to these documents – routine updates that reflect current practices and policy. Per the UCF Constitution these revisions require two meetings for discussion so the vote is scheduled for March 31.

The following revised programs were approved:
Revised Minor Proposals
1. Linguistics Minor

Revised Program Proposals
1. Minor Revision to all Biology Programs

The following new and revised courses were approved:
New Course Proposals
1. HIS 351 – Religion in America

Revised Course Proposals
none

The following W Courses were approved:
1. HSC 450 - Principles of Medical Documentation
2. HIS 351 – Religion in America
3. HLS 330 – Case Studies in Healthcare Ethics

The following special topics courses were logged:
1. ENV 498 – Spatial Analysis and Visualization of National Parks (Fall 2022; 1st time offered)
2. JST 398 – Antisemitism (Fall 2022; 1st time offered)
Other Notes

- As part of the LEP Revision process, the Steering Committee announced the formation of several LEP related workgroups to be formed this semester. Full details will be announced on March 31 and elections for the workgroups will take place in April.
- Results from the LEP revision task force report survey are available in Confluence.

Respectfully submitted,
Meredith Sinclair, UCF Chair
March 22, 2022
March 28th 2022: Graduate Council Report to Faculty Senate:
Cynthia O’Sullivan, Chairperson, Graduate Council

1. Graduate Student Awards: Departments, please send a list of current awards you provide to your graduate students so that these can be acknowledged at Graduate Commencement (send to Kauther Badr or Cindy O’Sullivan (Badrk1@southernct.edu; osullivanc2@southernct.edu)

2. All departments are welcome to the final Grad Council meeting on April 26, 2022 for Annual Reports. Elections for Graduate Council Executive Committee Members will also occur at this meeting. The positions for Graduate Council Chairperson and Graduate Curriculum Sub-Committee will not be filled by current offices. Please encourage others to self-nominate if they should be interested.

3. StAR Committee reviewed/updated their policy manual. These will be voted on at the March 28th Grad Council meeting and then circulated. See Tricia Lin and Kauther Badr with any questions about these updates.

4. Graduate Open House, Thursday, April 7, 2022, 4-6 p.m. EST (In-Person in Ballroom) Friday, April 8, 2022, 4-6 p.m. EST (Virtual)

5. Need volunteers to help with Commencement on May 19th, especially for the 7:00pm exercises. See Jonathan Wharton.
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, SCSU wishes to incorporate more equity into the recognition of the academic accomplishments of transfer and non-transfer students; and

Whereas, The SCSU Faculty Senate and the University are committed to transparency and clarity regarding academic policies; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the requirements for receiving Latin Honors be changed in the following way.

ORIGINAL:
Undergraduate students who have performed with distinction in scholarship, leadership, and service to the University are accorded special recognition at the Honors Convocation at the end of the spring semester. Seniors who have achieved collegiate honors are announced: those maintaining a 3.5-3.69 GPA are graduated cum laude; 3.7-3.89, magna cum laude; 3.9-4.0, summa cum laude. The GPA is computed from the student's entire collegiate record at Southern. Only earned grades at Southern will be tabulated when determining academic honors. Transfer students who have taken at least 60 credit hours or any student that has earned as many credits as might be required for any post-baccalaureate degree programs at SCSU and have attained a 3.5 GPA or higher in these courses will be eligible for academic honors. Students who successfully defended their honors theses are also recognized at the Honors Convocation, and graduate "with departmental honors."

PROPOSED CHANGE:
Undergraduate students who have performed with distinction in scholarship, leadership, and service to the University are accorded special recognition at the Honors Convocation at the end of the spring semester. Seniors who have achieved collegiate honors are announced: those maintaining a 3.5-3.69 GPA are graduated cum laude; 3.7-3.89, magna cum laude; 3.9-4.0, summa cum laude. The GPA is computed from the student's entire collegiate record at Southern. Only earned grades at Southern will be tabulated when determining academic honors. Transfer students who have taken at least 45 credit hours or any student that has earned as many credits as might be required for any post-baccalaureate degree programs at SCSU and have attained a 3.5 GPA or higher in these courses will be eligible for academic honors. Students who successfully defended their honors theses are also recognized at the Honors Convocation, and graduate "with departmental honors."

Note: Other Local School Requirements (in credits)
WCSU: 30, ECSU: 45, CCSU: 60, UConn: 54, Montclair State: 51, William Paterson: 64, SUNY: 45 – 60
Proposal for Department Status: Women’s and Gender Studies

Please see the following documents (available to all Southern affiliated members; if you have trouble accessing the documents, please email the Faculty Senate Secretary):

- Women’s and Gender Studies Self Study
- External Review: Women’s and Gender Studies
- Email Exchange re: Self Study

Letter of Support from Dean Bruce Kalk located below.
March 25, 2022

Professor Deb Weiss
Faculty Senate President
Southern Connecticut State University

Dear Professor Weiss:

This letter is to extend my enthusiastic support for turning the Women’s & Gender Studies program into a stand-alone academic department. I have discussed this with Provost Prezan and he shares my enthusiasm. There are several reasons for my excitement about the prospect of establishing a Department of Women’s & Gender Studies at Southern.

- The program recently conducted its self-study and the external reviewers strongly recommended that it seek departmental status
- There are no Departments of Women’s & Gender Studies anywhere in the CSCU System
- Our program is highly-ranked on at least two national surveys of Women’s & Gender Studies programs
- The graduate program in WGS is growing in large measure because of its dual MSW/ M.A. in W GS program. This is an especially important dual-degree program for graduate students pursuing careers serving in agencies, foundations, and NGOs dedicated to women’s issues and LGBTQ+ issues; it is also one of the only dual-degree programs of its kind in the United States
- Departmental status will provide the program the opportunity to recruit, retain, and advance the careers of faculty independently of other academic departments.

In conclusion, I thank you and the entire Faculty Senate for its advice on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

Bruce Kalk, PhD
Dean, College of Arts & Sciences
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, According to the majority of public health experts, another Covid surge is virtually certain to occur during the fall 2022 semester and is likely extend into spring 2023;

Whereas, As a rule, faculty and some staff members are the employees who have the most and closest contact with students within confined spaces;

Whereas, The primary concern during an ongoing pandemic should be to reduce transmission of infection to the greatest extent possible;

Whereas, Masking protocols and testing in particular, are easy, effective, and inexpensive to maintain;

Whereas, Past CSCU Covid policy decisions have inappropriately prioritized political and economic considerations over the health and well-being of faculty, students, and their families;

Whereas, CSCU and SCSU administration has repeatedly set Covid policy without adequate and meaningful consultation with elected faculty leaders despite persistent requests from those leaders; and

Whereas, SCSU administration has twice made Covid policy commitments to faculty which have later been reversed and/or overridden by CSCU administration without prior consultation with elected faculty leaders; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the SCSU Faculty Senate respectfully calls upon Presidents Cheng and Bertolino to include elected faculty leaders (at minimum the presidents of the CSU Faculty Senates, CSU AAUP chapters, and CSU-AAUP) in meaningful consultation during discussions, planning, and decision-making (i.e. before policies have been decided upon and announced) regarding all future changes to campus COVID policies.