



FACULTY SENATE

APPROVED MINUTES OF OCTOBER 2, 2024

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

The 3rd Meeting of the Faculty Senate AY 2023-2024 was held on October 2, 2024, at 12:11 p.m. via Zoom.

Attendance

FIRST	LAST	DEPARTMENT	TERM ENDS (SPRING)	ATTENDANCE	TOTAL
Lisa	Haylon	Accounting	2025		2/3
Valerie	Andrushko	Anthropology	2026		2/3
Jeff	Slomba	Art & Design	2027		3/3
		Athletics	2026		
Nicholas	Edgington	Biology	2026		3/3
Kate	Toskin	Business Information Systems	2025		3/3
Jeff	Webb	Chemistry & Biochemistry	2026		3/3
Shawneen	Buckley	Communication Disorders	2027		3/3
Melanie	Savelli	Communication, Media & Screen Studies	2025		2/3
Shafaeat	Hossain	Computer Science	2025		3/3
Matthew	Ouimet	Counseling	2027	x	1/3
Laurie	Bonjo	Counseling & School Psychology	2026		2/3
Beena	Achhpal	Curriculum & Learning	2027		3/3
Maria	Diamantis	Curriculum & Learning	2024		3/3
Jennifer	Cooper Boemmels	Earth Science	2025		3/3
Younjun	Kim	Economics	2027		3/3
Peter	Madonia	Educational Leadership & Policy Studies	2026		2/3
Paul	Petrie	English	2026		3/3
Mike	Shea	English	2027	x	2/3
Eric	West	Environment, Geography, & Marine Sciences	2025		3/3
Sandip	Dutta	Finance & Real Estate	2025	x	2/3
Amanda	Strong	Healthcare Systems & Innovation	2025	x	2/3
Matthew	Rothbard	Health & Movement Sciences	2025		1/1
Daniel	Swartz	Health & Movement Sciences	2025		3/3
Christine	Petto	History	2026		3/3
Polly	Beals	History	2026		3/3
Yan	Liu	Information & Library Sciences	2027		3/3
Cindy	Simoneau	Journalism	2027		3/3
Elizabeth	Wilkinson	Library Services	2026		3/3
Amy	Jansen	Library Services	2025		3/3

Alison	Wall	Management & International Business	2025		3/3
Melvin	Prince	Marketing	2026		3/3
Sebastian	Perumbilly	Marriage & Family Therapy	2025		3/3
Ray	Mugno	Mathematics	2025		3/3
Owen	Biesel	Mathematics	2025		3/3
Jonathan	Irving	Music	2026		2/3
Deborah	Morrill	School of Nursing	2026		3/3
Elizabeth	Hurlbert	School of Nursing	2027		2/3
Virginia	Metaxas	Part-Time Faculty (HIS)	2026		3/3
Garbielle	Ferrell	Part-Time Faculty (JRN)	2025		3/3
Michael	Sormrude	Part-Time Faculty (BIO)	2024	✖	0/3
Michele	Delucia	Part-Time Faculty (PSY)	2024	✖	0/3
Rex	Gilliland	Philosophy	2026		3/3
Evan	Finch	Physics	2027		3/3
Jonathan	O'Hara	Political Science	2025	✖	0/3
Katherine	Marsland	Psychology	2025		1/1
		Psychology	2027		
John	Nwangwu	Public Health	2027		3/3
Deron	Grabel	Recreation, Tourism, & Sport Management	2026		3/3
Isabel	Logan	Social Work	2026		3/3
Stephen Monroe	Tomczak	Social Work	2025		3/3
Gregory	Adams	Sociology	2026		3/3
Joan	Weir	Special Education	2027		3/3
Douglas	Macur	Theatre	2027	✖	2/3
Tricia	Lin	Women's & Gender Studies	2025		3/3
Luke	Eilderts	World Languages & Literatures	2026		3/3
Natalie	Starling	SCSU Faculty Senate President	2025		3/3
Dwayne	Smith	Interim SCSU President			3/3
Barbara	Cook	Chair, Graduate Council			3/3
Meghan	Barboza	Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Form			3/3
Riyanna Sarah	Singleton Wittman	SGA			

GUESTS

Dominika
 Dyan Robinson
 Marian Evans
 Marilu Rochefort
 Meredith Sinclair
 Patrick Crowley
 Steven Hoffler
 Trever Broliar

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

Early College Experience	
Faculty Development Advisory Committee (FDAC)	
Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF) liaison	Cindy Simoneau
University Library Committee (ULC)	Amy Jansen 1 Representative Unfilled
Strategic Action Plan Subcommittees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advancing Social Justice • Maintaining Academic Excellence • Engaging our Community 	Miriah Kelly Kenneth McGill Michael Sormrude
DEI Advisory Council	Laurie Bonjo
Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Search Committee	Natalie Starling
VP of DEI Search Committee	Laurie Bonjo Elizabeth Hurlbert
Social Venture Partners	Mike Shea Jeff Webb Melanie Uribe Stephen Monroe Tomczak Michael Sormrude
University Budget and Space Committees	Nicholas Edgington Cindy Simoneau Christine Petto

October 2, 2024

Faculty Senate President Natalie Starling called the 3rd meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 12:11 p.m. via Zoom.

- I. Announcements
 - A. N. Starling reminded the body of the email correspondence regarding Grade Appeal procedures. Senators are reminded that procedures outside those outlined in the official Grade Appeal Procedures document are not allowed.
 - B. T. Lin shared announced a virtual panel on career opportunities and alumni insights for graduates of the Women's and Gender Studies program on October 3 from 4-5:30.
- II. Minutes of the previous meeting held on September 18, 2024, 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. N. Starling provided an update on National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) ongoing work and its implications for the Connecticut State Universities (CSUs). She highlighted that NCHEMS is currently commissioned by the Office of Policy and Management (OPM), not the central office, to gather data and develop recommendations for the CSU system. NCHEMS has a history of working with Western Connecticut State University (WCSU), producing a report addressing financial challenges at Western, which included recommendations such as program cuts and concerns over collective bargaining agreements. N. Starling encouraged members to revisit the report for context and noted that the report for Southern, expected in December, may contain recommendations similar to those made previously. She shared concerns raised in stakeholder meetings about the justification and data supporting NCHEMS' recommendations, specifically regarding expenditure and operational comparisons with other institutions. Starling emphasized the need for faculty to be informed, access relevant reports, and proactively prepare for potential outcomes once the new report is released.
 - B. K. Marsland raised concerns about the historical context of NCHEMS' involvement with Connecticut higher education. She recalled a 2013–2014 legislative task force where they acted as a consultant, addressing outcomes-based funding for the CSU system. She noted similarities between that past initiative and the current discussions, expressing concern over unanswered questions and inadequate comparisons used by NCHEMS in their analysis. She inquired about the level of faculty involvement in the ongoing NCHEMS process and received confirmation from N. Starling that faculty were invited to participate in meetings, with information disseminated via the president's office. K. Marsland stressed the importance of revisiting historical records, and N. Starling agreed to assist in gathering this context for future discussions.
 - C. K. Marsland questioned the status of interim leadership positions at the university and whether any active searches were underway. N. Starling responded that no search for Southern's president would begin in the fall, but noted ongoing communication with the Chancellor about future plans. The topic will remain a priority in future faculty leadership meetings.
 - D. M. Savelli raised concerns about departmental Promotion and Tenure (P&T) guidelines, questioning their value when bodies beyond the department might disregard them during the review process. N. Starling acknowledged that this issue had been discussed previously and noted that a Senate-led focus group had gathered feedback on the topic, but past efforts to formalize departmental guidelines were not supported by administration. P. Petrie provided historical context, explaining that while there is a gap between university-level P&T guidelines and the varied expectations across departments, the utility of departmental guidelines remains a debated issue. The key question is whether such guidelines should be informal or a codified part of the P&T process. M. Diamantis added that while prior provosts supported departmental guidelines, recent changes in

administration halted their formalization. She advocated for reviving these efforts. V. Metaxas highlighted that the original purpose of the guidelines was to help new faculty understand what was required for promotion and tenure. The discussion emphasized that departmental guidelines, while helpful, must be made official and recognized by all levels of the P&T process to have a meaningful impact. M. Diamantis confirmed that if a candidate includes the guidelines in their P&T file, they are taken into consideration, but they are not currently mandatory.

- E. N. Starline asked the body if there was any objection to changing the order of business and giving the floor to M. Sinclair. Hearing none, the body welcomed M. Sinclair to take the floor.

IV. Guest: M. Sinclair, Faculty Director of Academic Advising

- A. M. Sinclair provided an update on the new degree plan tool, replacing the previous paper-based academic maps. She explained that the tool, which was launched this fall for students under the fall 2024 catalog, allows both undergraduate and graduate students to create and manage their degree plans. Advisors are responsible for locking these plans during advising sessions, which helps streamline the registration process and generate notifications if students go off track due to class withdrawal, failing a class, or missing registration. M. Sinclair noted that faculty are not required to use the tool this semester but are encouraged to familiarize themselves with it for spring. She also clarified that while degree plans are highly customizable, they serve as advising tools rather than set-in-stone contracts. Additionally, department chairs can run reports on students who are off track, and future updates to the templates will be handled through the regular catalog revision process. During the Q&A, faculty raised concerns about potential inequities in advising practices, the role of departmental input in revising degree plan templates, and communication with graduate students about changes to the system. M. Sinclair responded that accountability for advising remains a key issue, and further discussions on advising practices are necessary. She also addressed concerns about the absence of communication with students regarding the transition from academic maps to the degree plan tool. M. Sinclair encouraged faculty to reach out for further guidance and shared relevant resources, including a training PDF for faculty.
- B. L. Eilderts **moved to change the order of business** and move to Unfinished Business. N. Starling asked the body if there was any objection to changing the order of business. Hearing none, the body took up Unfinished Business.

V. Unfinished Business

- A. M. Barboza presented the UCF-Approved Revisions to the Flow of Proposals.
- B. After its presentation, C. Simoneau **moved to call the previous question**. N. Starling asked the body if there was any objection to closing debate. Hearing none, the body moved to a vote.
 - i. Vote tally
 - 1. Yes37
 - 2. No0
 - a. The UCF-Approved Revisions to the Flow of Proposals was approved **unanimously**.

VI. Reports of the Standing Committees

- A. Academic Policy (M. Diamantis & O. Biesel): M. Diamantis reminded senators of three items for which feedback is being gathered: (1) whether departments wish to create their own Promotion and Tenure (P&T) guidelines, (2) whether departments need more resources or information on AI, and (3) any issues encountered with book orders or the bookstore this semester. K. Marsland asked whether there is ongoing discussion at the university level regarding the digital access fee and the "first day complete" bookstore program. O. Biesel confirmed that a group is still looking into this issue, and M. Diamantis added that the contract has not yet been renewed. Further discussions with the bookstore are scheduled for an upcoming meeting. K. Marsland also raised concerns about a "pilot" plan related to students who started late due to FAFSA issues, questioning if there

are plans to continue this “catch up” program in the future. N. Starling clarified that the “flex start” initiative involved some courses beginning two weeks later as a small-scale pilot, initiated by Academic Affairs. She noted that the matter would be followed up with Academic Affairs for further clarification.

- B. Personnel Policy (S. M. Tomczak): J. Nwangwu raised a question about the status of Fellows who were recruited with the expectation of transitioning to assistant professors but have been informed there is no guarantee of permanent employment. S. M. Tomczak confirmed that these fellows were special appointments with no guarantee of permanent positions, and after their appointment ends, a hiring process may follow but is not assured. N. Starling added that this matter had been addressed during initial discussions with Academic Affairs and agreed to invite representatives from Academic Affairs to provide further clarification. K. Marsland asked about the status of the service value statement, which was deliberated last year. S. M. Tomczak explained that the statement was referred back to the committee for further consideration and is currently being reviewed, with input being gathered from key stakeholders. It remains a priority, and the committee plans to present a revised version in the future. K. Marsland also inquired whether part-time faculty have access to research support beyond travel funding. S. M. Tomczak confirmed that part-time faculty have access to some funds for conference travel, but there are no known provisions for research funding. N. Starling agreed to bring this issue to the Executive Committee for further discussion regarding part-time faculty support for research and creative activities.
- C. Finance (C. Simoneau): C. Simoneau reported that the Finance Committee met and discussed monitoring budget and space actions. They also began the annual review of travel funds to assess and determine any potential recommendations for changes to the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) regarding travel. This review is ongoing, and further updates will be provided as the committee progresses.
- D. Technology (J. Webb): K. Marsland asked about the status of the rollout of the new Blackboard system. J. Webb and T. Brolliar provided an update, stating that the planned pilot, originally scheduled for the spring, has been pushed back. The current goal is to begin the first large pilot in the fall of the 2026 academic year. No further updates have been provided since that decision.

VII. Special Committees

- A. UCF (M. Barboza): M. Barboza provided an update on the Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program, confirming that T. Marchant Shapiro is now the writing director, receiving nine credits for the role. The WAC program is working on developing writing rubrics for W courses and consolidating writing programs. The old W courses by instructor model is being phased out, with the newer W courses by course model expected to fully replace it by January 2026. K. Marsland asked if the writing director will handle waiver applications, which M. Barboza confirmed. She also raised the ongoing conversation about expanding the writing director’s focus to include graduate students. M. Barboza clarified that the writing director position has always included graduate students but noted that more attention has historically been given to undergraduates. M. Barboza suggested reaching out to T. Marchant Shapiro for more information on that topic, as the scope of the writing director position is broader than UCF. K. Marsland recommended that Senate invite T. Marchant Shapiro to a future meeting to provide updates on the writing program transition and discuss the role of the writing director in supporting both undergraduate and graduate students. N. Starling agreed to bring this suggestion to the executive committee for further consideration.
- B. Grad Council (B. Cook): B. Cook shared that if there any questions on the report included in the packet, please reach out to her.

- VIII. Guests: P. Crowley: P. Crowley, lead of the Newer Faculty Discussion Group, provided a brief update. The group, founded in 2019 by N. Starling, W. Faraclas, and K. Marsland, aims to create a supportive space for newer faculty to share experiences and engage in professional development outside the administration’s oversight. The group focuses on offering an informal forum for faculty to discuss challenges, successes, and goals. Currently, the group is in the process of selecting new co-facilitators after losing two members

to other opportunities. Meetings will alternate between Friday mornings and afternoons, and P. Crowley requested that senators help spread the word to newer faculty members about the group.

IX. Adjournment

A. C. Simoneau **moved to** adjourn. **Seconded.**

i. The meeting adjourned at 2:01 p.m.

L. Eilderts

Secretary

UCF-Approved Edits to the Flow of Proposals

The edits include:

1. The addition of a pathway for suspension and reinstatement of programs to mirror the forms available through the BOR.
2. Removal of reference to DocuSign and Accelerated Pathways. DocuSign will soon be phased out. Accelerated Pathways are no longer a concentration within programs.

SCSU Undergraduate Curriculum Forum

Flow of Proposals

v. 18~~7~~

Approved at UCF ~~September 12, 2024~~ ~~February 9, 2023~~

Approved at Senate ~~March 8, 2023~~

OVERVIEW	2
PREPARING YOUR PROPOSAL	2
Drafting the Proposal	2
Department Curriculum Committees & Departments	2
Interdisciplinary Programs Housed Outside of Departments	3
School/College Curriculum Committees	3
Notifications	3
Submitting Your Proposal to UCF	4
ACTIONS OF THE UCF	4
UCF Standing Committees	4
Standing Committee Review Process	6
UCF Review Process	6
Special Topics Courses	6
THE ROLE OF DEANS	7
RECOMMENDATIONS ON APPROVED PROPOSALS FROM UCF TO THE PROVOST	7

The flow of proposals outlines processes for generating, revising, and approving undergraduate curriculum (including courses and programs) at SCSU. This document is an extension of the Undergraduate Curriculum Forum bylaws.

Overview

Before Submission to UCF: Faculty generate proposals; departments (or interdisciplinary steering committees) review and approve (in some cases, school/college curriculum committees also review and approve)

At UCF: Proposal reviewed and approved by appropriate standing committee and the full UCF

After UCF Approval: Proposal reviewed and approved by provost's office (and in some cases the Board of Regents); curriculum implemented by the registrar

Preparing Your Proposal

Proposals for new and revised curriculum (courses and programs) must be initiated by faculty using the forms and directions located on the UCF Confluence site.

Proposers, departments, interdisciplinary steering committees, and school/college curriculum committees may consult with the UCF or UCF standing committees at any point in the process.

Drafting the Proposal

Faculty proposers are encouraged to consult with their departments (or interdisciplinary steering committee) as proposals will be submitted by the proposer on behalf of the department (or interdisciplinary steering committee).

Faculty developing program proposals are also encouraged to consult with appropriate deans (to discuss resources and other logistics) as well as the Provost's office (for assistance in with the BOR approval or notification process).

Department Curriculum Committees & Departments

Department Curriculum Committees (DCCs) conduct a thorough review of proposals and work with faculty proposers to make any necessary revisions.

DCC membership is determined according to a department's bylaws.

After approval by the DCC, the proposal moves to the department for review. Small departments may use the full department in lieu of the DCC.

Upon approval by the DCC, the full department reviews and votes on the proposal in accordance with their bylaws.

Interdisciplinary Programs Housed Outside of Departments

Proposals related to interdisciplinary programs housed outside of departments are reviewed and voted on by the interdisciplinary program's steering committee. Steering committees function as both the DCC and department in the proposal review and approval process.

Steering committee membership is determined by the interdisciplinary program's bylaws.

School/College Curriculum Committees

Schools and colleges may opt to use the school/college curriculum committee (SCC/CCC) as an additional layer of review for program proposals within the school/college. Course proposals are not subject to SCC/CCC review.

Currently, the College of Education and School of Business utilize the SCC/CCC. Membership of school/college curriculum committees should be determined by school/college-wide vote.

If faculty in a school/college wishes to change their status (add a SCC/CCC or remove it), they may request the UCF poll all full-time faculty in the school/college. The outcome of the poll will be determined by a simple majority.

If a faculty proposer is submitting a program proposal in a school/college utilizing a SCC/CCC, they should submit their program proposal to the SCC/CCC after approval by the department or interdisciplinary program steering committee; faculty proposers may also consult with the SCC/CCC during the development of their program proposal if they wish.

Upon receiving a program proposal, SCC/CCCs have 4 academic weeks to issue a decision (approve, revise, reject).

Faculty proposers will include a memo of approval from the SCC/CCC with their proposal package when submitting the proposal to UCF. Should the SCC/CCC reject the proposal or ask for revisions the faculty proposer disagrees with, the faculty proposer may appeal the decision to the UCF by submitting the proposal package with an explanation of why they wish to appeal the SCC/CCC decision instead of a memo of approval. In the case of such an appeal, the UCF standing committee reviewing the proposal will consult with the SCC/CCC as part of the proposal review.

Notifications

Faculty proposers must notify any departments or interdisciplinary programs potentially impacted by their proposal and include these notifications as part of their proposal submission to UCF.

Impacts may include, but are not limited to, revisions to courses included in a program outside the proposer's department and creation of courses or programs that may have content overlap with existing courses or programs.

The following special notifications should also be observed:

- Educator preparation programs housed outside of the College of Education should also notify the office of the Dean of the College of Education of any program changes.
- Programs part of a TAP pathway should include a memo of approval from the TAP-FIRC coordinator.
- ~~Programs with an accelerated pathway should include a notification to the Graduate Council Curriculum Committee.~~

Faculty proposers are not required to include responses to notifications nor must they receive affirmative responses to proceed with their proposal.

UCF standing committees may request additional notifications be made as part of their review of the proposal.

Departments/interdisciplinary programs with concerns about a proposal may submit their concerns in writing to the appropriate standing committee or to the UCF. UCF members, department chair/ interdisciplinary steering committee chairs, and proposers may also speak to concerns about a proposal during UCF standing committee or UCF discussions.

Submitting Your Proposal to UCF

Once a proposal is approved by the department (and by the SCC/CCC when relevant), the proposal should be submitted to UCF using the ~~DocuSign~~ links and directions on the UCF Confluence site.

Proposal's status will be listed on the UCF tracker (linked in Confluence). Questions about proposals can be addressed to the UCF chair.

Actions of the UCF

UCF Standing Committees

The UCF chair will route proposals to the appropriate UCF standing committee for review as follows.

New and Revised Courses

New and revised course proposals are reviewed by the Notifications Management Committee (NMC).

- new course proposals: used to create courses not previously offered
- revised course proposals: used to revise existing courses (including those that have been

removed from the catalog)

- LEP course addendum: submitted with a new or revised course proposal to create or revise a course in the Liberal Education Program (LEP)
- LEP removal proposal: used to request a course be removed from the LEP
- proposal for simple changes to multiple courses: used to make a simple change to multiple courses (change must be identical)

Revised Programs

Revised program proposals are reviewed by the Notifications Management Committee (NMC).

- revised degree program proposals: used to revise existing degree programs including the creation of new concentrations; ~~accelerated pathways are considered new concentrations in a program (not a new program)~~
- revised minor proposal: used to revise existing minors housed in departments
- revised interdisciplinary program proposals: used to revise interdisciplinary programs governed by steering committees
- revised certificates program proposals: used to revise undergraduate certificates, postbaccalaureate certificates, and educator preparation certificates

New Programs

New program proposals are reviewed by the University Wide Impact Committee (UWIC).

- new degree program proposals
- new minor proposals
- new interdisciplinary program proposals
- new certificate proposals

Program Suspension, Discontinuation, and Reinstatement

Proposals to suspend, discontinue or reinstate a discontinued or suspended program ~~a program~~ are reviewed by the University Wide Impact Committee (UWIC).

- In the event a proposal to discontinue a program is received from the department that houses the program, the review process described in this document will be followed.
- In the event a proposal to discontinue a program comes from another party, the review process outlined in article 5.20 of the Collective Bargaining Agreement will be followed.

W-Courses

W-course proposals are reviewed by the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee (WACC).

- Existing courses seeking W status in addition to revisions to the course must also submit a revised course proposal. If there are no revisions to the existing course, only the W-course proposal is required.
- New courses seeking W status must also submit a new course proposal.

Standing Committee Review Process

Standing committees (NMC, UWIC, WACC) shall take one of the following five actions on proposals:

1. Approve the proposal as is.
2. Approve with minor (e.g. syntax) changes. These changes may be made by the committee with the consent of the department.
3. Return with substantive concerns that need to be addressed. For process purposes, this should be considered a rejection. The following procedures may be followed if the department does not consider the objections to be valid.
 - a. The faculty proposer may meet with the standing committee. If the committee is persuaded, the proposal is approved and moves on.
 - b. If the standing committee stands by its evaluation, the department may choose to make the suggested changes or appeal the decision to UCF. UCF either approves or rejects the proposal.
 - c. If the proposal is rejected, the department may either modify it according to UCF's recommendations or withdraw it.
4. Proposal is rejected outright. Reasons for rejection must be provided. The appeal process follows the procedure listed in #3.
5. Table the proposal if further information is needed or if the amount of business exceeds the time allotted for the meeting.

If no action has been taken by the standing committee in four academic weeks, the proposal is considered pocket approved. The faculty proposer notifies the UCF chair.

UCF Review Process

Recommendations from standing committees shall be considered actions of UCF unless they are challenged at the UCF meeting.

If challenged, the proposal is put before UCF for thorough review. The UCF shall take one of the following four actions:

1. Approve the proposal.
2. Propose modifications to the proposal.
 - a. If the modifications are acceptable to the department, UCF approves the proposal.
 - b. If, after discussions between UCF and the department, the department deems the modifications unacceptable, UCF may reject the proposal.
3. Return the proposal to the department at the department's request.
4. Reject the proposal.

Special Topics Courses

Faculty may propose special topics courses using the ~~DocuSign~~ link and directions on the UCF Confluence site. Special topics courses may run a maximum of three semesters.

Special topics courses receive an expedient review at the department level. Special topics courses running as LEP courses will undergo an additional level of review, specifically of the LEP addendum, by NMC following the procedure for new courses outlined above.

The UCF chair will log special topics courses and enter them into the UCF minutes. Logging of special topics courses by the chair shall be considered an action of the UCF and permission for the special topics course to run.

The Role of Deans

Proposers and departments/interdisciplinary steering committees may give the dean the opportunity to review proposals as it is being developed.

Deans may also view proposals in the UCF Teams space (linked from the UCF Confluence site).

Deans may submit written responses to proposals to UCF. Such responses will be included in the proposal packet and considered during the UCF review process.

A negative response from a dean shall not stop a proposal from going forward through the curriculum approval process.

Deans may speak at any committee meeting where a proposal is being considered.

Recommendations on Approved Proposals from UCF to the Provost

Approved proposals shall be recommended for acceptance to the Provost of the University or the Provost's designee. W-Courses and special topics courses do not require acceptance by the Provost or Provost's designee.

All recommendations from UCF to the Provost of the University or the Provost's designee shall have the effect of a resolution from the Faculty Senate, which requires a response to UCF by the Provost or the Provost's designee on the recommendation. This response may take the form of a signature on the approved proposal.