

**Regular Meeting of the State of CT
Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents for Higher Education
Agenda: June 12, 2020, Online**

Agenda for the meeting:

1. Approval of minutes of last meeting (attachment)
2. Reports from Chair (attachment) and Vice-Chair, FAC
3. Issue related to FAC Comments and Reports at Board meetings
4. BOR First SF Progress Report to NECHE
5. College and Career Success Course issues
6. Additional Responsibilities Credit for Fall Online and Remote Learning Preparation
7. Campus return policies (our ideas: CCs and CSUs)
8. Other business
9. Next meeting and Adjournment

-- Do not delete or change any of the following text. --

Join meeting in my Webex Personal Room

Meeting number (access code): 646 745 357

[Join meeting](#)

Join by phone

Tap to call in from a mobile device (attendees only)

[1-650-479-3208](tel:1-650-479-3208) Call-in toll number (US/Canada)

[1-877-668-4493](tel:1-877-668-4493) Call-in toll-free number (US/Canada)

Access code: 646 745 357

[Global call-in numbers](#) | [Toll-free calling restrictions](#)

Join from a video conferencing system or application

Dial blitz@ccsu.webex.com

You can also dial 173.243.2.68 and enter your meeting number.

If you are the host, you can also enter your host PIN in your video conferencing system or application to start the meeting.

Need help? Go to <http://help.webex.com>

Criticism, Conclusion and Proposals on Students First
David Blitz, Chair, Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents

Failure of Transform 2020.....	1
System or Federation?	1
Students First	2
System Office Staffing	3
Curriculum Development	5
Multiplication of Levels of Administration	6
The Diminished role of Faculty.....	8
Conclusions and Prospects.....	9

We continue to face a crisis over Students First, involving serious differences between faculty, especially at the community colleges ,and the Board of Regents. A source of the problem is that the Board of Regents never was what it was supposed to be when it was planned in 2010: a coordinating body for all of public higher education in the state. Once UConn removed itself, that left the community colleges, Charter Oak, and the four Connecticut State Universities (along with the Dept. of Higher Ed. which was subsequently removed, and then made into a vestigial Office). What remained was talk of a “merged” system with no consistent respecting of the distinct missions of the remaining three component parts, or due respect for the autonomy and integrity of the constituent institutions, which have longer histories than the CSCU and real local and regional community links.

Failure of Transform 2020

With the merging of the community colleges, state universities and Charter Oak under one Board the goal became creation of a system where in fact none existed, with the first failed effort being Transform 2020. The plan for the project, for which up to \$20 million had been allocated, was outsourced to the Boston Consulting Group (BCG), a group with no previous experience or knowledge of public higher education in Connecticut. At a cost of more than \$1.9 million the BCG produced a total of 36 “Road Maps”, incorporating 743 “Milestones”, most of which were imaginary without any consultation with faculty and staff at the campuses. At least 12 of the constituent units of CSCU) voted non-confidence. The plan was scrapped but the following remnant of the project remains on the CSCU website as “Transform CSCU 2020, with as headline the statement (in part): “... uniting the 17 CSCU institutions as one interdependent system”. This continues to be the underlying principle of Students First, and raises an issue usually ignored: what is a system, and is or should CSCU be a system in the sense that its constituent units already are?

System or Federation?

How to make the 17 institutions into “one interdependent system” has never been made clear other than through heavy handed consolidation (of community colleges, “back offices” of universities), and really can’t be made clear in a reasonable way. Here are elements of three distinct missions: (1) the role of a community college in accepting all applicants and providing both vocational training and preparation for university admission; (2) the role of a university in offering both undergraduate and graduate degrees; (3) and the role of Charter Oak in helping

returning students combine credits earned elsewhere to achieve an undergraduate degree. These are significant differences, along with other distinctions related to differences in how each type of institution conducts research and outreach.

The concept of a “system” is not defined other than through the vague term “interdependent” often repeated, little analysed. Typically, a system is composed of parts which *strongly* interact, such that each part is *essential* to the whole; and in the case of social or technological systems have as a *goal* some specific behavior(s) or outcome(s). In that sense a university such as CCSU is a system: the various departments and schools provide programs (majors, minors, general education, graduate education) so that students can complete a degree (the desired goal), along with contributions to knowledge through faculty and student-faculty research, and serving the needs of the wider community (through social, political and economic outreach and engagement). A community college is also a system, one which allows students to graduate with Associate Degrees, albeit in a more limited number of academic fields than a university (depending on the size of the college and its offerings), though often with more job specific outcomes (direct links to businesses).

CSCU is not a system in that sense, nor can it be: it has a Board and “System” Office but no students, no faculty and offers no degrees or certificates, though the Board approves those offered by constituent institutions such as the CSU universities, Charter Oak, and the community colleges. Each constituent institution is itself a system, though differing in size and the extent to which each offers specific programs. At most (and at best) they form a federation, with a single umbrella funding and supervising agency (the BOR). A positive relationship between and among the constituent units should involve reasonable sharing of resources and exchange of best practices, but on the basis of mutual agreement, not enforced decree from a central office.

Students First

Students First Plan filled the vacuum, as it were, once Transform 2020 had been abandoned. There remained important problems to be solved in public higher education, of which the most important were obstacles to transferring credits from community colleges to state universities (one of the motivations, along with cost savings, for the original merger), and the fiscal health of the community colleges, or at least some of them. The former is a very real and important problem, for which Transfer Articulation Plans (TAPs) were developed for most, but not all majors. This was done largely by faculty committees largely independent of System Office staff), though publishing the many PDF documents for the various pathways and majors by college and university has been done centrally (a technical task). Work on transfer articulation began before Students First and is independent of it; it remains to be fully implemented.

Part of Students First essential goals was to save money by consolidation of “back office” functions of the universities, in addition to the consolidation (merger) of the 12 community colleges into a single institution. Over a previous summer a series of planning teams examined facilities management, financial aid, fiscal affairs, human resources, information technology, and institutional research. The expected tens of millions in savings (originally stated as \$48 million) were not found. Moreover, by including the university “back offices” the scope of

Students First was extended beyond the community colleges to the four universities. Though this aspect remains secondary, it had the further consequence of mobilizing university faculty opposition to Students First, as what were termed “back office” or “non-student facing” personnel to be “consolidated” are as far as we are concerned essential support staff, needed for local help. This aspect of the project has not been discontinued, and some elements continue in the background.

That left the merger of the community colleges as the heart of Students First. The original argument for the proposed merger was the precarious and even failing financial viability of at least some of the colleges. This was largely based on spreadsheet projections that college reserve funds would be expended by the mid 2020s, presumably due to a combination of increased costs and reduced enrollment. The formula used to calculate this dismal future was not made public, and I personally do not know which college was fiscally healthy and which in the red at the time of the spreadsheet prediction. But the net result of the planning for the one community college has been a considerable increase (+47% compared to 2017) in the 2020 budget for CCC component of the System Office – to \$36.9 million dollars, more than the 4 smallest community college budgets (MXCC = 24.7, ACC = 22.7, QVCC = 16.9 , NWCC = 16.4). To the contrary, consolidating the community colleges through Students First has increased costs:

	Total Expenditures FY 2020 in thousands	Total Expenditures FY 2017 in thousands	Difference 2020-2017 in thousands	Percentage change since 2017	Fringe cost FY 2020 in thousands	Fringe cost FY 2017 in thousands	Total exp. Less fringe FY 2020	Total exp. Less fringe FY 2017	Diff in exp. 2020-2017 less fringe	Percent change since 2017
ACC	22,725	19,326	3,399	17.6	8,155	6,362	14,570	12,964	1,606	12.4
CCC	38,286	32,686	5,600	17.1	13,932	10,181	24,354	22,505	1,849	8.2
GCC	62,270	60,517	1,753	2.9	20,843	18,383	41,427	42,134	-707	-1.7
HCC	45,827	41,524	4,303	10.4	14,930	11,800	30,897	29,724	1,173	3.9
MCC	55,821	55,028	793	1.4	21,094	18,315	34,727	36,713	-1,986	-5.4
MXCC	24,748	24,472	276	1.1	7,527	7,249	17,221	17,223	-2	0.0
NVCC	62,214	58,656	3,558	6.1	22,981	19,910	39,233	38,746	487	1.3
NWCC	16,414	16,240	174	1.1	6,372	5,541	10,042	10,699	-657	-6.1
NCC	51,430	49,151	2,279	4.6	16,201	14,310	35,229	34,841	388	1.1
QVCC	16,913	16,695	218	1.3	5,807	5,151	11,106	11,544	-438	-3.8
TRCC	38,082	33,478	4,604	13.8	13,297	10,554	24,785	22,924	1,861	8.1
TXCC	38,041	34,719	3,322	9.6	14,079	11,541	23,962	23,178	784	3.4
CCC System Office	36,958	24,749	12,209	49.3	9,182	5,792	27,776	18,957	8,819	46.5

Source: Finance Committee report

System Office Staffing

In part this is the issue of the size of the System Office, which has oscillated around 145 for the past three years. It is currently at 148, an increase of 3 from the preceding year; the largest number being in Information Technology: 59; Finance:22, and Academic Affairs: 16. The number of staff currently at the System Office is lower than when it was first established in 2011, as the system office originally listed Charts a Course staff (an elementary education program) and the Board of Higher Education (now Office), both of which were never or are no longer part of the CSCU system. In part there is the matter of consulting contracts, such as the one for the four Blackboard consultants for the online program working group (amount of contract not known). Overall costs have not decreased, but increased, and significantly so.

Area	Number in 2019	Number in 2020	Note
Academic Affairs	13	16	Increase of 3; Includes a Vice President for Community Colleges and one for State Universities who are paid salary bonuses above their campus President salaries; two faculty (one CC, one CSU) as transfer articulation managers; a full time Provost for Academic Affairs, plus Associate Provosts
Board Affairs	1	2	Secretary to Board, Administrative Assistant
Facilities	9	9	All CSU campuses have their own facility management teams
Finance	22	22	Second largest department
Financial Aid	1	3	Smallest unit, along with the next one
Government Relations	1	1	Smallest unit, along with Innovation and Outreach
Human Resources	8	9	Increase of 1
Information Technology	67	59	Has decreased by 8, still largest group, more than at the largest university in the system,
Innovation and Outreach	1	1	Smallest unit, along with Government Relations
Legal Affairs	6	6	Unchanged
Nursing	2	2	Unchanged, function not explicitly stated
President's Office	3	7	Includes the President and his Chief of staff, and an Associate for Board Affairs, plus Presidential Fellow, 3 Regional Presidents
Marketing and Public Affairs	4	3	Previously, with one more staff, just Public Affairs
Research and System Effectiveness	4	5	Plus one
Student/Academic Information Systems	3	3	Could be included in Information Technology area.
Total	145	148	Net increase of 3 since last count. Number has oscillated from 140 – 150 since inception of the Board

Source : CSCU Directories, at <http://www.ct.edu/directory>

The System Office does provide some services, in particular to the smaller community colleges (eg: email servers, internet security), though its services to the universities, in particular the larger ones, is significantly less. Yet the System Office budget, averaging about \$35 million a year just for the community college portion of its budget, and well over \$40 million including the university component of the budget, has cost over 1/3 of a billion dollars since the inception of the BOR. In comparison, the four campus CSU system office, in the early 1990s before it moved to Woodland St had about a dozen staff (including the then President, later renamed Chancellor) ; after the move, it ballooned to over 60, still serving the same 4 universities with about the same (and occasionally lower) enrollments. With the fusion of the CSU and community/technical college offices, the system office more than doubled to the current 145+ staff. Considerable savings could be made without merging the community colleges by even a 1/3 reduction in its size – for example, through transfers to constituent units and retirements.

The current budget proposal for 2020-21 by the Board indicates that the part of the System Office budget charged to the university sector will be \$12.7 million (including fringes), while

that to the community colleges is \$41.4 million, with \$38.6 million for the (currently non-existent) CSCC and \$2.8 million remaining for the non-CSCC part of the community colleges (CCC). This works out to a total of \$54.1 million dollars with 23.5% at the university level, and 76.5% at the community college levels (not including Charter Oak). Thus over 90% of the budget for the central personnel related to the community colleges is being transferred to the budget of the (currently non-existent) CSCC (“one” college).

Curriculum Development

One academic argument for the consolidation is the need for the “alignment” (uniformization) of programs. This meant the creation of various work groups and higher level committees by the System Office to align specific disciplinary programs and create a common general education core. This means reorganizing many hundreds of programs in a short time span, when the programs are already functional in their current format. An additional problem that arose was due to the participation of System Office staff who pushed their own agenda, more often than not in opposition to or disregarding of faculty input. This was complicated by a “dual power” situation, with the working groups and related committees bypassing or supplanting existing college structures of shared governance, particularly as concerns curriculum. The net result has been the recent movement for college senates to recall faculty from these groups. With the more experienced faculty removed, the working groups now have to rely on part time and junior faculty who need the minor stipend now being offered.

The case of the recently Board approved general education core is illustrative of the problem. 9 of 12 colleges refused to participate, considering that the process was illegitimate; 2 voted in favor (one of which had previously voted no confidence in Students First) and one voted in opposition. The matter was presented to the Board as if a majority had voted in favor (2 – 1)! even though the resolutions opposing the whole process by 9 others were included in the agenda package for the Board meeting. The disrespect for the majority (in fact 10 of 12 or more than 80%) of the colleges sent a clear negative message. To this must be added that the approved core included reference to a diversity requirement for which no course currently exists or is proposed, and did not include learning objectives for the various disciplinary areas, as required by accreditors.

There are real and pressing problems at the level of the community colleges – which also exist at the universities in somewhat modified form: (1) low rates of graduation (3 year figures for community colleges, 6 year figures for universities); and (2) the achievement gap affecting reduced enrollment and graduation rates for minority students. The response of the consolidation leadership has been to simply claim that consolidation and alignment will somehow accomplish these ends. Reading the many pages of documentation for Students First one finds no analysis of these problems or specific proposals to deal with them, other than administrative positions to be filled, or general statements about aligned courses, such as a diversity course or a college success course to be included in the general education core, for which no details as to learning goals or content is provided. To the external observer, the claims that consolidation will increase the percentage of graduates and reduce the achievement gap appear to be no more than ad-hoc justifications for a plan which really does not address those issues.

Multiplication of Levels of Administration

Further objections to Students First include: the multiplication of levels of administration, further increase in costs, the centralization of essential local functions, the elimination of department chairs, and the view of faculty as mere appendages to the “system”. With the naming of regional presidents and an interim one college (CSCC) president and Vice Presidents, and the downgrading of all but one of college president to CEOs (with unclear differences of function), there are now four levels of higher administration at the college level: Campus CEO → Regional President → CSCC President → CSCU President. Presumably, the two new intermediary levels will have their support staff, further increasing the bureaucracy and costs. The recent appointment of an interim president, provost and vice-presidents of the still non-existent CSCC, will add at least \$1 million per year to the costs of the “system”, however qualified the individuals may be – and I note that both the interim president and interim provost have experience and expertise as community college presidents.

The recently published organization chart for the proposed CSCC has pushed opposition to the plan to new heights and I think to a tipping point even among faculty not actively in opposition. The multipage, multicolored charts indicate seriously flawed planning, characteristic of over-centralization and bureaucracy. What is proposed is a Grand total of 181 administrative positions: Presidents, Provost, VPs, Associate VPs, Chief Officers, Deans, Associate Deans, Directors, Associate Directors or equivalents by level of line reporting. Adding in supervisors, advisors, and other non-teaching staff drives the number of “overhead” personnel well above 200. [See charts at <https://www.ct.edu/sf/org> for a more detailed breakdown of the charts; numbers below subject to correction as the blizzard of charts contain some duplications hopefully not double counted in this table]:

CSCU Top Level

Page	Reports to	Office	Number	Reporting Officers
1	BOR	CSCU President. - Ojakian	12	5 CSU Presidents, 1 Charter Oak, 4 Chief Officers, 1 Provost, 1 President CSCC

Note: Individuals at this level are not included in the 181 figure.

CSCC Top Levels

Page	Reports to	Office	Number	Reporting Officers
1	CSCU President	CSCC President - Levinson	7	1 Chief of staff, 3 Vice Presidents, 3 Regional Presidents
1	CSCC President	VP Finance and Administration/CFO - Kelley	5	Directors, Comptroller, Chief of Police
1	CSCC President	VP/Provost/CAO - Rooke	7	6 Associate VPs, 1 Title IX coordinator
1	CSCC President	VP Enrollment Management and Student Affairs - Buckley	6	5 Associate VPs; 1 Executive Director
1	CSCC President	3 Regional Presidents	18	12 CEOs, 6 Regional Chief Officers (Workforce, Fiscal)
	Sub- Total President, VPs and Regional CEOs		43	
2	VP/Provost/CAO	Associate VP Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment	3	3 Regional Directors
3	VP/Provost/CAO	Associate VP Academic Programs and Curriculum	23	6 College Deans (Areas of Study), 17 College Associate Deans (Programs of Study)

Page	Reports to	Office	Number	Reporting Officers
4	VP/Provost/CAO	Associate VP Quality Assurance and Strategic Planning	3	Directors
5	VP/Provost/CAO	Associate VP for Course Delivery, Scheduling and Catalog	5	Directors or equivalent
6	VP/Provost/CAO	Associate VP for Higher Education Transitions	4	Directors
7	VP/Provost/CAO	Associate VP for Teaching and Learning	7	4 directors directly reporting and 3 regional directors
	Sub-total VP/Provost/CSO		45	
9	VP Enrollment Management and Student Affairs	Associate VP for Admissions and Outreach	7	6 directors, half of whom are regional directors, along with one other Director subordinate to another
10	VP Enrollment Management and Student Affairs	Associate VP of Enrollment and Retention/ College Registrar	5	Associate Registrars
11	VP Enrollment Management and Student Affairs	Associate Vice President for Financial Aid and Title IV Compliance	6	2 associate directors, 1 coordinator, and 3 regional directors
12	VP Enrollment Management and Student Affairs	Associate Vice President of Student Success Management (Advising)	5	2 executive directors and 3 regional directors
13	VP Enrollment Management and Student Affairs	Associate Vice President for Student Support Services (wrap around)	2	Director
14	VP Enrollment Management and Student Affairs	Executive Director, Student Information Systems, Data and Reporting	5	2 directors and 3 associate directors
	Sub-total VP Enrollment Management and Student Affairs		30	
15	Campus CEO	Campus Team Report to CEO	39	Dean of Faculty, Associate Dean(s) of Faculty and Students, Assoc. Dean Campus Operation = (3 x 12) + 3 extra assoc. deans for largest campuses
15	College Leadership	Campus Team Report to College	24	Regional Directors: Advising, Enrollment Services, Financial Aid, Institutional research; Mental Health, Child Care, Centers of Academic Excellence, Library Services = 8 x 3
	Sub-total Compus and College Leadership		63	
Total		Total	181	Presidents, VPs, Associate VPs, Directors, Assoc. Directors (or equivalents)

Note 1: p. 2 is an overview of the VP/Provost/CAO responsibilities, pp. 3 – 7. The Assoc VP for Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment is listed here as there is not a separate page later for this function.

Note 2: p. 8 (not included here) is an overview of VP Enrollment Management and Student Affairs, numbers included in summary of pp. 9 – 14.

Note 3: There is no overview page for the VP Finance and Administration, which is not broken down further than the p. 1 reporting officers.

Note 4: p. 15 Campus Team Reports to CEO has been multiplied by 12; Campus Team Report to College Leadership appears to be actually Regional Team Reports to College Leadership, and is multiplied by 3.

Note 5: Note: This does not include the many individuals at levels below Directors and Associate Directors such as specialists, supervisors and advisors, which would bring the total number of individuals well past 200.

Note 6: How existing administrators in the 12 community colleges will be reassigned, supplemented or removed is not explained.

Note 7: There is a discrepancy between the figures in the summary presented here, and the CSCU figure in its budget projections of 80 personnel for the CSCC, though this may refer only to hirings planned (and now reduced to 28 due to budget restrictions as a result of the pandemic) for the 2020-21 year. Also, the definition of “staff” in the CSCC budget only may only include those physically present on Woodland St, and exclude regional and campus executive or mid-level staff included in the above table.

The Diminished role of Faculty

There is one further level, mentioned from time to time in the charts without specific numbers: Under each associate dean are listed (1) one full-time faculty, discipline leads, and program coordinators, (2) adjunct faculty and (3) academic laboratory technicians. These are the folks who, at the bottom of the pile, actually deliver the courses and associated labs. There is no indication of how this amorphous mass (from the point of view of the organization charts) is to be organized, whether in disciplinary or multidisciplinary units at each campus or across campuses (by region or for the whole state). Nor is there any indication in the charts or other documents of how faculty governance over curriculum will be maintained, along with professional development opportunities and support for faculty and student-faculty research and outreach activities, essential aspects to improve quality of courses and programs.

What is also noticeable is the absence – in fact, the elimination - of department chairs, whose functions have been presumably taken over by the associate deans, with the remnant left for undefined “discipline leads and program coordinators “. At institutions of higher education chairs are normally faculty who assume functions such as assigning classes, chairing meetings, selecting adjuncts, handling complaints, and advising the Dean. As such they play a key role in shared governance. They are drawn from the departmental faculty and are in turn responsible to faculty who normally elected them for fixed, usually renewable terms. Eliminating this essential function is yet another serious problem with the proposed plan.

Faculty, and in particular full time faculty are the backbone of any college or university. The fact that they are so obviously disregarded in the organizational chart is indicative of a deep-seated problem in Students First, which might as a result of the above be termed Faculty Last. We have seen over the last 3 years of the rolling out of college consolidation that faculty have been viewed as appendages to the plan, and now as hindrances as their opposition grows. There was no doubt a time when faculty could have contributed to a joint plan to deal with the real problems in the colleges – whether fiscal, academic or administrative. But that time would seem to have passed as far as Students First is concerned, as it turns out to be more and more centrally directed, to the exclusion of meaningful faculty input. Perhaps a different plan would help, based on faculty input. Difficult as such a plan would be to produce at this time, there may be sufficient good will left to attempt this.

In the course of the controversy over Students First, three developments have occurred; (1) community college faculty feel a greater sense of attachment to their local college (sense of community) and heightened concern that the “community” is being taken out of the community colleges; (2) community college faculty have developed links with university faculty who both sympathize with their critiques and oppose consolidation of university “back office” (support) staff; (3) community college and university senates (almost all) have passed motions

of opposition and/or non-confidence in Students First. These are unlikely to go away; though mobilization has been reduced during the pandemic, a movement of criticism now exists.

In conclusion to this rather lengthy comment, let me state my underlying principles which have led me to the criticisms stated above, and some preliminary conclusions I have drawn:

Conclusions and Prospects

1/ Public higher education, both at the college and university level is a bottom-up, not a top-down process, under the guidance of “shared governance” with differential levels of control. In particular, faculty exercise control over curriculum (subject to approval by administration) and administration exercise control over budget (subject to consultation with faculty). Any reorganization – especially one as vast as proposed by Students First – must be a collaborative effort (balanced role for administration and faculty), not one of command and control by the central authority as is currently the case.

2/ Public higher education in the state should be coordinated as a federation of autonomous, but not isolated institutions. The constituent institutions of public higher education (state universities, community colleges, and Charter Oak) now part of CSU have distinct missions in terms of how teaching, research and outreach are coordinated and conducted. The autonomy and integrity of each has to be respected, with shared services and programs established on the basis of mutual consent, not centralized command and control. “Distinct missions” of types of institutions, and “autonomy and integrity” of individual institutions are essential watchwords, along with “institutional cooperation” and “shared services” which are also desiderata.

3/ A key to solving the current crisis – and it is that – is recognition that neither the status quo of isolated institutions nor the proposed one community college are viable. It remains to be seen what forms of regional cooperation and shared services on the basis of mutual consent can be achieved, but forcing consolidation cannot result in buy-in by faculty and as a direct consequence, cannot contribute to the success of students. The federated model already at the heart of the constitution of this country should be examined and its principles applied in a flexible way, taking into account the conditions of public higher education in our state, the distinct missions of different types of institutions, and the autonomy and integrity of each. The current merger of community colleges, Charter Oak and the state universities under a single board should itself be reexamined as to its cost (financial and academic) relative to benefits (eg TAPs) since 2011.

4/ An effort should be made to “de-personalize” the conflict and avoid the “blame game”, giving up the pretense (made by some on all sides) that only one side has the interests of students at heart. It’s more complicated than that: involving students, faculty, administrators, staff, community, business and government. What is needed is a critical review and substantial revision of the current plan or its outright rejection and replacement by a better one. At the very least, the planned “merger” of the community colleges into the accreditation of one currently existing college, a flawed “work around” for the transition period should be immediately suspended, as should the bloated “organization chart” for the proposed one college and any further hirings or appointments based on it.

5/ Other areas for cost savings should be examined, including the following as suggestions made to the Board at public comment (and ignored):

- Significant reduction (perhaps 1/3) in the size of “combined” system office, currently at \$40 - \$50 million a year (including CSU and CCC components)— savings in millions to tens of millions;
- Use of open source software for savings from millions to tens of millions (just as Apache is now used as a server in replacement of proprietary servers);
- Reduction of inter-mural sports at the university level (over \$10 million at CCSU alone, much of it for football) while maintaining on campus intra-mural activities—potential savings in the millions;
- Raising revenue by individual foundations (assisted by a state-wide campaign) from private sector businesses that benefit from hiring our students – potential donations in the millions.

6/ Any new plan should be based on a clear presentation of problems to be solved, both those pre-existing in the colleges and universities, and new ones created by Students First’s spiraling costs, bulging bureaucracy, and failure to implement representative and shared governance. These have all contributed to growing opposition to Students First which has now become a movement. More listening is needed by all, followed by constructive proposals taking into account lessons learned from the failure of Transform 2020 and the crisis affecting Students First. Hopefully such a debate can occur at the BOR, and this is a challenge for both the voting members and those ex-officio members representing faculty and those representing students.

David Blitz, June 2020

Chair, Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents, CSCU

Chair, Dept. of Philosophy, CCSU

Co-coordinator, Peace Studies Program, CCSU