

**State of Connecticut
Board of Regents Faculty Advisory Committee
Friday, March 15, 2013
39 Woodland St.
Hartford, Conn.**

Present: Vice Chair Stephen Adair, Alternate, CCSU; Peter Bachiochi, Member, ECSU; Ilene Crawford, Member, SCSU; Chair Tom Failla, Member, NCC; Catherine Hoyser, Member, Charter Oak; Patty O'Neill, Member, WCSU; Barbara Richards, Member, Housatonic; Mary Jean Thornton, Member, CCC.

Guest: Braden Hosch, Director of Policy & Research and Interim Director of Academic Affairs, ConnSCU.

1. Meeting was called to order at 2:00 PM.
2. Review of Minutes from Feb. 15, 2013 meeting. Motion to accept (Crawford/Hoyser), 5 – 0 – 2
3. Election Process. An extended discussion, led by Barbara Richards, resulted in the finalization of election plans. The election process at the CSUs and COSC is straightforward. Each CSU institution will elect one faculty member from each institution, and one of these will serve as an alternate on an already determined schedule. The CSU institutions will also elect a representative from SUOAF. The CTC will be grouped on the basis of size: large, medium, and small. Each institution (of 12) will nominate both a teaching faculty member and an administrative faculty. In the second round of the process, members from each grouping will then vote for two faculty members from the nominees from that grouping. Members will also vote for 2 administrative faculty for the entire system. Motion to accept the plan developed by Barbara Richards, Tom Failla and Peter Bachiochi, with the following additions (Crawford/O'Neill, 7 – 0 – 0):
 - a. Faculty members are the determiners of the faculty nominees
 - b. In the second round of the process, those voting will vote for 2 teaching faculty from each grouping and 2 administrative faculty from the system-wide administrative faculty
 - c. The announcement of this election process and the call for candidates will include the reminder that the pending SB867 may change the nature of responsibilities for these positions
4. Responses to system-wide e-mail to faculty in regard to current events and SB 867. Tom Failla and Stephen Adair received approximately 30 thoughtful responses to the inaugural e-mail sent to the faculty of the ConnSCU system.
5. Review follow up after meeting with lawmakers
 - a. February 28, 2013 report to the Higher Education Committee Video of the reports presented to the Committee on Higher Education on February 28, 2013 can be found here: <http://ct-n.com/ondemand.asp?ID=8750> It is advised that this be viewed in Windows media so that viewers can scroll up to the approximate 1:23:00 mark at which

FAC members begin giving reports. The reports are included below. Motion that a second e-mail containing information about the 2/28/13 meeting with the Higher education and Workforce Development Committee and information about the upcoming election process be sent to faculty (Failla/Crawford, unanimous).

Stephen Adair: Report from the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents

To the Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee

February 28, 2013

Senator Bye, Representative Willis, and Members of the Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee, I am Stephen Adair, Professor and Chair of the Sociology Department at Central Connecticut State University. I am currently Vice-Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee and served as Chair through 2012. I am honored and privileged to be here with many of my colleagues from the FAC to represent almost 6000 faculty members and 100,000 students across the 17 institutions overseen by the Board of Regents. In this report, I will review the major activities and priorities through the first year of the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC), but I would like to begin with a few words about the system and faculty view of the challenges and opportunities under the Board of Regents.

Introductory comments on the role of Connecticut State Colleges and Universities and the Board of Regents

Simply stated, the mission of our system is to educate Connecticut's citizenry. Over 90 percent of our students are Connecticut residents and over 90 percent of our graduates continue to live and to work in the state after graduation. Nearly half of the students in the system are first-generation students.

Unlike many students at more elite institutions who have many educational opportunities before them, for a large portion of our students, we represent their only chance for a quality, post-secondary education.

Overall Connecticut is a wealthy state, but it is also among the most unequal. If we are to address that inequity, reduce the achievement gap, and expand opportunities for all citizens, this system must be integral to creating this change.

I also feel obliged to say a few things about the general uncertainty and dismay felt among faculty and staff over the betrayal of system leadership disclosed last fall and the subsequent uncertain footing and lack of vision for the system in the vacuum that ensued. Although we do not yet know the budgetary outcome for the next fiscal year, course schedules for fall 2013 have been finalized and students will begin registering in

just a few weeks, so we are anticipating likely realities. The situation is not the same on every campus, but overall we see that most, if not all, of the 47 new faculty positions momentarily gained from savings in the consolidation of our systems evaporated, existing full-time faculty positions are being lost or left unfilled, course offerings are being reduced with significant reductions in expenditures for part-time faculty, local administrations are exerting pressure to increase class sizes, operating budgets are being sharply reduced, and conversations have begun about possible elimination of some programs. At the same time, the proposals being floated by the Board indicate that students will likely be faced with significant increases in tuition and fees. While no one enjoys this state of affairs, the lack of any alternative plan, leadership, or vision to counter this erosion of value in what we offer students and the state is disheartening.

Despite the rocky beginning, we still believe that the road ahead is through the consolidated system. The merger has brought about an unprecedented degree of collaboration across institutions. Chief academic officers from across the system now meet routinely. The FAC, numerous faculty committees for the new transfer and articulation policy, and the workgroups dedicated to improving developmental education following passage of PA 12-40 have brought energy, insight, mutual respect, and collaboration across institutions and systems. There remains much potential for the sharing of ideas, resources, and costs across the institutions that has yet to be conceived or realized. In addition, the FAC has opened communication lines and begun to coordinate activities and resolutions across the faculty governing bodies at the 17 institutions, and developed an electronic list that includes all faculty in the system.

On the structural relationship between the FAC and the BOR

Over the last year, the FAC has engaged with numerous substantive issues, but the uncertainties regarding the organizational and structural relations between the FAC, the BOR, and senior management have been the source of our biggest challenges. Aside from the language in the initial enabling legislation, there is no structural diagram or established set of rules and procedures that describe how the FAC ought to proceed with its recommendations or resolutions. At the FAC's first meeting in February 2012, we were mindful and deliberate of this challenge. We identified the importance of establishing institutionalized procedures for managing the communications between the faculty and the board as our first priority. And it still is. The lack of a clear line of communication meant that the work of the FAC has not been easy. We have had to be both assertive and creative to make our voices heard.

Yet despite, the communication and structural obstacles, we believe the FAC has made positive contributions to policy and the governance of the system. We believe that the

Board could have avoided some missteps over the last year if the members had been more mindful of faculty views, experiences, and expectations. For this reason, there is strong support within the FAC and faculty across the system for Senate Bill 867, which would make the Chair and Vice-Chair of the FAC non-voting members of the Board of Regents, and permit FAC members to be voting members of the Board's subcommittees.

The FAC's and Faculty Role in the Design and Implementation of the Transfer and Articulation Policy

The new Transfer and Articulation Policy (TAP) is, by all accounts, the biggest academic success of the new system. The policy aims to align General Education and major requirements across the 17 institutions based on core competencies and defined learning outcomes so that students who transfer from the community colleges to the four-year institutions are well prepared and have transparent curricula paths into four-year degree programs. This will result in fewer students wasting time and money accumulating credits that do not contribute to their degree requirements.

The initial draft of the TAP that was presented to the FAC at its first meeting in February 2012 was flawed. The FAC distributed the policy across the 17 institutions to solicit comments and advice. The FAC received hundreds of e-mails in response, which we gathered, compiled and distilled into a set of 10 recommendations, which were presented to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee of the BOR in March (The memo is included as item 4 with this report). All of the FAC recommendations were accepted and endorsed by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee except for the recommendation that a timeline not be established until an implementation plan had been completed. The FAC was also instrumental in getting faculty representation on the TAP Coordinating Committee, a committee that had initially only included senior administrative personnel, as well as securing a Program Manager and additional resources from the system to assist in implementation.

Over the summer, faculty committees designed a new 30-credit common General Education framework based on core competencies to meet the TAP requirements. The excellent work done by the faculty committees in conjunction with the system's provision of resources and direction ought to be a model for a successful collaboration between faculty and administration that could be used by other states.

As the TAP steering committee was completing its work defining a common General Education program for the system in the early fall, the FAC initiated conversations with both senior management and members of the Board regarding a formal process of review

to make official the work of the committee. After considerable discussion with both faculty and senior management, the FAC presented a recommendation to the BOR in November that campus votes through established curricula governance procedures would serve to ratify the General Education program (Item 5). At the time, the FAC was unaware of a management decision to forego the faculty votes. After subsequent faculty consternation and a personal appeal, the Academic and Student Affairs (ASA) committee of the BOR elected to rehear the question, and agreed to acknowledge the campus votes in a Board resolution endorsing the curricula framework. All campuses have now voted, and 15 of the 17 campuses approved the TAP framework.

Much work remains to complete the work that is promised by TAP. If we can fulfill the potential, a student entering a Connecticut Community College will not only be able to receive personalized, educational support in a variety of programs provided at the community level, but they will also be crossing the threshold into a large and multi-faceted set of educational possibilities and opportunities that span well over a hundred different Bachelor degree programs.

The BOR's Strategic Plan and the FAC

In December 2011, the BOR passed a resolution that outlined a process for creating distinct mission statements for the state universities, the community colleges, and Charter Oak to comply with section 230 of PA 11-48. The resolution specified that an initial draft of the mission statements would be crafted by the Council of Presidents, and included a subsequent period for review and commentary by the FAC and the Student Advisory Committee.

On September 25, 2012, the BOR approved a new mission, vision, and goal statement for the system as a whole that did not distinguish between the different types of institutions (item 6).

The FAC reviewed the Board's statement, compared it with the mission statement from UConn and the SUNY system (item 7), deemed it insufficient as a guide for public higher education in Connecticut, regarded it as a set of accountability measures rather than describing the set of qualities we aim to realize, and questioned whether the Board's actions were in compliance with the legislative intent.

The FAC sent a short paragraph to the leaders of faculty governing bodies across the system inviting them to review the Board's mission, vision, and goal statement, and asked them to consider voting on a FAC recommendation that strategic planning ought to follow the distinct missions for each type of institution. To this date, nine institutions have voted. The Faculty Senate at ECSU passed a compromise resolution that endorsed

both the work of the Board and the FAC. The FAC's resolution was passed at Norwalk CC and Charter Oak, and passed unanimously in the faculty governance bodies at Capital CC, Middlesex CC, CCSU, SCSU, WCSU, and Tunxis CC. The Board now has an approved strategic plan that has been unanimously rejected by faculty at many institutions.

The FAC wrote an open letter to Regent Lerer, the Chair of the Strategic Planning Committee outlining our concerns and detailing the faculty votes (item 8). We received a respectful and timely reply. The FAC expects to continue to work with the Board to develop a mission and vision that can inspire us as we move forward. The FAC is in the process of assembling an ad hoc committee to craft some alternative statements that it intends to promote in its ongoing dialog with the Board.

Additional Matters and Concluding Remarks

Activities relative to the transfer and articulation policy and the strategic planning process do not exhaust the substantive foci of the FAC over its first year. We have also reviewed new

Board policies regarding information technology, the possible consolidation of academic calendars, and system-level research and teaching awards. We have collaborated with several faculty groups and the senior administration to develop an effective reform of development education to comply with PA 12-40. The FAC is also finalizing a set of rules through faculty governance bodies for the elections for future FAC representatives. We expect to complete those elections by this May.

I also do not want to leave the impression that the FAC's first year could be characterized as one of drama, tension, confrontation, and conflict. While at times our work has been challenging and we have felt obliged to be assertive, we have also striven to be transparent and respectful, and to cultivate working relationships with members of the Board and the senior administration.

In closing, I would like to extend my gratitude to this committee for the opportunity to present to you today, but more importantly, for your forethought in creating the FAC as an important component of system governance. This committee and the legislature in general has before it ambitious proposals that will have lasting impact on the future of public, higher education in the state. We ask that you consider all of the needs and interests in the state so that the crisis in our current leadership does not constrain the vision and opportunities of our soon-to-be-incoming President.

Finally, I would like to thank my colleagues on the committee and the tremendous spirit of trust, collaboration, mutual respect, and dedication that all of you have shown over the last year. It has been my pleasure to work with you all.

Ilene Crawford

Conn SCU Faculty Advisory Committee Report to Higher Education and Workforce Development
Committee

Feb. 28, 2013

Ilene Crawford, PhD, Professor of English, Director, Liberal Studies

Southern Connecticut State University

To many, the reorganization of part of higher education in CT seemed like a solution in search of a problem. However, one very positive aspect of the legislation was the creation of the Faculty Advisory Committee. We come from diverse institutions, with diverse constituents, yet we have been amazingly united in our fierce devotion to, and belief in, the role that ConnSCU institutions can play in transforming our students' lives.

Faculty at the CSU institutions strive to instill in all our students the value of the liberal arts and the sciences as a foundation for professional development and life-long learning. Over 85% of our graduates remain in Connecticut and contribute to the state's economic and social welfare. There are significant challenges to this worthy task: nearly half of our students are first-generation college students, an increasing number arrive with inadequate academic preparation, and many come to us from a public school system still struggling with the nation's largest achievement gap. We strive to maintain high academic standards in the face of such challenges, and all our students deserve more support and commitment from the public.

As our FAC colleagues have suggested in their comments to you today, we need you to remain strong advocates for the ConnSCU system's students. One of the cornerstones of the Governor's budget is *Next Generation Connecticut*, "a major expansion of and investment [of nearly 2 billion dollars] in UConn" (*Capitol Monitor* 2/19/13). We are disheartened—not by UCONN's increased capacity to serve its students, which we applaud, but rather by the austerity logic that seems to inform the Governor's proposed current services budget for ConnSCU. Our students need the diverse and--oftentimes non-traditional--paths to higher education that ConnSCU's CCs and

CSUs create for them. The system is over-reliant on part-time faculty and lacking in the critical technological infrastructure and research facilities required to provide students with the skills and abilities they will need to navigate a rapidly globalizing economy after graduation. We need the resources to ensure we can maintain high academic standards for them, because their success is Connecticut's success.

Mary Jean Thornton

Conn SCU Faculty Advisory Committee Report to Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee

Feb. 28, 2013

Mary Jean Thornton, Professor of Management Capital Community College, Hartford, Conn.

As an executive in the private sector for 20 years, I worked on many teams but during those 20 years, only one was truly high performing. That was until last year, when I joined the Faculty Advisory Committee under Stephen Adair and Tom Failla's leadership. The members of our committee are student-focused; there is mutual respect; the tough issues are met head on; we never identify a problem without suggesting a solution. We believe in the possibilities of the ConnSCU system. We want to do the right thing and, most importantly, we want to do what is right.

Community colleges should never be an afterthought. Community colleges provide access to higher education for students from diverse backgrounds. We serve ready-on-level students who immediately enter degree programs like Nursing, Liberal Arts, or Business Administration. Many students are the first in their families to attend college; growing numbers are immigrants who initially need to improve their language skills before transitioning into degree programs. A number of students simply need another chance. Another segment, primarily, adult students, find themselves in the position of reskilling or advancing their skills to keep pace or enter the 21st century workforce. For some, community colleges bring those on the margins into the mainstream, as education is still the only pathway out of poverty. Highly successful community colleges understand their student population; they meet and embrace the students where they are. Community colleges value innovation in teaching and support services and focus on building their students' knowledge base, which results in increased self-sufficiency.

Because of our access policy, we have the privilege to witness and participate in transforming our students' lives. The community colleges serve many students, who initially, might be challenged by the expectations and the environment of a CSU for a host of reasons including academic preparedness, cost, family responsibilities and life circumstances. In a sense, we see many students a CSU would never see. We launch them into higher education and prepare

them to make a successful transition to a CSU *or* COSC. The opportunity to transform students' lives is the mutual interest the community colleges, the CSUs *and* COSC share. The transformation begins at the community college and continues at the CSU *or* COSC.

The ConnSCU system has the potential to provide a unique value proposition. We excel at teaching; we are everywhere; we offer students the broadest range of degree, certificate and training programs in CT; we engage in innovative research. Our 17 colleges and universities give students the opportunity to access higher education to fulfill their goals and to contribute to Connecticut's society and workforce as well-educated citizens and leaders. ConnScu can serve Connecticut well throughout many decades if effectiveness and excellence share the same importance as efficiency. Our faculty and staff are proud of the unique and vital role that we play in educating Connecticut's citizenry. For the community colleges to continue to perform that role at the highest level, we need:

1. visible leadership to promote creativity, experimentation, and innovation
2. passionate advocacy to influence policy decisions and funding priorities
3. stronger partnerships with the Connecticut State Universities, Charter Oak State College and the employers which reside in our state

Catherine Hoyser

Conn SCU Faculty Advisory Committee Report to
Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee

Feb. 28, 2013

Catherine E. Hoyser, Ph.D. Statement to the BOR and state legislature

I am pleased to be Charter Oak State College's representative to the Faculty Advisory Committee. As my colleagues on the FAC have stated so eloquently, this committee works astonishingly well together. To ensure academic rigor, COSC has academic area committees composed of faculty from across the state and across institutions, public and private. I am the chair of the Charter Oak History and Humanities committee and professor of English and director of Women's Studies at the University of Saint Joseph. When I joined the History and Humanities committee 6 years ago, I had a vague idea of what COSC was. Once I attended the first meeting and realized the opportunity COSC provides to people who, for whatever reason, cannot attend a traditional four-year institution, I became committed to the institution's mission and its devoted administration and staff. The rigor of the process for completing a degree combines with a compassionate realism about the conditions of people's lives. Because

of the opportunity COSC provides, many of its graduates have continued on to graduate degrees and prestigious jobs. The innovative foresight of the educators and lawmakers that conceived of Charter Oak State College 40 years ago represents what is best when administrators, legislature, and faculty work together.

Charter Oak State College is unique among the higher education institutions in Connecticut because it offers adults the opportunity to complete degrees that they may have started ten or twenty years ago. Many people begin university study only to be sidelined by life situations including financial, health, and family issues. As a result, the Connecticut higher education administration developed an alternative route for people who desire a bachelor's degree for personal satisfaction and career change or advancement. COSC recognizes the value of life-long learning even though a person is not in a classroom. Consequently, credit for life experiences can be paired with college credit classes. Returning students may aggregate courses that they have taken at community colleges and universities. This program was developed long before adult education programs were commonplace. In addition, the online component of its programming anticipated what has become a national and global enterprise in higher education. Because of the longevity of its programming, COSC has a rigor for online classes that newer, more entrepreneurial online organizations may lack. As a result of its mission, Charter Oak State College has enabled adults who may have stayed out of the workforce because they lacked a 4-year degree to become productive members of Connecticut's labor force.

- b. Advising. One of the legislators at the Higher Education Committee expressed concerns about advising. Those concerns were discussed by the FAC and no further action taken.
- c. Review calendar of key hearings, appropriations and others, related to higher ed. The chair/co-chair of the FAC will join Jeannie Phillips', Clerk of the Higher Education Committee, e-mail list and be notified of key hearings on issues that affect higher education in Connecticut.
- d. Determine how FAC coordinates with management, BOR unions on testifying

6. Review response letter to Dr. Lerer

- a. SME ad hoc committee to work with FAC on its response to mission and strategic plan. A meeting between Stephen Adair, Mary Jean Thornton, and Regent Rene Lerer will be arranged to discuss FAC's concerns with the overall mission statement.
- b. CSU research professors' open letter on research
- c. CCSU faculty Senate document regarding public higher education

7. TAP update and permanent steering committee status Stephen Adair, Lauren Doninger (co-chair of TAP Steering Committee) and Deb Weiss (co-chair of TAP Steering Committee) met with Dr. Merle Harris (Chair, BOR Academic and Student Affairs Committee) and discussed the issue of creating a permanent steering committee to guide the implementation of TAP. Motion: That the Steering Committee be made

permanent to address rising concerns created by the implementation of TAP (Crawford/Hoyser), unanimous.

8. Developmental Education update. No action taken.

9. Update on letter to Dr. Austin regarding compensation for FAC members. No action taken.

10. Braden Hosch on academic and research awards process committee and other relevant items.

- a. Braden Hosch reported that the Board of Regents would approve the CSU-AAUP research grants at the March 21, 2013 meeting.
- b. He also reported that the committee tasked with developing guidelines for the expansion of the former CSU Trustee Teaching and Research Awards was close to being convened.
- c. The plan to comply with Section 230 of PA 11-48, which calls for a plan to maintain the distinct missions of the CSU system, the CTC system, and Charter Oak State College is moving forward. Independent mission statements have been developed by the Council of Presidents and by the FAC. Once the SAC completes their independent mission statements, a group of presidents, faculty, and students from the 17 institutions will be convened to develop the three mission statements. Further, this group will also make recommendations to the Strategic Planning Group chaired by Regent Lerer.

11. Other business. No action taken.

12. Meeting adjourned at 4:50 PM.

Submitted by
P. O'Neill