Meeting of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the BOR
June 16, 2023. 3pm (after joint meeting with BOR)

1. Approval of May 2023 Minutes
2. Approval of the agenda
3. Discussion Post-Joint meeting: legislative session and state budget
   Questions submitted to Administration and BOR for Joint Meeting (p.2)
4. Reports of Chair and Vice Chair
   FAC Co-chairs statement to BOR EXEC 6/6 (p.5)
   Response from Ben Barnes- 6/8 (p.7)
   Questions and Follow up post- May 12 meeting with CTState Leadership (p.10)
5. Criminal Investigation re: speech at FAC meeting
   FAC Statement in Support
6. CTState accreditation and OPEID (pending)
   June 1 Update letter [https://www.ct.edu/merger/neche]
7. Old/new business
8. Adjourn

Next Meeting: July 14 2023

3:00 PM

Join meeting

President Cheng, CFO Ben Barnes, and Board of Regents,

In the absence of any official updates on our financial outlook since the state budget was voted out of house and senate on 6/6, we submit the following questions in advance of our Joint FAC BOR meeting on June 16th, 2023.

Some questions concern the administration's documents, plans, and calculations. For those, we (again) request as much in writing as is feasible in advance of the meeting so that our committee can review and digest the information in time for a productive discussion on Friday. What cannot be provided in advance, we request in writing as soon as it is available.

Other questions concern the administration and board's perspective and goals. For those questions, we hope you will review and reflect in advance. We look forward to our interaction and to getting to know you all a little better as we problem-solve together at this difficult time.

CSCU administration:

1. Your June 8 response to my and David Blitz's emailed statement to the BOR in advance of its executive committee meeting on 6/6 noted a difference of $181M between what the system received in state funding and the CSCU 2030 request. But the CSCU 2030 request does not describe the funding needed to maintain a current-services level of operation. It is, rather, a more aspirational document calling for a 'generational investment' in our system. The difference between the generational investment number and what we have received could not possibly be the amount required to maintain status quo.

   Likewise, if you subtract the CSCU2030 ask from the *governor's* proposed budget- which is $165M less than we received- you get a number that falls within $2M of our advertised deficit: $337M. But such a comparison is unhelpful and uncredible as a claimed deficit that requires hundreds of layoffs, thousands of part time reductions, tuition increases and other devastation.

   To this end, please describe for us:
   a) How much is the projected current service level for FY24 and FY25? b) What are projected revenues for FY24 and FY25?

2. An early deficit mitigation plan identified a $109M system deficit in FY24 and attributed $95M of that to CTState. And yet your public narrative has attributed all shortfalls to the state's failure to adequately fund the SEBAC wage increases it voted to implement in spring of 2022, backdated to the contract start date of July 1, 2021. What difference between the colleges and universities explains why the colleges suffer so much more, and so very immediately, from this oversight?

3. Please provide an updated breakdown across institutions of projected revenues and expenditures so that we can understand the variations between institutions. If the large disparities between institutions are still there, please explain why there are such wide variations between institutions.

4. Using your estimates of SEBAC-related costs from the CSCU2030 document (p.7) and how they vary relative to FY23, those costs are about $32M less in FY24 than in FY23 and about $0.7M more in FY25 than they were in FY23. In FY24, the approved budget gives us (using the numbers as presented in Ben Barnes' June 8 email) $13M more than FY23 but $102M less than FY23 in FY25.

a) How do these numbers relate to the system's claim of a $335M deficit over the biennium?
b) Does your most recent calculation of the cost of wage increases match these numbers? If not, what are they?

5. CSCU has aggregate reserves of $329.0M as of 6/30/23, which constitutes 22.6% of FY24 systemwide expenditures. The initial deficit mitigation plan proposed using only $22.7M of these reserves to offset the projected deficit, and none of the $75.1M in reserves held at the system level, leaving projected systemwide reserves equal to 19.6% of expenditures as of 6/30/25.

a) Does CSCU have a standard for the colleges and universities as to the targeted level of reserves as a percentage of expenditures? If so, how did you arrive at that target? b) CSCU's projected systemwide reserves as of 6/30/23 equal 22.6% of expenditures. Are you aware that community colleges in other states, such as California, use a reserve target of 5% of expenditures?
c) Why didn't the early version of the DMP propose using reserves more aggressively as an alternative to program and staffing cuts and to tuition increases? Will mitigation plans currently being developed take a different approach to use of reserves?

6. Could you share with us the most recent version of the FY24-25 CSCU Deficit Mitigation Plan, including comparable figures on revenue and expenditures for FY22 and 23 for the purpose of comparison?

7. Deficit mitigation, thus far, has been focused on cuts to offerings and increases in tuition but, in the face of reduced state funding, enrollment is an increasingly important source of revenue. These mitigation measures would serve to further depress enrollment, resulting in both reduced revenues and further justification– by the governor's and OPM's current logic, anyway– to withhold state funding. As such, no mitigation plan we have seen can be said to successfully address our current challenges to preserving the public service with which we have been entrusted. They are focused, rather, on describing, with numbers, the measure of pain that has been inflicted on us.

a) Now that efforts to alert the legislature and the executive branch to the enormity of the problem are behind us, what other approaches have been considered in the service of preserving the integrity and existence of the system?
b) Related: what are the current enrolment numbers- broken down by college/campus for the community colleges?

8. You have claimed that the transition to the consolidated college has had no cost and indeed the Students First Plan that proposed this transition did not project a cost greater than just over one million dollars for the transition (appendix LL, p.264). If that is true, over the past five years we have managed to achieve the (imminent) opening of the fifth largest community college in the country at almost no cost– perhaps at a savings.

a) If this is true, how do we justify this extended project of targeting the sector of our public college population that is least wealthy and majority non-white for extracting savings?
b) If this assessment has since been modified, what is your estimate of the cost of launching the fifth largest community college in the country?

The following two questions are versions of questions included in a list we submitted to CTState leadership after they met with our committee on May 12. They have not yet answered. We ask for Regents' responses here:

9. The current budget crisis and political climate do not indicate that this new college will have very much external support. In fact, in a recent interview, Governor Lamont was quite clear about his vision for the community colleges and unapologetic about the budget's potential consequences for our workforce.

a) Does the Board agree with the vision that the Governor outlined for the community colleges of more night classes and certificates that can be achieved in a few weeks? If not, what is he missing and how might we best convey that vision to him?
b) There is quite a lot of work ahead of us to get this college running even adequately. How do you launch a college while being starved into reductions by your primary funding source- the state? Is it responsible to launch an enterprise like this one with no investments on the horizon?
c) Given the forecasted budget deficits for the one community college, can we reasonably and responsibly claim that the new college can meet NECHE's standards for accreditation, especially standard 7 that requires adequate financial resources? (the June 1st submission to NECHE makes no mention of the advertised deficit and mitigation plans)

10. This Consolidated College was advertised as a triumph for equity and even as an antiracist institution but cutting funding, decreasing offerings, increasing class sizes, reducing full time staffing etc are all time-tested austerity measures that have a proven track record of undermining the prospects of the working class and people of color.

a) What is the relationship of this college to the aspiration of equity? How could it be understood as meeting even the most minimal standards of justice in a state that struggles with the challenges of income inequality and disparities exacerbated by racial segregation in education?

To: Executive Committee, BOR
From: Colena Sesanker, Chair FAC and David Blitz, Vice-Chair, FAC
Date: June 5, 2023
Re: CSCU Budget and Mitigation Measures

As Chair and Vice-Chair of the Faculty Advisory Committee we have followed the various budget proposals leading up to the current HB-6941. We request that the following statement be read at the BOR Executive Committee meeting of June 6:

The current budget bill before the legislature (HB-6941) provides a total of 626.04 million for FY 24 and 516.45 million for FY 25, adding together the Agency Total (p. 16 for FY24/FY25: 423.34/440.15 millions), Temporary Operating Support (p. 57:; 55.00/27.50 millions) and transition from ARPA (p. 69: 147.70/48.80 millions).

Compared to the original CSCU 2030 General Fund proposals for those years, excluding the CSCU request to expand PACT, but including the legislative proposal to fund PACT (23.5 million for FY 24 and 28.5 for FY 25), we calculate a positive balance of 59.39 million for FY 24 and a deficit of 109.50 million for FY 25.

These figures are significantly different from the deficit numbers provided by CSCU in its mitigation plans, and within the scope of existing system reserves and/or midbudget adjustments by the legislature.

Whether the above calculation is complete or subject to correction, we consider that these and related numbers do not justify the mitigation proposal as stated at the April 24 CSCU Press conference, which called for 650 full time faculty and staff layoffs, nearly 3000 part-time positions to be eliminated, 5 percent student tuition increases across the colleges and universities, and elimination of some high subsidy and workforce related programs.

We consider this response exaggerated and counter-productive, as it would put in jeopardy the on-going transition to the CT Community College and the continued progress of the CT State Universities.

We therefore request that this statement be read at the Executive Committee meeting of June 6, and that no measures as envisaged by the April 24 CSCU press conference be undertaken. We consider it time to develop a more appropriate set of objectives and priorities in consultation with the Faculty Advisory Committee, as well as the appropriate Board Committees and College and University academic and financial leaders.

Colena Sesanker, Ph.D
Chair, Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents for Higher Education
Ex-officio Member, Board of Regents for Higher Education

Associate Professor of Philosophy
Gateway Community College
20 Church Street, New Haven, CT 06510
csesanker@gatewayct.edu

David Blitz, Ph.D
Professor of Philosophy, CCSU
blitz@ccsu.edu
Vice-Chair, Faculty Advisory Committee to the BOR/CSCU
Ex-Officio Member, Board of Regents for Higher Education

From: Barnes, Benjamin

Sent: Thursday, June 8, 2023 6:15 PM

To: Sesanker, Colena; Blitz, David (External Contact)

Cc: Cheng, Terrence; Ryan, JoAnn (External Contact)

Subject: Response to June 5th statement to the Executive Committee

Dear Professors Sesanker and Blitz,

President Cheng has asked that I provide a response to your statement of June 5th to the

Executive Committee of the Board of Regents.

The table below details the categories of state operating support that have been budgeted by

the State of Connecticut for CSCU from FY 2022 through FY 2025 based on the recently enacted

budget.

CSCU State Appropriations, FY 22 - FY 25

Account Name		Approved 2022	Approved 2023	Approved 6/5/23 HB 6941 2024	2025
State Appropriations					
Charter Oak State College		3,459,107	3,656,390	3,127,472	3,182,468
Community Tech College System		153,376,054	172,456,308	208,495,341	217,494,271
Connecticut State University		161,882,818	174,367,292	176,054,688	178,635,888
BOR		436,324	453,500	460,084	466,906
Developmental Services		8,912,702	9,896,460	10,042,069	10,190,984
Outcomes-Based Funding Incentive		1,202,027	1,335,638	1,354,341	1,374,425
O'Neill Chair		-	315,000	315,000	315,000
	$	329,269,032	$ 362,480,588	$ 399,848,995	$ 411,659,942
PACT Program - Debt Free Community College		14,000,000	15,000,000	23,500,000	28,500,000
Enhance Student Retention at Community Colleges		-	19,500,000	6,500,000	-
Additional Fringe Benefits Support		60,990,877	64,503,926		
Restructure Fringe Benefits Gov's Proposal					
Deficiency Funding for Wages (Leg. Source ARPA FY23)		21,600,000	24,000,000		
Provide Support for Salary Cost of the 27th Payroll		-	10,000,000		
CharterO Additional State Approp (Graduation Fee Waiver)		140,000	140,000		
Community Colleges: E-Commerce Training Program		-	65,000		
Provide Operations Support Through Short-Term Recovery Funds		-	118,000,000	147,700,000	48,800,000
Provide Temporary Operating Support		-	-	55,000,000	27,500,000
Charter Oak State College					
Community Tech College System					
Connecticut State University					
ARPA Funding - Lecturers Pay		10,000,000	5,000,000		
Enhance Public Safety at CCC, CSU and CharterO		-	-		
GRAND Total State Support	$	435,999,910	$ 618,689,514	$ 632,548,995	$ 516,459,942

The final appropriations compared to prior years and other proposed amounts, including CSCU 2030, as shown in the small table here. As you can see, the final appropriation is $8 million higher than our CSCU 2030 request in FY 2024 but is $181 million less in FY 2025.

CSCU Total State Assistance Proposals and Final Budget		
($ millions)	FY2024	FY2025
Governor	512.5	472.3
CSCU 2030	624.3	697.8
Appropriations	576.0	518.0
Final	632.5	516.5

In your letter you also made comparison to the Preliminary Deficit Mitigation plan that we made public in April. As you may recall, those plans were assembled quickly to estimate the scale of reductions – both of financial resources and of faculty and staff – that would have been necessary to live within the Appropriations Committee proposal based on the information and circumstances known at that time. To identify the potential scale of our financial shortfalls at that time, we compared our projected revenues from tuition and fees, our projections of current-services level spending, and the proposed levels of state aid.

Just as the legislature has been finalizing the state aid package, CSCU institutions have been developing detailed spending plans for the coming year, as well as a projection of the same spending and operating revenue through FY 2025 and FY 2026. These plans are still under construction but are scheduled to be presented to the Finance and Infrastructure Committee of the Board of Regents on June 21st

. Once the Board approves final spending plans at the June
28th Board of Regents meeting, CSCU and institutional leadership will work collaboratively to develop strategies aimed at reducing identified shortfalls in FY 2024 and/or FY 2025.
It is essential that CSCU, including management, faculty and staff, be as clear and specific as possible when communicating internally or externally about steps we may consider for financial reasons. In that vein let me clearly state that the preliminary deficit mitigation plan that was produced in April was based on a proposed state budget, and was prepared as a way to estimate the impact of that proposal on our system. It is not responsive to the level of state aid ultimately provided in the final budget and, at this time, no such plans exist that are responsive to the final budget.

Best Regards,
Ben

Benjamin Barnes (He/Him/His)
VP Administration / CFO
PHONE: 860-723-0251 (office)
203-273-2759 (mobile)

EMAIL: bbarnes@commnet.edu
ADDR: 61 Woodland St., Hartford, CT 06105

To: Gayle Barrett, Associate Vice President for Enrollment and Retention Services
Tamika Davis, Interim Vice President of Enrollment Management
Amy Feest, Associate Vice President of Programs and Curriculum
Manuel Gomez, Associate Vice President of Academic Operations
Miah LaPierre Dreger, Interim Provost CTState
Mike Stefanowicz, Interim Associate Vice President Academic and Student Affairs
John Maduko, President, CTState

Date: 17 May 2023

Re: Follow up from FAC meeting, May 12, 2023

A list of the questions prepared for the May 12 meeting of the FAC at which you were all guests is attached as you have requested.

We were able to address a few of these questions during our time together. There was some cause for concern regarding what I believe we learned. I will list some of those concerns here so that there is an opportunity for follow-up and greater clarity, if necessary. Each of these concerns, if legitimate, warrants its own discussion but I will attempt to be as concise as possible in the effort to simply establish the facts:

1. **An Inaccurate and Evolving Live Course Catalog**
   I believe that, as a consequence of our discussion about the inaccuracies reflected in DegreeWorks, we established that DegreeWorks was tested and is functioning as intended- it reflects the contents of the course catalog.

   The discrepancies students are seeing, and which risk misleading students in their course choices for the coming semester, are a consequence of two separate things:
   a. There is no way to anticipate and automate all of the substitutions that will be necessary to make students whole and they must be processed on a student-by-student basis.
   b. The catalog contains a significant number of inaccuracies and that, given your answers on Friday, it is currently impossible to estimate what percentage of the catalog is accurate.

   If this is true, this is cause for concern.

   First, it should be clear that DegreeWorks was released to students too early because it has the potential to cause more harm than good currently.

   Second, enrolment for the fall semester is well underway and our course catalog contains a significant but unknown number of inaccuracies.

   Third, based on this information, I suspect the following might be true: that the constantly changing information in DW may be the result of attempts to correct the course catalog while it is live and during active enrolment; That advisors' reports of degree audits and program

information that changes sometimes literally by the hour is not simply a consequence of a glitchy and slow integration of DegreeWorks but of an evolving catalog.

If the catalog is being modified while it is live, that should stop. CTState has already made a commitment to making students whole but that commitment will be honored by comparing the requirements of the student's catalog year with the CTState requirements and modifying accordingly. There is no reliable way to do no harm when students will have registered for courses based on misinformation we provided but of which no published record has been retained.

The current state of the fluctuating information, whatever its reason might be, is not only undermining our students' academic progress, it compromises our advisors' professional integrity. Whatever the path forward, it would seem that at least the following is necessary: freeze the catalog, make an assessment of the errors, make a plan to contact and address students affected by those errors, produce a reliable source of information to guide students' course choices and future planning. The current state of things (whether a consequence of catalog modification or program glitches) is cause for serious ethical concerns if not legal ones.

2. **New policy with risk of financial aid repercussions**
   Given what we learned about the state of the catalog, the impending implementation of CPoS appears to create the further risk of doing irreparable harm to students as it will, most likely, pull from the catalog which is both inaccurate and inadequate to determine whether a course is, in fact, in a student's program of study. Its implementation is likely to create an unreasonable volume of work for those who will have to make adjustments in time to avoid financial aid consequences for students. Some students will, inevitably, slip through the cracks. Without an understanding of how far we are from accuracy- and there is currently no process in place determine accuracy other than mass emails to faculty- it is impossible to tell how significant the challenge will be.

   Additionally, on the topic of CPoS, and in the context of many years of rhetoric about the quest for equity in the design of the consolidated college: please share how the compliance facilitated by CPoS is achieved at the universities. Given that we were not informed of this policy until after the community college curriculum was set, it would be wise for all programs to review their design in light of the policy to ensure that we are not overly constraining our CC students.

3. **Budget transparency and viability**
   A document presented later in the May 12 meeting creates greater urgency around the answer to question 4 on our original list. The context is this: on at least one version of an existing mitigation plan, CTState is represented as bearing $95M of the system's claimed $109 deficit in FY24 while its reserves are estimated as about $106M at the end of this fiscal year. Transparency on how CTState is charged for both the shared services and support of the system office would be appreciated as well as how resources are to be apportioned to campuses, especially in the case of concurrent enrollments.

4. **Governance**
   If I understand correctly, all of the curricular and policy products that must be processed by the BOR before fall have already been approved by governance bodies though those bodies do not yet have bylaws in place. Is that right?

5. **No Title IV date**

   We don't seem to have an *exact* date established for access to federal financial aid funds. There is a set cut off date for work study students this summer… do we anticipate a gap for any of the typical summer activities?

6. **Who assumes current responsibility for our situation?**

   When asked about details of the design and implementation of Guided Pathways, those present were not able to give specific answers. Dr. LaPierre Dreger noted that most of the people who came up with the initial projections were no longer 'around the table'. Dr. Davis offered that the retention projections that justified the hiring of more than 150 GP advisors were perhaps made inaccurate by an unforeseen pandemic. Mike Stefanowicz also suggested that COVID may have contributed to any shortfall of projections.

This response was not credible for a number of reasons. Among them:

1. Most full time members of the community college faculty and staff could easily answer the question regarding the initial plan for funding these positions since both the funding of salaries using one time funds and the claim that the positions would pay for themselves by FY'25 are notorious and have been discussed and challenged publicly many times.
2. The accelerated hiring of Guided Pathways advisors was partially achieved through ARPA funding designated for that purpose during the last budget session (Spring 2021). Not only was that *after* the pandemic, the money used was funding provided to the state by the federal government in response to its devastating effects.
3. Tamika Davis, Gayle Barrett, Mike Stefanowicz and Mike Buccilli (who was mentioned by the group but not present) were among the very first people assigned to the design of the consolidated college and its structure. Davis, Barrett, and Buccilli all held the title 'Guided Pathways Manager' while Stefnowicz was responsible for academic and student affairs for the college in its entirety. Not only do many members of the FAC have personal experience of participation in workgroups led by these individuals dating back to 2018, CTState's documentation affirms that experience.

Gayle Barrett, Tamika Davis, and Mike Buccilli were all members of the Guided Pathways Taskforce and The Guided Pathways Choice Architecture Workgroup until those groups' sunset in Spring of 2021.

GP Taskforce charge: To support the CSCU Student Success Center with the advancement, adoption, and implementation of Guided Pathways across the CSCU community colleges. The GPTF oversees all Guided Pathways working groups and teams and makes decisions on Guided Pathways proposals developed by those groups, by the GPTF, and by the CSCU Student Success Center.

Choice Architecture charge: To use Guided Pathways practices and existing expertise in the CSCU community colleges to design and recommend policies and practices that facilitate student retention and completion through encouraging early choice and removing student success barriers. The Choice Architecture team will help implement systemic change related to all four Guided Pathways principles: Developing coherent academic paths, creating meaningful learning experiences, helping students select an academic/career path, and helping students stay on their path. This work requires collaboration with the Support and Recruitment Architecture subgroups as well as the creation of specialized work groups. Specific tasks include but are not limited to: Organize existing academic programs into meta-majors, design a common first year experience for students, develop a protocol for academic program and discipline groups to use in mapping programs to end goals, and use evidence to foster culture change surrounding behaviors predictive of academic success (e.g., 15-to-finish, completion of college level math and English in the first year).https://www.ct.edu/gp/groups

Buccilli, Davis, and Stefanowicz were group leads for the CATR Working group

- Gayle Barrett is listed as holding titles of Director of Enrollment Management, Guided Pathways Management and Student Success Center College Liaison while an ex-officio member of the GP workgroups
- Tamika Davis is listed as having held the titles of Director of Admissions, Guided Pathways Manager, Student Success Center Liaison while holding ex-officio positions in the GP working groups
- Mike Buccilli as Director of Student Success and Guided Pathways Manager.
- On Dec 8 2017, then President Ojakian announced the formation of the Students First Academic and Student Affairs Consolidation Committee to be co-led by Mike Stefanowicz at which point he assumed the role of Interim Associate Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs. https://www.ct.edu/studentsfirst/about
- Dr. Feest was a member of the Choice Architecture group until April 2021 while holding the position of interim Dean at Tunxis CC
- Dr. LaPierre Dreger is currently the chief academic officer of the college

Dr. Maduko's suggestion that this group attend our meeting, your current job titles, and many of your roles over the last 5 years or more suggest that you are ultimately responsible. If you are not, please provide an org chart or some other documentation that will help us understand the scope of your executive roles and identify those who are both knowledgeable and responsible. The question of who is actually making these decisions has long been a preoccupation of the FAC and transparency about what we all, apparently, agree is mismanagement of state funds and institutions is necessary.

Colena Sesanker
Chair, Faculty Advisory Committee to the CT Board of Regents.

Addendum:

Questions prepared for the 5/12 meeting.

1. When will CTState's OPEID be approved? What is the status of students' financial aid until then?

2. Was DegreeWorks tested before it became available to students? If so, by whom and what was the standard of accuracy set to authorize its release?
   a. What about the schedule? Banner?
3. What percent of the program information in your office would you estimate is accurate?
4. Shared services runs payroll, HR, IT and other services for the community colleges (badly) yet they do not report to CT State.
   a. Will that reporting line be changed?
   b. Related: what is the cost to CTState for these (inadequate) shared services? How is that number calculated?
5. How many GPAs were hired? How many remain? What was the initial plan to fund those positions? What is the current plan?
   a. When will they be trained/provided with tools adequate to being on the front lines of this transition?
   b. Students have reported very long wait times for advising. Why is that?
6. Last we heard there was quite a volume of last-minute curricular and policy changes to address before July 1. How many of those do you anticipate will be processed before that deadline?
7. Why are there multiple layers of approvals required for course substitutions? And, with the volume of substitutions necessary over the next few weeks, why isn't there an electronic process?
8. Curricular Congress and Senate are currently operating without bylaws, the Curriculog system that would have made documents available won't be up and running for maybe another year, meeting minutes aren't always available, meeting links aren't publicly accessible. How is this different from the transitional consolidated college committees? Do you intend to present the products of these committees in their current state to the board?

9. How were course caps established? What factors were taken into consideration and by whom?
10. In the CTState Webinar on Monday 5/8 it was reported that enrollment is level with where it was last year this time. Is that correct? Can you share those numbers?
11. It was also mentioned that some students had registered for four or five different campuses concurrently and that calls were being made to confirm that it was intentional– in most cases it was. How many students are concurrently registered at multiple campuses? Could we get a full report? For such students, how is tuition to be apportioned to the various campuses?
12. Has the Banner error regarding ENG1010W/910 been fixed? Can it be fixed? How is its current status compatible with the ultimate goal of redeveloping these courses?
    a. More generally, how soon can the problem of paired courses in Banner be corrected?

13. The current budget crisis and political climate do not indicate that this new college will have very much external support. In fact, in a recent interview, Governor Lamont was quite clear about his vision for the community colleges and unapologetic about the
budget's potential consequences for our workforce.

    i. Are night classes and certificates that can be achieved in a few weeks your vision for the community colleges? What is he missing?
    ii. There is quite a lot of work ahead of us to get this college running even adequately. How do you launch a college while being starved into reductions by your primary funding source- the state? Is it responsible to launch an enterprise like this one with no investments on the horizon?
    iii. If this budget remains as is, how will you represent to NECHE that you have met standard 7 requirement of financial capacity?

14. This Consolidated College was advertised as a triumph for equity and even as an antiracist institution but cutting funding, increasing class sizes, reducing full time staffing etc are all time-tested austerity measures that have a proven track record of undermining the prospects of the working class and people of color. What is the relationship of this college to the aspiration of equity? How could it be understood as antiracist?

15. The course search page is clunky - the old search was highly functional. When will the new search page become functional?

16. How are sections selected for waitlisting? How long does a waitlist last? How was this policy established?

17. There is a new CPoS tool that will determine whether a course is in a student's program of study. It will need to interact with other programs that are currently inaccurate. It will be consequential for students' financial aid awards, and financial aid is on hold until approval of the OPEID. Isn't there a significant risk of both human and programmatic error once this is all integrated in the summer?
    1. Do the universities use this CPoS tool? If not, what do they use to ensure compliance?

18. Students usually register for courses while finishing the prerequisites for those courses. However, students sometimes fail those prerequisite courses and must
withdraw from the subsequent courses before they begin. Who will be checking to make sure that students who have failed a prerequisite course withdraw or are dropped from the course that requires the failed prerequisite?

19. CCS101 was inserted into the curriculum as a 'policy' even though it is a course and even though it was overwhelmingly rejected by governance bodies across the 12 colleges as well as at the consolidated college's general education workgroup. Is there a commitment to honoring governance going forward, and will there be a correction or apology for this violation?