

UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING MINUTES

A regular meeting of the University Senate was held
Monday, December 7, 2020 at 4:00 p.m. via WebEx

1. Call to order and Approval of Minutes of November 2, 2020 University Senate meeting

The University Senate was called to order by Moderator **Deans** at 4:01 p.m.

Moderator **Deans** asked for any objections or amendments to the November 2, 2020 minutes.

Senator **Morrell** mentioned he had submitted a correction by email, clarifying his comments about the block grant. Moderator **Deans** called for a vote on the minutes, with Senator Morrell's correction included.

The minutes passed by show of hands.

2. Report of the President – Presented by President Tom Katsouleas

The President started by noting that we now had our institutional experience of the pandemic this year behind us, and he praised the entire University community with the fact that we had gotten through 2020 remarkably well. He acknowledged the surge in coronavirus cases starting in early November but credited our monitoring of early indicators through testing individuals and wastewater, leading up to our full residential quarantine, with our ability to control the surge. We had made exit testing available for every student to ensure they could keep their families and communities safe. He noted that looking ahead to spring, we know a lot more than we did, but cautioned that the starting point for the spring would be worse than it was in the fall, given the marked rise in the virus nationally. He reassured the Senate that the University would pivot as necessary in the spring as the disease evolved. He shared that the residence halls would be slightly less de-densified in the spring with about 5200 students expected to live on campus.

Regarding the budget situation, he shared good news from the Office of Policy and Management (OPM) and the Governor's Office: a further \$20 million from the CARES Act would go to UConn to address its anticipated \$76 million shortfalls for FY21, which resulted in large part from lost dining and housing income. We had already worked aggressively to mitigate this shortfall, which had brought our projected budget gap down to \$28 million. The state funds would bring that gap down to \$8 million, which was still significant but much more manageable. He thanked the state for coming to UConn's aid.

He turned his remarks to the U.S. Presidential election, expressing pride in the broad programming offered by a range of individuals and groups, including faculty members, administrators, and student organizations such as USG and PIRG. He had taken part in some

of these programs. He shared that after the election senior administration, including Andrew Agwunobi (Chief Executive Officer, UConn Health and Executive Vice President for Health Affairs) had met remotely in small groups with state legislators who had been elected or re-elected this year and that there is a lot of goodwill toward UConn right now. They've been sharing with legislators the four budget priorities for the year: 1. Maintaining the block grant at current levels (they are making a case to be excluded from the rescission proposed by OPM to apply to all state agencies), 2. Requesting the State back the University again, should the pandemic take another negative turn (e.g. if we had to send students home in the spring), 3. Asking for support with the legacy costs of the unfunded fringe burden, and 4. Maintaining capital projects that have been approved by the state and are already underway.

He restated the importance of the social contract between the University and the citizens of the State, which can be built on. A meeting between Connecticut college presidents, FEMA, and the governor's office explored how the talents and assets of the state's academic institutions could aid in recovery from the pandemic. The focus had moved from plans for reopening to how we can use our scholarship and skills and students aid in areas such as public health, K-12 education, and economic recovery. He cited several examples: UConn is sharing its wastewater testing technologies and process with several municipalities; there has been discussion of letting trained nursing and medical students assist with vaccination, should vaccine production exceed the distribution capabilities of the state; the Neag School of Education is exploring how to use students to act as emergency substitute teachers. He encouraged anyone with ideas to reach out to him or Nicole Fournier Geltson (Chief of Staff in the President's Office).

Finally, he celebrated the strong launch of strategic planning work in the form of several energized discussion exercises attended by around 200 people each. He acknowledged the work of the Provost and his team in organizing these events so effectively. He expressed excitement about seeing where the University was headed, to uplifting minds and spirits to be the jewel of the state.

He welcomed questions.

Senator **Long** referred to the September 22 Executive Order on Combating Race and Sex Stereotyping signed by President Trump, which effectively banned using critical race theory in training in any federal facilities or organizations that received federal funds. He asked about the status of the order, whether it would expire with Trump's presidency, and whether it would become regulatory policy. President **Katsouleas** answered the UConn had made no change to its policy to support academic freedom across all subjects, including critical race theory. He noted that they made some accommodations in their administration of Title IX but had been able to make these changes without altering core values, that the changes were procedural and did not diminish core principles of due process, fairness, and support of victims.

Senator **Jockusch** asked about the impact of the virus on students beyond total numbers. How many student cases had been serious, required hospitalization, or were "long haul." She also commented on the faculty-staff testing site, which had moved indoors, noting that

it felt risky to stand for 30 minutes in a room with others. President **Katsouleas** answered that students were resilient as a demographic and that there had been no serious illnesses or injuries, and no student had been hospitalized. He acknowledged that there were still unknowns, such as the long-term effects on that population. He said he had been to the indoor testing site and had stood in line for about 15 minutes, noting that he had been met by greeters and that everyone was at least 6 feet apart. He had not felt unsafe but noted that there were personal differences in that perception. He commented that the University would accommodate those who wished to get testing done privately, and again emphasized that, even though the testing was run fully in compliance with Environmental Health & Safety requirements, he understood personal comfort levels with the environment would differ.

Senator **McCutcheon** said he was heartened by the call for the academic community to contribute to state recovery. He singled out the importance of engaging Neag, as the education system was very impacted and parents who were faculty members were struggling to both teach their children while teaching their students, and that we were suffering the loss of six months of lost in-person instruction. He cited Trinity College's outreach to local schools in the form of temporary student teachers, who could keep K-12 student pods staffed. He thought the issue had largely been ignored in the state and hoped we would engage. President **Katsouleas** answered that Neag's Dean Kersaint was very engaged and that students were being given emergency credentials so they could help in classrooms. Everyone was motivated in this effort, but there were some logistical challenges. He shared that State Congresswoman Rosa DeLauro spoke of the "lost generation," reflecting concern about this issue. Educational professionals emphasize that young people are resilient and can make up lost work, but there is some question about how best to do that. Senator **Kersaint**, Dean of the School of Education, echoed the President's statements that we were very active in supporting schools and districts, both through students in the classroom and also with their ability to employ rapid research practices to answer questions from the districts. She cited a policy brief on university pre-K, which had been provided within a month. They were also supporting students with college applications. She noted that, although they were engaged in multiple ways, their students and faculty were also experiencing needs related to the pandemic.

Moderator **Deans** announced there was time for three more questions.

Senator **Rubega** commented on the expressed concern about conditions at the indoor testing facility in the field house. She noted that around the state, doctor's offices were using remote check-in procedures and letting people wait for appointments in their cars or elsewhere so that no one was gathered in a waiting room. The concern was not only for those waiting in line but also for those doing the testing. President **Katsouleas** said he would take these comments to Scott Jordan (Executive Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer) and others, including the medical design team.

Senator **Douglas** asked about staff survey testing. He said that, as a residential student, he had been called in about six times during the semester for testing, and that his experience of the same indoor testing site had been much quicker than had been described. He wondered if whatever system was being used for students could be applied to faculty and

staff. President **Katsouleas** responded that the weather had required the shift and that the previous site had been outdoors at the Depot Campus. He said that he was hearing some discomfort with the indoor location and process and that the administration would reflect on the comments expressed here.

Senator **Bramble** commented that she was heartened to hear that, despite the caseload, no students had been hospitalized. She added that she had recently heard that at least one Stamford student had been hospitalized and that several students there were very sick, and that her thoughts were with them. President **Katsouleas** answered that this was new information to him, that he was sorry to hear it, and that he wished them well.

3. [Report of the Senate Executive Committee – Presented by SEC Chair Carol Atkinson-Palombo](#)

[See attached report provided by the Senate Executive Committee.](#)

Following the report, Moderator **Deans** invited questions.

Senator **Athina** asked about the recent Work-Life discussions and the fact that they were focused on faculty and staff development and did not include students. Senator **Atkinson-Palombo** said that she had not attended the previous meeting and asked **Senator Michael Bradford** (Vice Provost for Faculty, Staff, and Student Development) to respond. Senator **Bradford** clarified that several committees had been formed around work-life balance. This meeting for faculty and staff had been focused specifically on issues around work-life during the pandemic as it affected faculty and staff, and that other meetings on work-life did involve students.

Senator **McCutcheon** commented on the fact that the chat feature in the Senate meeting was still disabled, although it was helpful in this unique environment, and also saved time. Senator **Atkinson-Palombo** responded that the SEC had extensive conversations about this and that they felt it was necessary for the smooth function of the meeting for everything to go through the Moderator, and that the Secretary could not capture important information from chat. She expressed that this was simpler and more consistent with Senate meeting rules, so chat would remain off for now. Senator **McCutcheon** commented that this would result in more long meetings.

Senator **Ceglio** commented that chat can be saved and that senators could be reminded that saved chats would include all private chats also. She noted that in Zoom, the Q&A feature allows questions to be posed to moderators and be visible to all. She wondered if this could be explored and stated the importance of acknowledging we're not in the same physical space, and that we shouldn't treat the meeting as if we were. Senator **Atkinson-Palombo** answered that the SEC would continue to look at alternatives made available by technology, which was rapidly evolving.

Senator **Majumdar** thanked the SEC for recognizing in their report the long service of Senator Ranjeev Bansal but urged that a better way of recognizing him would be a formal resolution expressing these thanks. Moderator **Deans** said that this could be introduced when the call was made for new business.

4. Consent Agenda Items

Report of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee

See attached report provided by the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee.

Moderator **Deans** asked for requests to pull items from the Consent Agenda before the vote. There were none, and so the vote was called.

The Consent Agenda passed: 67 Yes; 0 No; 1 Abstention

5. Report from Senate Scholastic Standards Committee by Senator Bedore

PRESENTATION and VOTE on a joint motion with the Undergraduate Student Government to amend the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University By-Laws E.II.3.b, Pass-Fail Grading

See attached report provided by the Senate Scholastic Standards Committee.

The motion was presented on the screen, with a modification from the version distributed in advance to the Senate: the extension dates for Pass-Fail (P/F) were changed to Dec 28, 2020 (fall semester) and May 14, 2021 (spring semester).

Moderator **Deans** opened the floor to debate.

Senator **Armstrong** spoke as both a member of the Scholastic Standards Committee (SSC) and the Chair of the Student Welfare Committee, expressing support for the extensions. She said that there was concern about long-term, post-pandemic repercussions for students, but agreed that students would make better decisions after their grades were known.

Senator **Schultz** also voiced support for the motion and stated that the special circumstances of this semester meant students should have this added flexibility.

Senator **Long** also spoke as a member of the SSC and in support of the motion. He noted the considerable discussion in committee about this complex issue and that it should be supported for all the reasons stated.

Senator **Gordina** shared the example of a student who she had tried to persuade to delay the decision about pass-fail until later, but who hadn't. She asked if he would be prevented from reversing this decision and would have to suffer the consequences of having decided earlier. Moderator **Deans** confirmed that he believed students could move back and forth in designating pass-fail. Senator **Bedore** called on Erin Mason (Associate Registrar) for clarification. Associate Registrar **Mason** confirmed that students can put classes on, and off, pass-fail, and that in any special circumstances, students would have to go through the advising deans of colleges/schools, who would make their own decisions. Senator **Gordina**

expanded her original question to query if a student who had already chosen pass-fail could take advantage of this extended deadline and commented that a student who had chosen not to receive a letter grade might be ineligible for the requirements of minor they might have satisfied. Associate Registrar **Mason** suggested adding language about the pass-fail decision not being finalized until the deadline.

Senator **Athina** stated that the language “adding or removing” made it clear a student could go back and forth but that the issue of minor requirements was not addressed in the existing language. She asked how exactly students would get permission from advisors. Senator **Bedore** said it was up to the advisor and student, that it could be email or some other means.

Senator **Majumdar** asked for clarification: could a student change their decision multiple times? The answer (from several audible but unidentified voices) was that they could.

Senator **Douglas** asked for another confirmation of the fact that students could switch their decision up until the deadline? Again audible, unidentified voices confirmed yes.

With no further comments, Moderator **Deans** moved to vote on the motion, as proposed, with the modified extension dates.

The motion to extend the deadline to set (or revoke) pass-fail passed: 70 Yes; 7 No; 0 Abstentions

Moderator **Deans** called for any new business early, as the next presentation would cross over the designated time to make that call.

Senator **Majumdar** said that he would bring forward a motion that the University give thanks to Senator Ranjeev Bansal for his many years of service, which was seconded by Senator **Morrell**. Moderator **Deans** stated that the motion would be considered at the end of the meeting under New Business.

6. Report from Senate Faculty Standards Committee by Senator Holle

Motion to endorse recommendation regarding the OVPR’s Administrative Review and Approval of Proposals for External Support Policy

See attached report provided by the Faculty Standards Committee.

The motion was projected on the screen. Senator **Holle** noted that this was a modified version from what had been distributed in advance of the meeting. She shared remarks providing context for the motion. The Faculty Standards Committee (FSC) had met immediately before the Senate meeting and had decided it would be helpful to revise the motion to provide more direction to the recommendation—for example, how to form the workgroup, and a suggested timeline to ensure the group could move forward quickly. The FSC understood that bottleneaking is occurring with research proposal submissions, which impacts faculty, staff, and administrators. Although FSC comprises members of these groups, the committee feels it is important to have even broader representation on the

workgroup, so that what contributes to this bottlenecking can be better understood and so that effective solutions can be proposed that will benefit all stakeholders.

Moderator **Deans** opened debate on the motion.

Senator **Schultz** voiced support for the motion, which he believed would resolve many of the issues that had been expressed by his constituency about the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) and efforts to enforce the existing policy.

Senator **Long** asked whether existing members of the President's Research Advisory Council, along with Sponsored Programs (SPS) staff, would be sufficient to do this work and whether a new group was needed. Senator **Holle** responded that we also needed to consider staff from colleges and schools who also work on the grant submission process yet are not SPS staff. Senator **Long** asked if they would consider, not only staff but existing members of the President's Research Advisory Council. Senator **Holle** confirmed that would be acceptable.

Senator **Vokoun** asked if one of the impediments to the review process was a lack of money and would the group consider staffing and its cost. Senator **Holle** answered that the group would if that was identified by them as an impediment.

Moderator **Deans** reminded the Senate that the discussion was just about the proposed formation of the workgroup, not about their work.

Senator **Vokoun** commented that his concern was that, if money was not clearly stated as an issue, the group would not address it.

With no further comments, Moderator **Deans** called the vote on the motion.

The motion passed: 63 Yes: 3 No; 2 Abstentions

7. [Report on University Athletics – Presented by David Benedict, Director of Athletics](#)

[See attached report provided by the Director of Athletics.](#)

Following the report, Moderator **Deans** invited questions for Director Benedict.

Senator **Long** asked a question with offered context: why do we still have a football team? He referenced a *Sports Illustrated* article noting the misadministration and high cost of football at UConn. He cited state records showing Coach Edsall makes over \$1 million per year and his son over \$100 thousand. He added that his multiple degrees hadn't earned him that much. The football team loses more games than it wins and is expensive, and that although it provides scholarships for young men, it is only men. So why do we have one? Director **Benedict** answered that the University has had a football team for a long time and that there was value in sponsoring a football team, a belief shared by those involved in choosing which sports to eliminate this year. He remarked that he would not speak to the mentioned article, which contained inaccuracies.

Senator **Terni** commented that she was pained to see a proposed reduction in summer school, as both that and winter intersession had made a significant difference to those students. She was disturbed that we would reduce academic support to the most fragile students. Director **Benedict** answered that it was not elimination of summer school, that it would be offered to those who needed those opportunities and support.

Senator **Rubega** asked if he could provide counts of scholarships by gender, amounts awarded by gender. She said she had no sense from the report how much funding goes to support men's sports vs. women's. Director **Benedict** answered that in the number of scholarships, 200 went to men, compared to 216 to women. The split on full vs. partial scholarships was different, but Title IX requires that they keep within a specific percentage difference and that both opportunities and awards were about 50% each to men and women. Senator **Rubega** followed up by asking if there was equivalency in full vs. partial scholarships by gender, that a total dollar amount if more partials, would amount to less support for women. Director **Benedict** answered that all of football had to be on full scholarships, per NCAA requirements for that sport and some others. Some sports allowed either full or partial awards. Basketball scholarships had to be full. Baseball, by comparison, gets 11.7 scholarships, and they can award between 25% and full to individual athletes. A lot was dictated by the NCAA rules. He was happy to share that information but emphasized that we didn't have total control over how we made awards. Senator **Rubega** continued, commenting that, while we might not be able to control the decision to give partial scholarships for all sports, we could decide in practice to award full scholarships or nothing. Director **Benedict** responded that we are trying to build competitive teams, and it would be difficult to offer only 12 scholarships when we needed 40 players. He added that more women's sports have bigger headcounts to offset the male-only football. We based award-giving on how we built teams.

Senator **McCutcheon** said it was good to see the budget mitigation strategies but had a point of information question. Football revenue was shown as \$8 million, but that was over 5 years, so less than \$2 million per year. Director **Benedict** answered that the slides showed new revenue opportunities. Senator **McCutcheon** continued by commenting that the University had best/worst/likely scenarios for pandemic-related shortfalls developed since the end of FY20. Athletics doesn't have a pandemic-related budget scenario that gives any sense of costs and expenses that will result from the pandemic, and whether it will affect the University's athletics subsidy in FY21. Director **Benedict** answered that they were working closely with Scott Jordan (Executive Vice President for Administration and Chief Financial Officer) and that it was a moving target, as they didn't yet know how the pandemic would affect conference distribution. The multimedia rights holder would be impacted, basketball would be impacted. He said the question was a good one, but that they just didn't know how all the revenue streams will be impacted yet. Athletics is mitigating everything they can. Recruitment has been halted until April, saving a lot, as we usually recruit for 24 sports. All travel outside of conferences (or due to weather) will be by bus. But we don't have a complete answer, we don't know how this will impact our conference distribution in the Big East, what the impact will be if we shut down competition again, and we won't know the total impact until the end of the year. Senator **McCutcheon** responded

that with basic assumptions, a best/worst could be created. Director **Benedict** said that Scott Jordan would have those.

Moderator **Deans** noted that there was time for two more questions.

Senator **Jockusch** asked about expenses and budgetary savings and the differential impacts (by gender) on support, travel, and training. Director **Benedict** responded that they had had a Title IX evaluation two years before that measured all of those things and that they identified needed adjustments, which they have started to make. Based on the report, they are in very good shape. Not perfect, and they strive to review and adjust, as seen in facilities enhancements (as shared in the report), which improve things for multiple women's sports. Renovations are also needed for the field house, but the condition of that building affects both men's and women's teams. We are in good shape and continue to make changes and add investments where they need to, and they had brought in a consultant who specializes in Title IX, a reflection of how important this is to Athletics.

Senator **Terni** clarified her earlier comment. She was not concerned that summer school would be eliminated, but that it would be at all diminished, as it supports the core academic mission. The students who will be impacted need it the most. It's an institutional equity issue. Many of these students come from disadvantaged backgrounds and less strong public schools. We need a detailed accounting of proposed cuts, which should be referred to the Senate. Director **Benedict** answered that he would rely on the recommendations of Ellen Tripp, Director of the Student-Athlete Success Program, about summer school. Many of the important academic supports mentioned would not be reduced, but they would make cuts that supported early graduation or double majors, which were not priorities or essential to their mission. He would rely on both Director Tripp and the Provost's Office and would continue to support what was critical, that this was a question of needs vs. wants.

8. New Business

Moderator **Deans** announced that the final votes would be by voice.

He re-introduced the motion put on the table by Senator **Majumdar** (seconded by Senator **Morrell**), namely:

The University wishes to thank Rajeev Bansal for his many years of exemplary service to the University and the Senate.

The vote was called and carried by enthusiastic voiced assent.

Moderator **Deans** asked if someone would make a motion to end the December meeting. Senator **Long** made the motion; it was seconded by Senator **Jakubsin-Konicki**.

The vote was called, and the Senate voiced their assent to adjourn.

Meeting adjourned 5:48 p.m.

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Carol Atkinson-Palombo, Chair
Rajeev Bansal
Nafis Fuad
Andrea Hubbard
Gustavo Nanclares
Eric Schultz

Gary English
Michael Hernandez
Deb Kendall
Angela Rola
Manuela Wagner

These minutes are respectfully submitted by Susanna Cowan, Senate Secretary.

**Senate Executive Committee
Report to the University Senate
December 7, 2020**

Good Afternoon,

The Senate Executive Committee continues has met twice since the last Senate meeting in addition to online discussions as needed.

At the November 2nd meeting, the Scholastic Standards Committee presented a motion on student authentication for online courses and a vote was planned for this meeting. You will note that the item was not included on today's agenda. Student authentication for online courses is a federal mandate and required by our accreditors and should not be included in the University Senate by-laws. The authentication policy was shared with deans and department heads. Questions regarding the policy can be directed to the Provost's Office and CETL. There were several questions posed at the November 2nd Senate meeting that the SSC wanted to provide answers to at this meeting.

Q1. What kind of liability, if any, will faculty face if they fail to accurately authenticate students' identities?

A. As per guidance from the general counsel's office, faculty will not be held liable unless they know a student is an imposter and take no action.

Q2. How do we handle students who have no photo ID in Peoplesoft or who don't look much like their ID photo?

A. Faculty can ask students to show their student ID or government-issued ID if the Student Admin images are missing or unclear.

Q3. What should an instructor do if they suspect a violation?

A. If the instructor suspects academic misconduct, they must fill out a reporting form at Community Standards. If the instructor would like guidance on better carrying out their authentication plan, they should contact CETL for assistance.

The Scholastic Standards Committee has considered many options to offer support to our students during these challenging times. In a joint resolution with the Undergraduate Student Government, a motion to extend the fall 2020 and spring 2021 deadline to elect pass/fail grading will come before you this afternoon. A change to the deadline in opting for course withdrawal was announced by the Provost late last month. Students have until Friday, December 11th to withdraw from one course. The Registrar's Office has reopened the online form to make such a request. Although no extenuating circumstance documentation is required, advisor consent is needed. Requests for more than one withdrawal will require dean-level review.

The SSC has formed an ad hoc group to consider the creation of a new grade that could replace COVID-related W grades on transcripts. The grade, perhaps NRC (No Record-COVID) would indicate to people viewing the transcript in the future that the No Record was recorded during the pandemic. The SSC is investigating actions taken at peers and aspirants in terms of creating this new temporary grade that would be used instead of or in addition to Ws or Fs. If it finds that this is a viable and helpful move here at UConn, it will let the Senate know as early and possible and hopefully present on it at the February meeting.

The Faculty Standards Committee (FSC) has devoted significant time to reviewing the Administrative Review and Approval of Proposals for External Support Policy. This long-standing policy, created 6/12/2008 and revised 6/24/2015, requires all proposal submissions seeking external support for research and other sponsored projects be submitted to the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) Sponsored Program Services (SPS) a minimum of five (5) business days prior to the agency or submission deadline for review and approval of the full proposal, internal forms and budget. The FSC has prepared a report on their findings and will present a motion to recommend the formation of a faculty-staff-OVPR working group to study further the challenges with the expeditious review of proposals in advance of deadlines and propose solutions. The motion, not the policy itself, will be discussed and voted on later in this meeting.

This afternoon it is my great honor to recognize one of the longest-serving members of the University Senate on the occasion of retirement. Rajeev Bansal will retire on January 1st after 39 years of service to the University. The SEC would like to offer a few words regarding this long time Senator and Faculty advocate. Many individuals have served in the Senate and the SEC, with distinction, and offered innumerable hours and nearly unlimited effort to support faculty and shared governance. Some of these people include Bruce Stave, Peter Halvorson, Karla Fox, Cindy Adams, Greg Anderson, David Palmer, and many others now retired who offered leadership, moderated and temperate if at time impassioned discussion informed by intellect and thoughtful insight. In the last 30 years of shared governance, we have had the pleasure of working closely with these folks and know many of them well - but none have served with more distinction or made more important contributions than Rajeev. Hearing of your retirement caused in us a sense of loss, but also a deep respect for your work, your example of tolerance for all, moderation in manner, and the way you always steer us toward firm principles of fairness and academic standards. Thank you, Rajeev. You will be missed.

As has been said often, this was a fall semester like no other. We were challenged in new ways and we rose to those challenges. I do want to mention that the SEC is well aware of the additional challenges being faced by many of our female faculty because of childcare or other family responsibilities. Vice Provost, Michael Bradford, convened a Covid-Focused Work-Life Balance Task Force. This group met last Friday to identify measures that may help relieve some of the pressure being faced by faculty and staff this upcoming semester. Please stay tuned for an announcement before the start of the Spring semester about which of those measures we are able to adopt.

As we head into the semester break, the Senate Executive Committee wishes everyone happy holidays and best wishes for a healthy new year.

Respectfully Submitted,

Carol Atkinson-Palombo, Chair
Senate Executive Committee

University Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
Report to the Senate
December 7, 2020

I. The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommends ADDITION of the following 1000- or 2000-level courses:

- A. ECON 2451/W Economic Behavior and Health Policy (#16266/2119) [W – Approved by GEOC]

Proposed Catalog Copy

ECON 2451. Economic Behavior and Health Policy

3.0 credits

Prerequisites: ECON 1200 or both ECON 1201 and ECON 1202. Not open for credit to students who have passed ECON 3451.

Grading Basis: Graded

Basic principles of health economics, including the demand for health, health behaviors, public-health economics, and behavioral health economics, applied to five topics: smoking, obesity, opioid and other drug addictions, depression, and infectious diseases.

ECON 2451W. Economic Behavior and Health Policy

3.0 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; ECON 1200 or both ECON 1201 and ECON 1202. Not open for credit to students who have passed ECON 3451.

Grading Basis: Graded

Basic principles of health economics, including the demand for health, health behaviors, public-health economics, and behavioral health economics, applied to five topics: smoking, obesity, opioid and other drug addictions, depression, and infectious diseases.

- B. GERM 1920 Cyborgs, Robots, and Androids in the German Imaginary (#2935) [Approved by GEOC for CA1-b and CA4-Int]

Proposed Catalog Copy

GERM 1920. Cyborgs, Robots, and Androids in the German Imaginary

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

An examination of the figure of the nonhuman-human and representations of artificial beings in the German imaginary with a focus on issues of technology, art, philosophy of subjectivity, and culture. Discussion of imaginary and real robots, cyborgs, homunculi, and automata as representations of humanity's understanding of futurity and innovation. Taught in English. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

C. PHIL 1108E Environmental Philosophy (#2694)

Proposed Catalog Copy

PHIL 1108E. Environmental Philosophy

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Philosophical issues raised by humanity's interaction with its environment. Topics may include ethical and policy ramifications of the use of non-human animals for food, medicine, and scientific inquiry; whether the natural world has a status calling for its protection or preservation; obligations to future generations; environmental justice; and movements such as deep ecology, ecofeminism, and social ecology. CA 1.

D. STAT 2255 Statistical Programming (#3474)

Proposed Catalog Copy

STAT 2255. Statistical Programming

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: MATH 1132Q, or instructor consent.

Grading Basis: Graded

Introduction to statistical programming via Python including data types, control flow, object-oriented programming, and graphical user interface-driven applications such as Jupyter notebooks. Emphasis on algorithmic thinking, efficient implementation of different data structures, control and data abstraction, file processing, and data analysis and visualization.

II. The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommends REVISION of the following 1000- or 2000-level courses:

A. ECON 2327/W Information Technology for Economics (#2121) [Add W section – Approved by GEOC]

Current Catalog Copy

ECON 2327. Information Technology for Economics

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ECON 1200 or both ECON 1201 and 1202; STAT 1000Q or 1100Q.

Grading Basis: Graded

The presentation of economic data and testing of economic theory through the use of appropriate computer based tools. Analysis of macroeconomics concepts such as the consumption function, influence of the money supply, budget deficits, and interest rates on macroeconomic equilibrium, and the tradeoff between unemployment and inflation. Analysis of microeconomic concepts such as demand, supply, elasticity, the achievement of equilibrium price and quantity, and analysis of several industries and the stock market. Analysis of historical data such as aggregate and specific price levels, sectoral shifts in the economy, and changes in income distribution.

Revised Catalog Copy

ECON 2327. Information Technology for Economics

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ECON 1200 or both ECON 1201 and 1202; STAT 1000Q or 1100Q.

Grading Basis: Graded

The presentation of economic data and testing of economic theory through the use of appropriate computer based tools. Analysis of macroeconomics concepts such as the consumption function, influence of the money supply, budget deficits, and interest rates on macroeconomic equilibrium, and the tradeoff between unemployment and inflation. Analysis of microeconomic concepts such as demand, supply, elasticity, the achievement of equilibrium price and quantity, and analysis of several industries and the stock market. Analysis of historical data such as aggregate and specific price levels, sectoral shifts in the economy, and changes in income distribution.

ECON 2327W. Information Technology for Economics

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ECON 1200 or both ECON 1201 and 1202; STAT 1000Q or 1100Q; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

The presentation of economic data and testing of economic theory through the use of appropriate computer based tools. Analysis of macroeconomics concepts such as the consumption function, influence of the money supply, budget deficits, and interest rates on macroeconomic equilibrium, and the tradeoff between unemployment and inflation. Analysis of microeconomic concepts such as demand, supply, elasticity, the achievement of equilibrium price and quantity, and analysis of several industries and the stock market. Analysis of historical data such as aggregate and specific price levels, sectoral shifts in the economy, and changes in income distribution.

B. ENGL 1701 Creative Writing I (#3215) [Level change, revise title]

Current Catalog Copy

ENGL 1701. Creative Writing I

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011. Cannot be taken for credit after passing ENGL 3701, 3703, or 3713.

Grading Basis: Graded

First course in creative expression. Covers two or more genres (fiction, poetry, creative nonfiction, and drama). Genres vary by section.

Revised Catalog Copy

ENGL 2701. Introduction to Creative Writing

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011. Cannot be taken for credit after passing ENGL 3701, 3703, or 3713.

Grading Basis: Graded

First course in creative expression. Covers two or more genres (fiction, poetry, creative nonfiction, or drama). Genres vary by section.

C. SOCI 2701 Sustainable Societies (#15716/1998) [Add CA2 – Approved by GEOC]

Current Catalog Copy

SOCI 2701E. Sustainable Societies

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher. Recommended preparation: SOCI 1001, SOCI 2709.

Grading Basis: Graded

Sociological perspectives on the concepts of sustainability, focusing on issues of climate change mitigation and adaptation, including questions of social transitions based on concepts of social justice, biomimicry, permaculture and the future of life on earth.

Revised Catalog Copy

SOCI 2701E. Sustainable Societies

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher. Recommended preparation: SOCI 1001, SOCI 2709.

Grading Basis: Graded

Sociological perspectives on the concepts of sustainability, focusing on issues of climate change mitigation and adaptation, including questions of social transitions based on concepts of social justice, biomimicry, permaculture and the future of life on earth. CA 2.

D. SOCI 2705 Sociology of Food (#15717/1999) [Add CA2 – Approved by GEOC]

Current Catalog Copy

SOCI 2705E. Sociology of Food

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher. Not open for credit to students who have passed SOCI 3271 when offered either as Food or as Sustainability. Recommended preparation: SOCI 1001

Grading Basis: Graded

Social factors shaping the industrial food system, as well as a social analysis of viable alternatives.

Revised Catalog Copy

SOCI 2705E. Sociology of Food

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher. Not open for credit to students who have passed SOCI 3271 when offered either as Food or as Sustainability. Recommended preparation: SOCI 1001

Grading Basis: Graded

Social factors shaping the industrial food system, as well as a social analysis of viable alternatives. CA 2.

E. SOCI 2709W Society and Climate Change (#15715/1997) [Add CA2 – Approved by GEOC]

Current Catalog Copy

SOCI 2709WE. Society and Climate Change

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher; ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 2011. Recommended

Preparation: SOCI 1001. Not open for credit to students who have passed SOCI 3271 when offered as Society and Climate Change.

Grading Basis: Graded

Sociological perspectives on the social, economic, political, and environmental causes and consequences of anthropogenic global climate change.

Revised Catalog Copy

SOCI 2709WE. Society and Climate Change

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher; ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 2011. Recommended

Preparation: SOCI 1001. Not open for credit to students who have passed SOCI 3271 when offered as Society and Climate Change.

Grading Basis: Graded

Sociological perspectives on the social, economic, political, and environmental causes and consequences of anthropogenic global climate change. CA 2.

F. WGSS 2250 Critical Approaches to Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies (#3458) [Revise prereqs]

Current Catalog Copy

WGSS 2250. Critical Approaches to Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Recommended Preparation: Any 1000 level WGSS course.

Grading Basis: Graded

Theories, practice, and methodologies of the Women's, Gender, and Sexualities Studies interdiscipline.

Revised Catalog Copy

WGSS 2250. Critical Approaches to Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Theories, practice, and methodologies of the Women's, Gender, and Sexualities Studies interdiscipline.

G. WGSS 2253. Introduction to Queer Studies (#3023) [Level change, revise title and description]

Current Catalog Copy

WGSS 2253. Introduction to Queer Studies

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Not open to students who have passed WGSS 3995 when offered as "Introduction to Queer Studies."

Grading Basis: Graded

Introduction to the interdisciplinary field of queer studies. Explores a range of issues including how to study queer sexualities in a globalizing world, methodological and theoretical approaches, the role of feminism and social justice activism in Queer Studies, and the integration of transgender studies into the field. Provides an understanding of intersectional approaches to human sexuality and how LGBTQA movements are shaped globally.

Revised Catalog Copy

WGSS 3256. Feminist, Queer, and Trans Theories

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Not open to students who have passed WGSS 3995 when offered as "Introduction to Queer Studies." Recommended Preparation: WGSS 2250

Grading Basis: Graded

Exploration of foundational and current critical theory in feminist, queer, and trans studies. Emphasis on the shared historical development of, transnational and intersectional approaches in, as well as controversies within and between these theoretical perspectives. Among diverse approaches to be considered are major feminist, queer, and trans revisions of critical race, psychoanalytic, Marxist, Foucauldian, indigenous and postcolonial theories.

III. The General Education Oversight Committee and the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommend REVISION of the following 3000- or 4000-level existing courses within or into the General Education curriculum:

A. ANTH/HRTS 3230/W Propaganda, Disinformation, and Hate Speech (#14977/1876) [Adding CA2, W]

Current Catalog Copy

ANTH 3230. Propaganda, Disinformation, and Hate Speech

Also offered as: HRTS 3230

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Not open for credit to students who have passed ANTH 3098 when offered as "Propaganda, Fake News and Hate Speech."

Grading Basis: Graded

Draws on current social science research to understand the effects of false information and hate speech on our politics and culture and to evaluate various private and public initiatives to regulate speech.

HRTS 3230. Propaganda, Disinformation, and Hate Speech

Also offered as: ANTH 3230

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Not open for credit to students who have passed ANTH 3098 when offered as “Propaganda, Fake News and Hate Speech.”

Grading Basis: Graded

Draws on current social science research to understand the effects of false information and hate speech on our politics and culture and to evaluate various private and public initiatives to regulate speech.

Revised Catalog Copy

ANTH 3230. Propaganda, Disinformation, and Hate Speech

Also offered as: HRTS 3230

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Not open for credit to students who have passed ANTH 3098 when offered as “Propaganda, Fake News and Hate Speech.”

Grading Basis: Graded

Draws on current social science research to understand the effects of false information and hate speech on our politics and culture and to evaluate various private and public initiatives to regulate speech. CA 2.

ANTH 3230W. Propaganda, Disinformation, and Hate Speech

Also offered as: HRTS 3230W

3.00 credits

Prerequisite: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Draws on current social science research to understand the effects of false information and hate speech on our politics and culture and to evaluate various private and public initiatives to regulate speech. CA 2.

HRTS 3230. Propaganda, Disinformation, and Hate Speech

Also offered as: ANTH 3230

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Not open for credit to students who have passed ANTH 3098 when offered as “Propaganda, Fake News and Hate Speech.”

Grading Basis: Graded

Draws on current social science research to understand the effects of false information and hate speech on our politics and culture and to evaluate various private and public initiatives to regulate speech. CA 2.

HRTS 3230W. Propaganda, Disinformation, and Hate Speech

Also offered as: ANTH 3230W

3.00 credits

Prerequisite: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Draws on current social science research to understand the effects of false information and hate speech on our politics and culture and to evaluate various private and public initiatives to regulate speech. CA 2.

- B. COMM 4222/W People of Color and Interpersonal Communication (#15846/2047) [Revise number, prereqs]

Current Catalog Copy

COMM 4222. People of Color and Interpersonal Communication

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 1000 and 3200

Grading Basis: Graded

Impact of race, ethnicity, and culture on interpersonal interactions. Surveys key theories and empirical works of past and current race relations in the U.S., negotiation of identity, and ways identity is communicated in various personal relationships.

COMM 4222W. People of Color and Interpersonal Communication

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 1000 and 3200; ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Impact of race, ethnicity, and culture on interpersonal interactions. Surveys key theories and empirical works of past and current race relations in the U.S., negotiation of identity, and ways identity is communicated in various personal relationships.

Revised Catalog Copy

COMM 3222. People of Color and Interpersonal Communication

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 2200.

Grading Basis: Graded

Formerly offered as COMM 4222. Impact of race, ethnicity, and culture on interpersonal interactions. Surveys key theories and empirical works of past and current race relations in the U.S., negotiation of identity, and ways identity is communicated in various personal relationships.

COMM 3222W. People of Color and Interpersonal Communication

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 2200; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Formerly offered as COMM 4222. Impact of race, ethnicity, and culture on interpersonal interactions. Surveys key theories and empirical works of past and current race relations in the

U.S., negotiation of identity, and ways identity is communicated in various personal relationships.

- C. COMM 4410/W Government Communication (#15856/2056) [Revise title, number, prereqs; Add non-W version]

Current Catalog Copy

COMM 4410W. Government Communication

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 1000; ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open to juniors or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

Communication in government processes. Communication theory and practical applications. Issue management, lobbying, interest-group strategies, government relations, grassroots action, and coalition building. Students may not pass this course without passing the written work.

Revised Catalog Copy

COMM 3410. Political Communication

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 2300 or 2500

Grading Basis: Graded

Formerly offered as COMM 4410. Communication in political processes and the role of mass media in American politics. Topics may include campaigning, issue management, lobbying, interest-group strategies, government relations, grassroots action, and coalition building.

COMM 3410W. Political Communication

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 2300 or 2500; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Formerly offered as COMM 4410. Communication in political processes and the role of mass media in American politics. Topics may include campaigning, issue management, lobbying, interest-group strategies, government relations, grassroots action, and coalition building.

- D. COMM 4930W Public Relations Writing (#15844/2045) [Revise number, prereqs]

Current Catalog Copy

COMM 4930W. Public Relations Writing

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 4820; ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open to juniors or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

Philosophy and practice of good, ethical and effective public relations for advanced students. Writing projects such as press releases, media advisories, briefing packets, speech introductions, brochures, newsletters, and op-eds.

Revised Catalog Copy

COMM 4530W. Public Relations Writing

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 3530; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Philosophy and practice of good, ethical and effective public relations for advanced students.

Writing projects such as press releases, media advisories, briefing packets, speech introductions, brochures, newsletters, and op-eds.

- E. HIST 3205/W Personality and Power in the Twentieth Century (#2594) [Revise level, title; Add CA1 and W version]

Current Catalog Copy

HIST 3205. Personality and Power in the Twentieth Century

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Dynamic leadership in historical crises, including, for example, Churchill, Roosevelt, Stalin, Hitler, DeGaulle, Kennedy, and Mao.

Revised Catalog Copy

HIST 2205. Personality and Power in History

3.00 credits

Graded

Prerequisites: None

Analysis of the links between personality and power in various countries and across different eras. CA 1.

HIST 2205W. Personality and Power in History

3.00 credits

Graded

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011

Analysis of the links between personality and power in various countries and across different eras. CA 1.

- F. PHAR 3087W Honors Thesis in Pharmacy[W] (#13865/1688) [Adding PHRX cross-listing]

Current Catalog Copy

PHAR 3087W. Honors Thesis in Pharmacy

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open only to honors students within the School of Pharmacy.

Grading Basis: Honors Credit

Open only to honors students within the School of Pharmacy with consent of the instructor and Associate Dean.

Revised Catalog Copy

PHAR 3097W. Honors Thesis in Pharmacy

3.00 credits

Also offered as: PHRX 3097W

Prerequisites: ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open only to honors students within the School of Pharmacy.

Grading Basis: Honors Credit

Open only to honors students within the School of Pharmacy with consent of the instructor and Associate Dean.

PHRX 3097W. Honors Thesis in Pharmacy

3.00 credits

Also offered as: PHAR 3097W

Prerequisites: ENGL 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open only to honors students within the School of Pharmacy.

Grading Basis: Honors Credit

Open only to honors students within the School of Pharmacy with consent of the instructor and Associate Dean.

G. WGSS 3265W Research Methodology (#3040) [Revise title and description]

Current Catalog Copy

WGSS 3265W. Research Methodology

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: Any 1000-level WGSS course, or HIST 1203; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open only to Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies majors.

Grading Basis: Graded

Analyses of gender bias in research design and practice, problems of androcentric values, and over-generalization in research. Varieties of feminist research methods and their implications for the traditional disciplines. Student projects using different methodologies. Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies majors are strongly urged to take this course as early as possible and before PHIL 3218. SM 11/3/14

Revised Catalog Copy

WGSS 3265W. Producing Intersectional, Interdisciplinary and Transnational WGSS Scholarship
3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: WGSS 2250; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open only to WGSS majors and minors. Grading Basis: Graded

Exploration of the theoretical underpinnings of diverse critical scholarship used by WGSS researchers and the significance of praxis for fostering knowledge production in this

interdisciplinary, intersectional, and transnational field. Explication of the ethical dilemmas faced by feminist, critical race, queer and trans scholars and other critical scholars, activists, artists, and policy makers. Experiential opportunities in designing and producing WGSS scholarship.

IV. The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommends REVISION of the following 3000- or 4000-level S/U Graded Courses:

- A. GEOG 4090 Internship in Geography: Field Study (#14088/1733) [Revise restrictions and repeatability]

Current Catalog Copy

GEOG 4090. Internship in Geography: Field Study

1.00 - 3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Must be taken with GEOG 4091; open to juniors or higher

Grading Basis: Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory

A fieldwork internship program under the direction and supervision of the geography staff. Students will be placed in agencies or industries where their academic training will be applied. One 8-hour work day per week (or its equivalent) for the host agency during the course of the semester will be necessary for 3 academic credits. Students taking this course will be assigned a final grade of S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory.) May not be repeated for credit. Hours by arrangement with hosting agency, not to exceed 16 hours per week.

Revised Catalog Copy

GEOG 4090. Internship in Geography: Field Study

1.00 - 3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: Must be taken with at least one credit of GEOG 4091 if more than one internship credit is requested in a semester; open to sophomores or higher. May be repeated to a maximum of fifteen credits. Only six credits of internship (between GEOG 4090 and 4091) may count towards the GEOG or GIS major. Instructor consent required.

Grading Basis: Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory

A fieldwork internship program under the direction and supervision of the geography staff. Students will be placed in agencies or industries where their academic training will be applied. One 8-hour work day per week (or its equivalent) for the host agency during the course of the semester will be necessary for 3 academic credits. Students taking this course will be assigned a final grade of S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory.) Hours by arrangement with hosting agency, not to exceed 16 hours per week.

V. The General Education Oversight Committee and Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommend approval the following courses for offering in intensive session format:

- A. ART 3375 Indian Art and Popular Culture [CA1, CA4-Int]
B. EPSY 2450 Whole Child, School, and Community: Linking Health and Education [CA2]

C. NRE 2215E Introduction to Water Resources [EL]

D. POLS 3240E Environmental and Climate Justice [CA2, EL]

Respectfully Submitted by the 20-21 Senate Curricula and Courses Committee: Eric Schultz (Chair), Kate Fuller, Manuela Wagner (Ex-Officio), Alana Adams, Mark Brand, John Chandy, Marc Hatfield, Benjamin Keilty (Student Rep), Matt McKenzie, George Michna, David Ouimette, Sharyn Rusch, Lauren Schlesselman (Ex-Officio), Irene Soteriou (Student Rep), Steve Stifano, Gina Stuart, Julia Yakovich, Terra Zuidema

From the 11/2/20 and 11/16/20 meetings.

Temporary University Senate By-Law Revision
For AY 2020-2021
Approved on December 7, 2020 (70/7/0)

Senate By-Law II.E.3.b, Pass Fail Grading

A student may elect a maximum of 12 credits (not including Spring 2020) to be distributed over not more than three courses, to be recorded as 'P' for Pass or 'F' for Fail on his or her permanent record. Courses taken on Pass-Fail may only be used as electives; they may not be used to satisfy general education, school/college, major or minor requirements. Students who are adding a course to or removing a course from the Pass-Fail option must obtain advisor consent and submit the request by 11:59 pm on December 28, 2020 for the Fall 2020 semester and by 11:59 pm on May 14, 2021 for the Spring semester. During the semester, the student completes the course and is graded in the usual way by the instructor; and the instructor submits a letter grade (per 3a, above). This letter grade is translated into a 'P' ('D-' or above) or remains an 'F.' In neither event will a course taken under the Pass-Fail option be included in the computation of the semester or cumulative grade point average, but a grade below 'C' makes the student ineligible for Dean's List. The individual schools and colleges have the privilege of adopting the Pass-Fail option with or without supplementary restrictions. Students are referred to the detailed statements of the various schools in the University Catalog for such restrictions.

University Senate Faculty Standards Committee
Report to the University Senate
December 7, 2020

Background

The Administrative Review and Approval of Proposals for External Support Policy is a long-standing policy, originally created 6/12/2008 and revised 6/24/2015, that requires all proposal submissions seeking external support for research and other sponsored projects be submitted to the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) Sponsored Program Services (SPS) within a minimum of five (5) business days prior to the agency or submission deadline for review and approval of the full proposal, internal forms and budget. One of the main challenges for both investigators and SPS support staff is the bottleneck that occurs immediately prior to proposal submission. Nearly two-thirds of all proposals submitted in recent years are received by SPS (with all components ready) within 1 working day or less of the sponsor deadline. As a result, numerous proposals are just barely getting submitted on time and proposals that have been submitted to SPS far in advance may not get a timely and thorough review because other proposals with an earlier deadline came in late. This situation creates unnecessary stress on investigators, local research administrators, and SPS staff, and cannot be addressed by adjusting staffing levels alone. Thus, OVPR is taking initiatives to remedy the submission bottleneck. One of them is to implement an enforcement of their existing policy, clarifying the items that are required to be submitted within 5 business days of submission deadline in an effort to allow more timely review for all faculty, many of whom submit their proposals ahead of the deadline, but are not able to receive a timely review because are backlogged to attend to those who submit late.

The Senate Executive Committee asked the Faculty Standards Committee to review and discuss the proposed policy enforcement, which was originally slated to begin September 2020. However, it was delayed due to the OVPR/SPS's willingness to work with the Faculty Standards Committee and Senate Executive Committee to review and provide feedback on the revision to the existing policy.

Current Policy:

Administrative Review and Approval of Proposals for External Support (Found at: <https://policy.uconn.edu/2011/05/26/administrative-review-and-approval-of-proposals-for-external-support/>)

REASON FOR POLICY

The timely submission of proposals for internal UConn review and approval allows for thoughtful consideration and review of sponsored project proposals for compliance with University, Federal, State and sponsor policies. Additionally, Sponsored Program Services professionals review proposals against the administrative requirements of the sponsor's announcement, including budgets and budget justifications to identify potential administrative or financial challenges to the success of the proposal.

POLICY

All proposal submissions seeking external support for research and other sponsored projects must be submitted to the Office of the Vice President for Research (OVPR) Sponsored Program Services (SPS) for review and approval prior to submission to an external sponsor, even when institutional sign-off is not required by the sponsor.

All letters-of-intent and pre-proposal submissions seeking external support for research and other sponsored projects must be submitted to Sponsored Program Services for review and approval prior to submission to an external sponsor if the signature of an authorized official, a detailed budget, or cost share commitment is required.

Proposals submitted without SPS approval may be administratively withdrawn or the offer of funding (award) may not be accepted if the submission is found to be non-compliant with University, Federal, State or sponsor policies.

SPS requests a minimum of five (5) business days prior to the agency or submission deadline for review and approval of the full proposal, internal forms and budget.

The University of Connecticut reserves the right to withdraw any proposal or refuse acceptance of any award that does not comply with this policy.

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The Executive Director of Sponsored Programs and Faculty Services has overall responsibility for this policy. The Principal Investigator accepts the responsibility for the timely submission of all proposals and pre-proposals that require SPS approval to SPS. The Department Head, Center Director and/or Dean attests to the academic purposes of the proposed project and its appropriateness in terms of budget, committed effort, space and equipment. The Executive Director of Sponsored Programs and Faculty Services is the authorized signatory for all proposals for sponsored programs. In the absence of the designated official, arrangements are made to ensure timely signing by alternate University signatories. Principal Investigators, Department Heads, Deans and other individuals as required are responsible for authorizing and signing internal processing documents, but are not authorized to sign a sponsored projects proposal as the institutional official on behalf of the University.

PROCEDURE/FORMS

See OVPR SPS website: [Proposal Preparation Guidelines](#)

ENFORCEMENT

Violations of this policy may result in appropriate disciplinary measures in accordance with University Laws and By-Laws, General Rules of Conduct for All University Employees, applicable collective bargaining agreements, and the University of Connecticut Student Code.

POLICY HISTORY

Policy created: 6/12/2008

Revised: 6/24/2015 (approved by the Vice President for Research)

Summary of Original Proposed Process Changes

Although guidance on internal deadlines was issued in the OVPR Town Hall, as well as in OVPR updates in March and April, along with FAQs, this guidance has not resulted in a change in last-minute proposal submissions.

Beginning X/X/XXXX

SPS will begin enforcing internal deadlines for proposals. All proposals must be submitted to SPS 5 business days before the deadline day. *Proposals that are not received five business days prior to the deadline day, or which are not complete, will not be reviewed or submitted.* Five business days does not include the deadline day or holidays when the SPS office is closed.

As a key service, Principal Investigators and Department Administrators will receive a full review from Pre-Award within three business days. Additionally, SPS will commit to a one-week turnaround on all proposals that do not have a hard deadline.

Due to SPS 5 Business DAYS Prior to the Day of Submission

- IPR (signed)
- Final Budget
- Final Budget Justification
- Solicitation/Guidelines (if there is no solicitation, please indicate this)
- Complete Proposal with all documents included/uploaded
 - narrative documents including abstract, project description and references cited may all be in draft form
- Other internal forms, completed and fully approved (cost sharing, PI Eligibility, etc.), if applicable
- Subrecipient documents, if applicable

SPS Pre-Award will complete their review of proposals received within 3 business days and will submit proposals without hard deadlines within 5 business days following the same process.

Faculty Standards Discussion

Initial Discussion

The Faculty Standards Committee reviewed the proposed internal deadline for grant proposals and related FAQs and correspondence received from the SEC and OVPR. The committee expressed an understanding of the issues OVPR is facing, including the stress and pressure put on SPS staff, significant delays in review for those investigators submitting in advance of the deadlines, and the potential for a reduction in the quality of rushed reviews. The faculty investigators were also interested in an efficient, expeditious, and high-quality review process but do have several concerns about this proposed enforcement policy. The concerns ranged from potential loss of funding opportunities to lack of clarity around what should be submitted when, and concern that in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic, faculty are not only adapting their teaching and research programs, but may be doing so in a less than ideal environment because of family situations also dealing with pandemic (eg, childcare, homeschool children, home-work environments). This in particular may have a significant impact on pre-tenure faculty and other underrepresented groups; committee recommends this should be considered.

However, since not all stakeholders involved in the grant proposal submission process had been engaged in reviewing the proposal for enforcement of the internal deadline for grant proposals, we believed more discussion was warranted before imposing this policy. We requested input from tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty at all levels with relevant grant experience as well as grant support staff at the College/School levels, Deans of Colleges/Schools, and staff within SPS to ensure that an efficient and expeditious process that supports all staff and faculty in the submission of high quality grants was identified. We realized OVPR wanted to initiate this policy more quickly, but felt it warranted more discussion and invited OVPR/SPS staff to discuss further

FSC Committee Discussion with Michael Glasgow, Jr.; Associate VP for Research Sponsored Program Services:

Mike Glasgow, Jr. shared some of the efforts of SPS to improve the efficiency and quality of proposal review/submission including 1) recruitment and hiring of staff to assist with grant writing; 2) further training of SPS and college/school level grant support staff for efficiency and appropriateness of grant

review as well as new staff orientation that will be lengthy (6 mo+); 3) new faculty orientation and guidance about the SPS and grant writing process; 4) clear role/responsibilities delineation of local grant staff; 5) roll-out of software that will allow investigators to see where the grant submission is within review process and communication with all involved in grant submission; and 6) implementation date will occur January 1, 2021 with a Town Hall for further discussion amongst stakeholders Fall 2020.

Committee members asked for clarification on following and discussion ensued as such:

- Data on when submissions are received from colleges/schools vs when SPS reviews/submits and data on when college/school grant review and SPS review have discordant recommendations. Mike Glasgow, Jr stated he has data but not with him for this discussion
- Implementation process – seems as this could be tricky if in a situation where no pass is available and investigator is unable to submit – that means a potential financial and research credibility loss for the investigator and university. Will the university be willing to do this in the end? After first year, the passes used will be reviewed and the process evaluated for further description for 2022.
 - Exceptions to the research deadline enforcement include
 - Late-breaking grant submission deadlines
 - Rapid awards
 - Multi-institution awards
- Fairness if there is a technical glitch or the investigator submits early but because of backlog it puts unfair stress/potential for errors on the investigator's part as they don't have clear expectations when it will be returned from SPS for revisions. This might lead to investigators "not working at their best" especially during pandemic
- UConn Health subawards/shared grant contract improvement – Mike Glasgow Jr indicated liaisons at each site (UConn-Storrs and UConn Health) who can facilitate subawards/grant review process; an affiliation agreement is underway to allow collaborations without typical subaward process

Summary

The FSC emphasizes the need to have this be a collaborative and not punitive effort that continues to work toward the goal of a highly successful research I university that can strive to meet President Katsouleas's goal of doubling research. Additionally that given pandemic, we all understand the tremendous pressures/stressors that are not typical and that this should be considered when issuing this policy.

Motion:

The Faculty Standards Committee moves that the University Senate endorse the following recommendation.

The Faculty Standards Committee recommends the formation of a faculty-staff-OVPR working group, formed and charged by the President, to identify impediments to the expeditious review of proposals in advance of deadlines and propose solutions, to be presented to the University Senate and the OVPR, that enable all parties to work together effectively to support the University's pre-award operations. A report including the proposed solution will be presented to the University Senate at the March 2021 meeting. The FSC requests no changes in enforcement of the policy until the working group recommendations have been reviewed and evaluated.



Division of Athletics

December 2020 Senate Meeting

David Benedict

UConn

Academic Excellence & Community Outreach

3.25 Average GPA among UConn's 650 SA's

18 Teams have over an average 3.00 semester and cumulative GPA

1,400 Hours of community service work (18-19)

Note – The Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness calculates data for us to report.

Academic Progress Rate (APR)

- 5** Teams awarded the NCAA's Public Recognition Award
 - Signifying Top 10 status in Academic Progress Rate
- 985** Athletics overall Academic Progress Rate
- 12** Teams scored a perfect APR in 2018-19

Latest APR scores that have been released are for the 2018-19 academic year

Student-Athletes

Total Number of SA's: **609**

Total Men: **306**

Scholarship: **210**

Non-Scholarship: **96**

Total Women: **303**

Scholarship: **216**

Non-Scholarship: **87**

Athletics Budget Snapshot

Category	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21 PreCovid
Revenue				
University Support	\$ 30,360,423	\$ 33,516,078	\$ 37,740,559	\$ 32,485,032
GUF	\$ 8,529,029	\$ 8,784,900	\$ 6,534,945	\$ 6,534,945
Total University Support	\$38,889,452	\$42,300,978	\$44,275,504	\$ 39,019,977
Total Revenue	\$79,156,863	\$78,303,247	\$74,399,127	\$ 71,582,498
Expenses				
Operating	\$ 28,819,446	\$ 28,440,096	\$ 24,220,292	\$ 23,503,123
Payroll	\$ 32,742,568	\$ 32,061,093	\$ 32,873,800	\$ 33,936,903
Scholarship	\$ 16,926,762	\$ 17,715,831	\$ 17,380,002	\$ 14,142,472
Total Expenses	\$78,488,776	\$78,217,020	\$74,474,094	\$ 71,582,498

Athletics Fundraising Summary

Year	Total Amount Raised	Total Donors
FY17	\$8 MM	4658
FY18	\$10.3 MM	4990
FY19	\$14.3 MM	4936
FY20	\$26.4 MM	4343

*Athletics has closed 13 \$1MM gifts in the past 3 years. 28 total in history.

Total Revenue Opportunities

Source of Revenue	Amount of Revenue
Football Guarantee Games	\$8.05 Million over 5 Years (FY22-FY26)
Increased MBB Revenue	\$1 Million
Football TV Contract (CBS)	\$500K Annually

Total Revenue Opportunities Exceed: \$9 Million

2020-2021 BB Season Ticket Holder Update

Convert to Philanthropic Gift:	\$1,431,143
Apply to 21-22 Season:	\$1,257,740

Request	# of Accounts	# of Accounts (% of Total)	Philanthropic Gift (\$)		Apply to 21-22 (\$)		Refund (\$)	
			Seat Donation (\$)	Ticket (\$)	Seat Donation (\$)	Ticket (\$)	Seat Donation (\$)	Ticket (\$)
Philanthropic Gift	292	15.84%	\$406,500	\$404,852				
Donate & Apply Balance to 21-22 Season	948	51.41%	\$343,487		\$217,337	\$985,038		
Donate & Receive Refund of Balance	444	24.08%	\$123,912				\$98,037	\$475,316
Apply Purchase to 21-22 Season	3	0.16%			\$50	\$949		
Full Refund	94	5.10%					\$64,225	\$148,736
Special Arrangement	63	3.42%	\$110,237	\$42,153	\$9,200	\$45,166	\$57,937	\$78,909
Grand Total	1,844	100.00%	\$984,137	\$447,005	\$226,587	\$1,031,153	\$220,200	\$702,961

Expense Reduction Opportunities

- Reduction of 4 Sports: 124 student-athletes impacted
- Reduction of 6 full-time equivalencies
- Reduction in summer school
- Reduction in scholarship expenses
- Travel Reductions: Recruiting, Scheduling, Travel Rosters, Non-essential Travel
- Sport Operating Expense Reductions

Total Annual Expenses Reduced by FY23: \$10MM

UConn

Student – Athletes Impacted

- All scholarship commitments will be honored through undergraduate graduation.
- Teams will be able to compete in 2020-2021.
- Fully support and assist student-athletes interested in the transfer process.
- Continued access to all student-athlete support services

Near Completion of Stadia Project



UCONN