

FACULTY SENATE

APPROVED MINUTES OF [10/29/2025]

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

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

Attendance

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

Cindy	Simoneau	Journalism	2028	x	
Amy	Jansen	Library Services	2028	x	
Zheni	Wang	Management & International Business	2028	x	
Melvin	Prince	Marketing	2026		
Seon	Kim	Marriage & Family Therapy	2026	x	
Leah	Sturman	Mathematics	2027	x	
Danial	Cicala	Mathematics	2027	x	
Natalie	Starling	Mental Health Services	2026	x	
Sameer	Ramchandra	Music	2028	x	
Deborah	Morrill	Nursing	2026	x	
Elizabeth	Hurlbert	Nursing	2027	x	
Selin	Doganalp	Part-Time Faculty	2025	x	1/1
Noah	Goldsher	Part-Time Faculty	2025	x	1/1
Shenira	Billups	Part-Time Faculty	2027	x	
Mike	Sanger	Part-Time Faculty	2027	x	
Rex	Gilliland	Philosophy	2026	x	
Evan	Finch	Physics	2027	x	
Jonathan	Wharton	Political Science	2028	x	
		Psychology	2025	x	
Patricia	Kahlbaugh	Psychology	2025	x	
John	Nwangwu	Public Health	2027	x	
Michael	Dodge	Recreation, Tourism, & Sport Management	2027	x	
Isabel	Logan	Social Work	2028	x	
Stephen Monroe	Tomeczak	Social Work	2028	x	
Gregory	Adams	Sociology	2026		
Kristy	Hynes	Inclusive Education & Behavior Science	2027	x	
Douglas	Macur	Theatre	2027		
Tricia	Lin	Women's & Gender Studies	2028	x	
		World Languages & Literatures	2026		
Joan	Weir	SCSU Faculty Senate President	2026	x	5/5
Sandra	Bulmer	Interim SCSU President		x	
Venezia	Michalson	Chair, Graduate Council		x	
Tricia	LIn	Chair, Graduate Council		x	
Meredith	Sinclair	Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Form		x	
William	Moroz	SGA		x	

GUESTS
Jordan Jones

Robert Yanez
Trevor Brolliar
Erin Larkin
Dyan Robinson
Craig Hlavac
Gary Winfield
Martin Miller
Kari Swanson
Julia Irwin

Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes

October 29, 2025

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

Announcements

- None

Minutes review/approval

- Minutes of the previous meeting held on October 15, 2025 were accepted as distributed. <https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings>

Faculty Senate President's Report:

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

Discussion:

Tricia Lin: Search consulting firm costs were high and now we are changing the process- why? Joan Weir noted that Chair Guay indicated support for SCSUs search committee/process for that search. Jeff Webb reported that the search cost a total of \$177,443 for the presidential search which included search consulting fees.

Cindy: Search Committee underway- reach out to Cindy to ask questions or make suggestions.

Change in order of business was approved:

Guests:

Ethnic Heritage Center Members:

Guests from the various societies shared their historical resources and objects in their archives, and shared examples, and emphasized their role in the New Haven community. All are invited to visit. There are also walking history tour brochures available for five different tours.

Chair Guay:

Expressed thanks and shared that he is interested in listening and learning. As his role as chair, he seeks to understand and listen to what is going on. There are many changes from outside of our system and within. Notes many new people in the system. Identifies the goal of making the

six brands of CSU shine with Chancellor Maduko. There are a lot of changes coming from Washington, but things are a bit unclear now. The system has gotten a lot quieter but in a good way since we should focus on what we do, which is educating young people.

Comments/Questions:

Mike Shea shared gratitude for Chair Guay to join the meeting and that past issues may have arisen from lack of communication. Question: meeting of the BOR regarding changing standards from NECHE and “erasing” a lot of DEI stuff. They are asking for a draft from us- Will we submit a draft where we erase a lot of the DEI initiatives. Chair Guay indicated that he noted these changes and is looking into this. This is an issue across a lot of organizations, and some are shifting language but continuing the work. DOGE used technology to search DEI wording to get rid of these programs. He suggested that perhaps we continue the work but change the language if needed. We may look at the impact of the work as opposed to the words we use. Joan asked if we have information about the language change with NECHE. Faculty need to be involved with the draft, and Chair Guay agreed.

Natalie Starling: shared gratitude for joining again. Response to resolution from spring related to mutual defense compact. Chair Guay indicated he asked for legal input and will get back to Natalie about this.

Paul Petrie: Add on Natalie’s compact. Concern that Academic freedom is critical to what we do as faculty. The vision of higher ed that is emanating from the current administration is about ideological control which many see as an existential threat to what we do. A mutual defense contract may protect us from this issue. This is uncharted territory but historically, lawyers get involved, but that is a reactive response and is about compliance. What is needed is something more proactive. It is not clear whether the board, etc. when/if the federal government comes after a faculty member. Chair Guay said discussions are taking place – do we become proactive and then cause something that might not have otherwise occurred by putting it “out there” or do we plan for a strong defense. They have not received anything thus far. Discussions across other states and in CT have occurred. He indicates they are unified and will be unified if the time comes. This is high on the agenda. “We will have your back.”

Jeff Webb: As treasurer, he is astonished at the money that was spent on the search this spring for the firm. Upsetting that this amount was spent when money is so tight. Chair Guay: He has the same concerns and does not feel they have been getting the value they have had in the past. The cost is the same as others pay. They will look at other firms per AG requirements to vet firms. Hard when you pay and do not get something. He anticipates it will change.

Standing Committees:

Academic Policy:

- When you read the minutes from the APC, you will note that they received feedback regarding the letters from the chairpersons. The committee has made changes and is asking all to review and provide further feedback.

- Fresh Start Policy: They are discussing this issue with the director of the early college program to find out how this policy was adopted and how it was approved over the summer.

Finance:

He has travel numbers: Full-time travel balance was received and backlog cleared.

Comment: Cindy Simoneau: Encourages all faculty to file TAs earlier in the year so they can see what the numbers are so they can anticipate how much of the funds will be used this year.

Question: Patty Kahlbaugh asked- Finance ran workshops to answer questions regarding the new process= will there be more? Several responses shared that additional drop-in meetings will be held Fridays. See new written guidance what was emailed today. Faculty should educate themselves, so they submit the documents correctly with fewer corrections needed, which slows down the process. Paul Petrie notes that the links in the new document do not take the user to the form but not instructions so far as he could see. Provost Irwin notes that leadership discussed this, and they are working on having a single set of directions that are clear.

Personnel Policy:

Nothing to add

Rules:

Nothing to add

Student Policy:

Nothing to add

Technology:

Nothing to add.

Question: Navigate was not working today? Did anyone have the same problem. Noted that some people were having this issue and others were not. IT to be contacted.

Special Committees:

UCF:

One motion passed to move review of LEP courses to LEPC for review.

Lengthy discussion regarding how Special Projects are logged. This will continue to be reviewed: highlights: all departments have these courses. The policy has the courses sent to UCF for logging, which allows them to be scheduled. The change would be to no longer log these courses with UCF. Also, departments will have the ability to set prerequisites permanently in a special project “shell”. The document was shared. The registrar can facilitate other aspects of this happening. Please review the document and send feedback to UCF.

Grad Council:

Highlights: Grad Council Curriculum Committee has extended new course proposals to November 3. Grad open house November 4. Tentative Grad Council meeting date December 8. Bylaws: GSA is being reconstituted and meets Fridays- calling for a student rep to be on

UGC, this is in the works. Minor revision will be proposed to allow for co-chairs. This will need to be approved by the Senate for a future meeting. Mike Shea: asked if there are fees for grad students to use for travel to conferences. Tricia shared that yes, this has been happening for a few years now. Students are now subsidized up to \$750 if they are presented. Mike asked if there is still a surplus, and if so, could that amount be revisited. Tricia said she would look into this. Patty Kahlbaugh asked: It is advising season, and many students are asking about graduate school possibilities- would it be possible to have a list of all of the graduate program advisors somewhere. Tricia said they are working on this also- encouraging graduate coordinators to serve on GC. She agreed that they should have this information- Provost Irwin said there is a list of grad coordinators. Also, there is a large pool of money that is clearly earmarked for graduate students to travel to conferences. Mike Shea reinforced increasing the amount of money available for students to travel to conferences and consider adding travel to conferences even if they do not present. This would be up to the GSA since they have their own constitution.

Elections Officer:

Need two Senators to serve on a committee looking at independent studies, and low enrolled courses. There is an agreement to examine this since independent studies have been used to replace low enrollment courses. Natalie and Rex volunteered to serve.

Reports from Faculty Senate Representatives:

Natalie Starling asked if anyone has knowledge as to who the Faculty Advisory Committee representative is this year and if they are present, please provide an update.

Professor Shea is the representative. FAC has reps from all 17 institutions and meets monthly. Most recently, the main issue raised was related to the DEI language being compromised, which was discussed with Chair Guay earlier in this meeting. As he understands it, the Draft for NECHE will need to be voted on. Do we want to push the institutions not to vote for the erasure of the DEI terminology. This vote is to take place in December. The BOR made it seem like a done deal. They also emphasized that it was up to each institution as to how they would react to all of this. Natalie proposed that the Executive Committee and Faculty Senate that the FAC is on the agenda each week, so the faculty can hear things firsthand from the representative. Mike Shea also suggested that the AAUP also report on each meeting- this was added, but a rep does not consistently attend. Perhaps someone can connect with AAUP to make sure someone is present at each meeting.

New Business: None

Resolutions:

UCF Resolution to add the Honors College to UCF:

- Resolution reviewed; Discussion commenced; Vote held; This motion was approved unanimously 39/39.

Rules Committee:

- Resolution to change the Sabbatical Leave Document. Changes and the resolution were reviewed; Discussion commenced, Vote held: This motion was approved unanimously 38/38.

- Motion to postpone the resolution regarding the changes to the FCARG was made and seconded. This item is postponed until the next Faculty Senate Meeting on November 12, 2025

Academic Policy Committee Resolution:

- Vote to approve the Motion approve the resolution to change the language to the resolution from May of 2025 fixing an error. Motion approved 34/34

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm.

Dr. Shawneen Buckley
Secretary

None

STANDING COMMITTEES

Academic Policy Committee (APC)

None this week.

Finance Committee (FC)

Finance Committee Meeting: 11/5/2025

Attendees: Nick Edgington BIO, Jennifer Cooper-Boemmels ESC, Jeff Webb CHE (Chair), Selin Doganalp (BUS-MKT)

Meeting on TEAMS

The Chair informed the committee of the latest travel numbers from Procurement (Ajay Chabra) and a subsequent meeting with Ajay.

As of 10/27/25 -

FULL TIME		Budget	Expenses	Balance	
FY2026	AUP770	633,037.74	8,214.09	624,823.65	
			10/26/2025		
PART TIME					
		Budget	Expenses	Balance	
FY2026	AUP773	59,989.78	680.00	59,309.78	
			10/26/2025		

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

Since the last update a large amount (although still not all) of the travel \$ backlog has gone through so the carryover & have changed as those req's come off of last year's budget line.

The chair then informed the committee about some recent discussion involving the Business Budget Hiring process. (Where the Provost mentioned there were ~15 applications submitted for the positions, also discussing the possibility that all the positions might not get filled.) Discussion also delved into the fact that many constituents (Dean's, chair's, council, etc.) on campus are skeptical of the hires and what they will be doing, how they are budget neutral as faculty have been told, and finally why they are being hired at such a high level.

The committee then discussed then little time left in the semester and the lack of a meeting (or even a planned meeting) for both the SCSU budget committee and the Space Committee. The chair volunteered to Email the CFO (Dr. Lillian Wangagi) about Budget / Space Committee representation and scheduling a meeting before the end of the semester sometime.

Meeting adjourned at 12:50 pm

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

FACULTY SENATE
PERSONNEL POLICY COMMITTEE
Minutes

FIRST	LAST	DEPARTMENT	ATTENDANCE	TOTAL
Daniel	Cicala	Mathematics	X	5/5
Amy	Jansen (Co-Chair)	Library Services	X	5/5
Patricia	Kahlbaugh	Psychology	X	5/5
Tricia	Lin	Women's & Gender Studies	X	5/5
Mike	Shea	English	X	4/5
Natalie	Starling	Mental Health Sciences	X	5/5
Stephen Monroe	Tomczak (Co-Chair)	Social Work	X	4/5

Meeting Date: 11/12/2025

Time: 12:10 pm

Minutes of October 22, 2025

Approved unanimously

OLD BUSINESS

- Discussion and revision of resolution to address faculty participation in Interfolio administration
 - A member composed a draft resolution shortly beforehand and co-chairs shared the draft for review and revisions during the meeting
 - Having a contingency or back up plan for this person is important, perhaps an alternate, co-coordinator roles, ad hoc committee? Consensus led to suggesting an alternate position that could step in during certain contingencies.
 - Role might be something similar to the Elections officer in the Senate
 - But does the person in this role need to be a Senator? Members agreed this individual could be a non-voting (ex officio) member of the Senate.
 - Person would not be an officer of the Senate (which would require Senate membership and might be unnecessary), but would instead have oversight by and report to the Senate
 - Continued discussion and revision of the new Coordinator position description
 - Discussion of qualifications, amount of reassigned time, and how the role might be appointed/elected.

Tabled for Future Discussion

- Renewal procedures document
 - P&T documents are more clear and detailed about the contents necessary for the file, may need more specific examples of types of documents for renewal
 - Ambiguous language around disciplinary action- should a statement be added if there is not a record?
 - Re: renewal docs, it would be helpful to have expectations about statements to write, word counts, what they should address.
 - Reviewing Interfolio, it is not clear what documentation is required for Renewals.
 - Committee members should review items in P&T, renewal, and prof. assessment documents – determine what items we might consider for adoption.
- Professional Assessment document
 - clarify what should be in the file, including the category of disciplinary action.
 - Should renewal and P&T docs mirror each other, and Prof Assessment be a separate conversation?
 - Even Professional Assessment can be a vulnerable thing for programs that are not favored by Admin.
 - Committee will review Professional Assessment docs in the future as well.
- Evaluator Responsibilities
 - The committee crafted language for DEC procedures document and conferred with AAUP.
 - Language reviewed with AAUP: Co-chairs will follow up with Gary to ensure that the newly revised language is clearer and still in agreement with the CBA. Further discussion is ongoing

Meeting Adjourned at 2:00 pm

Rules Committee (RC)

RULES COMMITTEE MINUTES

11/05/2025 (12:10-1:25 pm via Teams)

Attendance:

FIRST	LAST	DEPARTMENT	ATTENDANCE	TOTAL
David	Allen	Accounting	x	2/2
Jessica	Case	Athletic Training	x	2/2
Kristy	Hynes	Inclusive Ed & Behavior Science	x	3/3
Seon	Kim	Marriage & Family Therapy	x	3/3
Paul	Petrie	ENG	x	3/3
Mike	Sanger	Adjunct Faculty (Women's & Gender Studies)		1/2

- Met with University Sabbatical Committee chair, Jennifer Hopper, to discuss:
 - Potential mechanisms for providing unsuccessful applicants for sabbatical with USC feedback on their applications, without violating USC document article requiring confidentiality of committee deliberations.
 - USC will work with HR to revise post-evaluation letter to applicants, to include major categories of evaluation and, for unsuccessful applicants, indication of which category or categories were deemed by the committee to be inadequate in the candidate's application.
 - Potential solutions for problem of understaffing of USC.
 - Decided against document revision allowing smaller committee, on basis of workload, particularly re: required USC interviews with sabbatical applicants. (Better to rely on occasional MOU than to normalize smaller committee inadequately sized for the task.)
 - Possible revisions to USC composition, altering representation to match FCARG document's specification of membership distribution on University Grants Committee.
 - Table for possible reconsideration later.
- Reviewed relevant sections of governing documents for Senate, Graduate Council, and University Curriculum Forum and approved summary of required procedures for possible GC/UCF consolidation.

—Paul R. Petrie 11/05/2025

Student Policy Committee (SPC)

Student Policy Sub-Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: November 5, 2025

Time: 12:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.

Attendance

Present: Amanda Strong, Leah Sturman, Laurie Bonjo, Elizabeth Hurlbert, Troy Rondinone, Scott Jackson (guest), William Moroz, Matt Ouimet, Jonathan Wharton

Absent: Shenira Billups

1. Approval of Minutes

Approval of previous meeting minutes occurred via email.

2. Old Business

a. Student Opinion Survey (SOS) Updates

- Committee members conducted website research on comparable universities to determine how SOS data is collected, processed, and utilized.
- **Continuing review of issues raised in the AAUP Committee on Gender and Sexuality's letter regarding disparities in the SOS. The committee requested that faculty senate emphasize examining universities recognized for innovative approaches to addressing survey bias. ↓ NOTE: Laurie forgot to mention this during the meeting.**
- Discussion on Departmental Evaluation Committees (DECs):
 - Consideration of how departments use SOS data in faculty evaluation files.
 - Clarified that SOS administration is overseen by Chul Lee.
- The committee agreed to avoid duplicating the AAUP Committee on Gender and Sexuality's ongoing efforts while using their letter as a key reference document.
- Focus remains on how Student Evaluation Instruments/Student Opinion Surveys (SOSs) are used at the departmental level.
- Proposal approved to create a **working document** compiling data from "sister schools."
- Decision: retain the original document and develop a **database of findings**.

3. New Business

a. Guest Presentation – Scott Jackson (Office of Institutional Research and Assessment)

- Discussion centered on the **potential for bias** within the SOS process.
- The current SOS platform does **not include bias-checking mechanisms**, and faculty demographic data are not systematically entered.
- From approximately **39,000 survey responses**, demographic data could only be linked to **470 faculty members** (gender and race only; no data on sexual orientation or gender-expansive identity).
- Findings:
 - **No statistical difference** between ratings of cisgender men and cisgender women.
 - **Racial Disparities:**

- Overall mean: 4.39
- White: 4.43
- Nonresident: 4.16
- Hispanic/Latino: 4.29
- Asian: 4.28
- Black: 4.26
- Non-White aggregate: 4.27
- Statistical significance indicates **racial bias** in SOS ratings.
- Student demographics are unknown, limiting further analysis.
- Average response rate: ~33%, with significant variability across class sizes.

b. Discussion Points

- Need to clarify whether results aggregate tenure-track and contingent faculty; consider disaggregating by employment status.
- Consider re-launching a **Campus Climate Survey** to assess faculty perceptions of bias related to DEIJ content and nondominant identities.
- Recognize challenges in the current sociopolitical climate that may inhibit honest responses; strategies to mitigate fear and build trust discussed.
 - Resource shared: *AAC&U National Study of Faculty Attitudes and Perceptions on Academic Freedom and Civil Discourse*.

4. Strategies to Build Trust and Encourage Participation

- **Ensure Anonymity & Confidentiality:** Possibly use an external firm for administration and analysis.
- **Communicate Purpose Transparently:** Clarify how data will lead to tangible change.
- **Show Accountability:** Publicly share prior survey results and actions taken.
- **Engage Faculty:** Include diverse faculty voices in survey design and interpretation.
- **Acknowledge Sociopolitical Climate:** Address fears around self-expression directly.
- **Tailor Communication:** Use multiple outreach channels and avoid administrative coercion.
- **Emphasize Value of Diverse Viewpoints:** Frame surveys as tools for inclusivity and academic freedom.

5. Additional Updates

- The SOS survey **can be edited**, with content determined by the AAUP and approved by Faculty Senate.
- The instrument is **not standardized or psychometrically validated**.
- Historical development of the SOS remains unclear; likely developed by a past committee and approved by Faculty Senate.
- Last comprehensive review occurred approximately **five years ago**.
- Customization by course is theoretically possible but administratively challenging.

6. Increasing Participation and Buy-In

a. Incentives

- Departmental competitions (e.g., Political Science vs. History/Social Work).

- Incentives such as pizza, ice cream, Amazon gift cards, or departmental rewards (e.g., release time or additional graduate assistant).
- Student incentives: raffles, gift cards, small participation bonuses (1–2% extra credit).
- Class-level competitions and participation thresholds.

b. Enhancing Engagement

- Dedicate class time for survey completion.
- Promote via email, social media, and short in-class QR codes.
- Pilot test for clarity and conciseness.

c. Transparency

- Clearly state survey purpose and intended actions.
- Share aggregate results and resulting institutional changes.
- Publicly acknowledge student contributions.

7. Next Steps

- Confirm whether the Faculty Senate Executive Council plans to conduct a **new campus climate survey**.
- Continue developing the database of “sister school” findings, focusing on schools with innovative approaches to evaluation of teaching.
- Maintain focus on improving trust, participation, and inclusivity in faculty and student feedback mechanisms.

Technology Committee (TC)

Technology Committee Minutes – November 5, 2025

Attendance: Yan Liu, Christine Petto, Melanie Savelli, Jeff Slomba, Kate Toskin, Aashma Uprety, Eric West

Absent: Doug Macur

On-going Issues:

Blackboard Ultra Pilot

---Confirming that AI tools will be available for members of the pilot. For members of the pilot, AI tools have been turned beginning November 3rd.

Accessibility Questions

---Committee met with Trever and Bogdan to go over (again) the accessibility questions regarding making images (alt text), text, and videos (captioning) accessible. Use the Ally tool in Blackboard.

LTECH & IT GOV

---IT TEC (November meeting coming up on the 18th)

---IT GOV (October meeting) reports from representative?

Grade Appeal Processes & OnBase

---Eric West has nearly completed the process and the committee will share the documents with UASC, initiate a ticket in IT GOV, and move to complete this item.

Zoom

---latest word is that no agreement has been reached regarding contract renewal with Zoom

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF)

Southern CT State University Faculty Creative Activity Research Grants Application Guidelines

Project Performance Period: July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026

Submit in [Kuali Build](#)

General Provisions

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

Composition of the University Grants Committee

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

There shall be three alternate members elected by the faculty. Alternates shall take the place of voting members under the following circumstances:

- a. when a voting member is applying for a FCARG that year; or,
- b. when a voting member resigns; or,
- c. under other circumstances, such as prolonged absence, as evaluated by the committee.

In the event that, at the time the committee must begin its work, an insufficient number of faculty members have been elected to fully staff the committee, the committee shall be empowered to conduct its work with fewer than 7 members.

Statement on Applicant Eligibility

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

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

Performance Period

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

Application Availability

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

Guidelines

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

Funding Priorities

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

In addition, proposals submitted to this research program should take into account one or more of the following aspects of faculty research:

Establish new research (in the broad definition of the previous paragraph) at the university;

Support faculty in the continuation and completion of meritorious research;

Encourage the development of projects with potential for external funding.

Proposal Review Criteria

The University Grants Committee shall use the following criteria to rate the quality and completeness of the proposals submitted:

Significance: Presentation of a well-focused and worthy purpose in the context of previous research.

Work Plan: An appropriate and feasible methodology and a plan of action and/or conditions that will result in the accomplishment of the objectives of the project in the context of the particular area of research. The plan must be appropriate to the nature and area of research described in the proposal and may include a timeline accordingly.

Outcomes: Likelihood of achieving significant outcomes such as publications in refereed journals, conference presentations, performances, exhibitions, or other means of dissemination of research results. Submission of a proposal to an external agency for funding is a legitimate and encouraged outcome.

Procedures for Review of the Proposals by the University Grants Committee

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

been completed, and shall be used only for the purpose of determining how many awards can be granted within the available FCARG funding for the current application cycle.

~~LEVEL ONE REVIEW (SCREENING)~~

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

~~LEVEL TWO REVIEW (SCORING)~~

~~For each application remaining in the pool of active applications after level one review, each member of the grants committee will be asked to assign a score from "1" for weak to "5" for excellent for each of the items 1 to 3 listed in the Proposal Review Criteria section. The combined scores should produce a total proposal score ranging from a low of 21 to a high of 105. The University Grants Committee will meet to review and discuss these applications and scores as the basis for determining the final ranking according to which proposals are recommended for funding.~~

~~LEVEL THREE REVIEW (BUDGET EVALUATION)~~

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

Procedures for Reporting Award Competition Results

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

The University Grants Committee shall include the following information in the letters to applicants indicating whether or not they have been awarded an FCARG, and the Committee shall report this information to the Faculty Senate, the Provost, and the Faculty Development office:

number of applicants;
distribution of applications by school/college and department;
number of recommended awards;
distribution of awards by school/college and department;
~~the applicant’s ranking among all applicants.~~

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

Proposal Components and Rules for Submission

To be considered, grant proposals shall be submitted electronically via the [Kualī Build](#) Platform and must contain the following components and adhere to the following rules:

Cover sheet with abstract: Please use the exact format shown in Appendix A.1., which is also a guide for completing the [Kuali Build application](#). This form will route electronically to the attention of each participating faculty member named as a ~~Co-Proposer~~ co-applicant.

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

Award type and budget, where appropriate:

Award type. Awards are given in the amount of \$2,500 per proposal. Awards may be received in one of three ways:

as a stipend to support research time,

as a spending account to support research materials, services and/or travel, or

partly as a stipend and partly as a spending account, divided according to figures presented in the proposal.

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

Budget. Budgetary information required in the proposal is dependent on the type of award to be received: For a stipend-only proposal, budgetary information is not required.

For a spending account-only proposal, a simple budget totaling no more than \$2,500 is required. The budget must specify item(s) to be purchased, a brief rationale for each item, and the amount to be spent on each item.

For a combined stipend-spending account proposal, a budget, as described above, is required only for the spending-account portion of the requested award.

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

Human subjects and vertebrate animals: Research involving either human subjects or the use of vertebrate animals must be indicated on the proposal cover sheet. Once a project is funded, the awardee(s) must seek approval from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) for human research subjects or the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) for vertebrate animals. The appropriate committee should be contacted for information on submission procedures and timing. In no case should work with human beings or vertebrate animals as research subjects be undertaken until the proper approval is obtained. The

review of the proposal will include notification to the university regarding the need for compliance according to the procedures mandated by the IRB or IACUC. Failure to obtain the proper approval may result in termination of the award and recovery of funding. Letters of approval from the IRB or IACUC must be attached to the final report.

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

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

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

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

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

Post-Grant-Completion Reporting

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

Important Notices

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

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

Proposals will not be returned.

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

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

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

Faculty Creative Activity Research Grants Calendar

By the end of the first week of the fall semester, the Faculty Senate President shall publish a calendar for the current “Application Period,” which shall be distributed to the faculty by email and be posted on the Faculty Senate web page.

AY 2024 – 2025 Faculty Creative Activity Research Grants Calendar

Application Deadline

Opens November 15th, 2024 and closes on February 7th, 2025 by 4:00 PM.

Applications shall be submitted online via [Kuali Build](#). *No proposals will be accepted after the closing date and time.*

Committee Recommendations

April 4th, 2025 by 4:00 PM

SCSU University Grants Committee submits recommendations for funding to the Faculty Senate and the University Provost.

Provost’s Announcement

April 25th, 2025 by 4:00 PM

SCSU Provost approves recommendations and announces awards.

Final Project Report

By September 30, 90 days after the performance period, the principal ~~contact~~ applicant for each project shall [submit electronically a report](#) describing the results of the research, including the contributions of each participating faculty member; reports will be sent to the Office of Faculty Development.

Appendix A1: Faculty Creative Activity Research Grant (FCARG) Proposal Kuali Build Instructions

The form shown below can be found here: [FCARG Application](#). *The live application form will show the correct funding period dates. Below is only a preview.*

The application in Kuali Build is meant to function as your Cover Sheet. The first portion of the form collects information on your name, department, the dollar value being requested, whether or not the work is for a joint proposal, and the disciplinary grouping. Selecting “Yes” for the question “Is this a Joint Proposal”? will cause additional fields to appear.

The next section of the cover sheet requests information related to Research Compliance. Selecting “Yes” for either of the questions will cause additional information to appear related to necessary committee approvals prior to the start of your work.

The title, abstract, proposal components (*CVs for ~~Co-Proposers~~ co-applicants are provided in the section above, as they are named*), and appendices are provided in the section at the bottom of the form.

There are several options on the right-hand menu [at the top of the page] when you have finished working on the application: Submit, Save, or Discard

‘Submit’ will send the form and attachments forward for final acceptance and processing. You will receive an email notification when this proposal is received and approved, OR if it is incomplete and is denied.

‘Save’ will not submit the form, and a draft will be accessible to you when you revisit the [Kuali Build Home Page](#). To return to your drafted applications that have not yet been submitted and continue editing them, please select ‘My Documents.’

There will be a space under this tab to select between ‘Submitted’ and ‘Drafts.’

Select ‘Discard’ only if you wish to clear the application form and start over.

After you hit ‘Submit,’ the proposal will be sent to your ~~Co-Proposers~~ co-applicants and the Office of Sponsored Programs and Research. The application will then appear under the ‘Submitted’ list in your ‘My Documents’ tab.

It will show as being ‘In Progress,’ similar to what is shown in the screenshot below; this means that it is awaiting a team or staff member’s attention. *You do not have to resubmit the application or take any action.*

Appendix A.2: PROPOSAL CHECKLIST

Please utilize the following checklist to ensure that all critical parts of the application have been included in the following order and within the basic guidelines:

Cover Sheet

All the following boxes in Kuali Build are marked appropriately

Is this a Joint Application?

What research category are you applying for?

IRB/IACUC statement boxes

Abstract is 100 words or less

The form names all ~~Co-Proposers~~ co-applicants and receives their electronic approval within the Kuali Build workflow

Narrative

Text is double-spaced, in Times New Roman 12-pt or equivalent font, with 1” margins.

The narrative is no longer than 1200 words (for joint proposals, up to 240 additional words in one page are permitted per additional participating faculty member).

The narrative includes the following sections: Significance, Work Plan, and Outcomes. For joint proposals, an additional double-spaced page is permitted per participating faculty member.

The required headings are used to organize the narrative (Significance, Work Plan, and Outcomes).

Curriculum vita(e)

Vita is no more than 2 pages per applicant

Budget Upload: Amount to be received by stipend (must be divided equally amount recipients)

Recipient	Name	Amount
Principal contact applicant		
Co-Proposer Co-applicant 1		
Co-Proposer Co-applicant 2		
	TOTAL	

Spending Account Budget

For a stipend-only proposal, budgetary information is not required.

For a spending account-only proposal, a simple budget totaling no more than \$2,500 is required. The budget must specify item(s) to be purchased, a brief rationale for each item, and the amount to be spent on each item.

For a combined stipend-spending account proposal, a budget, as described above, is required only for the spending-account portion of the requested award.

FCARG Budget		
Spending Account Item(s)	Amount	Rationale
TOTAL		

Appendices (optional, please label Appendix B, C, etc. as needed)

All optional appendices should follow the vita(e)

Submission of proposal

Applications shall be submitted online using the Kualu Build form.

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

Resolution Regarding:

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

Whereas,	Southern Connecticut State University exists for the primary purpose of furthering academic excellence;
Whereas,	The SCSU Faculty Senate is the official representative body of the Academic Faculty; and
Whereas,	The Faculty Senate is responsible for making changes to the Faculty Creative Activity Research Grants (FCARG) document and forms; now, therefore, be it
<i>Resolved,</i>	<p>That the following revisions to the FCARG document and forms become effective for academic year 2026-27:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Provision allowing understaffed committee (p.1).2. Applications made available to Deans, for informational purposes only (p.1).3. Revisions to University Grants Committee's applicant ranking process:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Eliminate Level One Review (criteria-less yes/no vote on applications before they enter the pool of applications to be evaluated and ranked by the committee) (p.2);b. Eliminate prescribed points system for ranking applications, leaving it to the committee to determine internally its own methods for ranking applications in accordance with the published evaluation criteria (p.2);4. Specified information to be included in notification of FCARG awards to applicant and to university (p.3).5. Standardization of terminology referring to applications having multiple co-applicants (p.3 ff.)6. Modification of award types, restoring \$2500 award regardless of type of award (stipend-only, equipment-only ("spending account"), combination (p. 4).7. Modification of budgetary information reporting process, moving it out of evaluation stage to after applicant ranking (p. 4).8. Moved "proposal checklist" and "final report" instructions out of "Proposal Components" section to appropriate later sections of document (p. 5).