CT BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING
10:00 a.m., Thursday, October 16, 2014
Asnuntuck Community College, Enfield, CT

REGENTS PARTICIPATING

Nicholas M. Donofrio, Chair
Yvette Meléndez, Vice Chair
Richard J. Balducci
Stephen Adair*
Eugene L. Bell
Robert E. Brown
Naomi K. Cohen
Lawrence J. DeNardis
Matt Fleury

Sarah Greco
Merle W. Harris
Craig S. Lappen
William J. McGurk
JoAnn Price
Stefan Pryor*
Catherine H. Smith* *via teleconference*
Elease E. Wright

REGENTS ABSENT

Jewel Mullen*

Sharon Palmer*

*e*x-officio, non-voting member*

BOR STAFF

Gregory W. Gray, President (via teleconference)
David Levinson, VP State Colleges & President, Norwalk Community College
Elsa M. Nuñez, VP State Universities & President, Eastern Connecticut State University
Michael Gargano, Provost and SVP for Academic & Student Affairs
Laurie Dunn, interim VP for Human Resources & Labor Relations
Keith Epstein, Vice President for Facilities, Real Estate & Infrastructure Planning
Erika Steiner, Chief Financial Officer
Joseph Tolisano, Chief Information Officer
Ernestine Weaver, Counsel
Erin A. Fitzgerald, Associate Director of Board Affairs/BOR Secretary

UNIVERSITY/COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Edward Klonoski, Charter Oak State College
James Lombella, Asnuntuck Community College
Elizabeth Roop, Housatonic Community College
Anna Wasescha, Middlesex Community College
Daisy Cocco De Filippis, Naugatuck Valley Community College
Carlee Drummer, Quinebaug Valley Community College
Jack Miller, Central Connecticut State University
Mary Papazian, Southern Connecticut State University
James Schmotter, Western Connecticut State University

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Donofrio called the meeting to order at 10:15 a.m. and declared a quorum present.

BOR CHAIRMAN NICHOLAS M. DONOFRIO

Chairman Donofrio introduced new Regent Bill McGurk to the Board.

BOR PRESIDENT W. GRAY

President Gray introduced ACC President Lombella who provided an overview of the college. Following President Gray addressed the board on the following items: enrollment, budgetary considerations, a marketing task force recently empaneled to improve retention, an Advanced Manufacturing Grant, and Transform 2020.

STUDENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SAC)

Student Regent and SAC Chair Sarah Greco read the following statement from the SAC to the Board and into the record:

To begin, I want to say that Eugene and I look forward to these joint meetings; we spend much of our time listening – to student concerns and ideas, to the many insightful questions from our fellow Board members, and to the presentations of campus representatives from across the system at the various committee meetings that we attend. We learn much from these encounters and eagerly anticipate the semesterly joint meeting when we can share some of our related thoughts and concerns.

Though the SAC has experienced many hurdles over the past few months, we are pleased to have all seventeen campuses represented again – and to have active student liaisons from many schools that previously struggled to participate. At our last meeting, we were finally able to approve a resolution regarding institutional aid for all students regardless of immigration status; this resolution will come before the Academic and Student Affairs committee at the December meeting. We have two additional resolutions on the horizon, and I am hopeful that our season of productivity will continue.

The representatives to the SAC want to be involved. But they face many challenges – academic commitments, family responsibilities, work obligations, and difficulties affording gas and related travel expenses. And since the SAC has not always been included in the Board of Regents' efforts, it has been difficult for many students to remain optimistic and excited about

serving on the committee. We do not want to be a dog and pony show. We would like to engage with the BOR initiatives beyond the two committee seats that Eugene and I hold. Our students want to serve their campus constituents, but how can they if they don't know what questions to ask or what information to gather? Too often it seems we are told what the system is planning to implement rather than what the system wants to know about its students.

Our committee can not function efficiently unless we are intentionally engaged more in BOR activities. But we also can not be successful unless we eliminate some of the logistical red tape. Thanks to the clear guidance of Tom Clark and Dr. Gargano, we are finally moving forward toward achieving the legislative changes necessary to ensure that the SAC structure is strong and consistent. But the process to certify our representatives is so tedious that the committee was unable to achieve quorum on two different occasions. We are hopeful that this was merely the result of a learning curve for many of the campus administrators, but clear, uniform language describing the expectations and processes for designating an SAC representative would go a long way toward ensuring that we are not stuck at a roadblock again.

One of the clearest concerns we have encountered repeatedly over the past few months is the feeling of disconnectedness among our peers and the faculty and staff at campuses across the system. One staff member in particular remarked recently, "Everyone's voice is gone." The lack of efficacy is perhaps felt even more strongly by individuals at the state universities who once felt incredibly connected and heard through the former Board of Trustees system. As just four among seventeen, it is evident how our university colleagues may feel less heard. And though we repeatedly hear the motto, "Students First," here at the system, it often feels as though students are consulted second, third, or simply as an afterthought. For example, while we appreciate the fact that a Transform student survey has been developed, it seems somewhat backwards to seek student input after the thirty-six Transform initiatives have been determined – and some have advanced to the initial implementation stages.

While Eugene and I do our best to represent the over 90,000 total students enrolled in our system here at the BOR, we believe that additional Board-driven surveys and student engagement initiatives would not only help students to feel more engaged in their education and heard but would also balance some of the Board initiatives to ensure that student needs truly remain central to our work. For example, while we appreciate the diligence of the information technology staff who explored George Washington University's work and research in the realm of smart classrooms, it would be interesting to see if Connecticut's 90,000 diverse students agree with the 25,000 students from this one private university. Perhaps we could

draw upon data and statistics gathered from our own campuses' research efforts to better understand Connecticut students' needs in the future.

In fact, we may have missed a pivotal opportunity to hear from CSCU students: it was disheartening to see so few students at the seventeen town hall meetings. During the handful of conversations I participated in regarding the planning of these town hall meetings, I repeatedly stated that it is incredibly important to encourage student attendance through a unified marketing effort driven by the system (using consistent flyers, banners, a Transform logo etc. at each campus, for instance). While the student roundtable discussions may encourage conversation and provide feedback from a handful of student leaders, there are thousands of students on our campuses who are not represented in these roundtables – students who might have been able to attend the larger town hall conversations and at minimum, learn a bit more about the Transform initiatives. We have not optimally utilized our students in the development of Transform; why not include a few students as initiative co-leaders who can work alongside the faculty designee or campus president? There are certainly initiative groups that could benefit from student leadership and input, after all.

Furthermore, there are many who believe that there is far less transparency in the system today – and not only pertaining to the monumental changes we are undertaking through Transform 2020 either. To be more specific, the Board of Regents recently approved a Sexual Assault Policy for the whole system. While this is certainly a thankworthy accomplishment, who was consulted from our seventeen institutions when this policy was being developed? If every BOR and CSCU employee is now a mandatory reporter, will we as a system offer training to these individuals so that they can learn ways to identify possible victims? And more importantly, do all CSCU employees even know that they have now been given this significant responsibility? Many of the community colleges do not have Women's Centers or professional staff members to handle reports of sexual assault. Will we be able to ensure that campuses have sufficient resources?

At the beginning of Eugene's tenure on the SAC almost three years ago, the issue of security on our campuses arose. Students were concerned by the lack – or complete absence - of security personnel on their campuses. We are pleased that the Board of Regents thoroughly researched this problem, and with the report now finally available, we await the implementation of the Board's findings.

Yet these discussions of security provoke an equally important question: what preventative measures do we have on our campuses? In October 2013, Eugene and I made our

first joint presentation to the Board after being elected just weeks prior. If you recall, I said (and quote): "Yet the students we are enrolling today need MORE services than ever before; students across the ConnSCU system are coming to us less academically prepared than ever before, and more of our students have great psychological and emotional problems. We are simply becoming unprepared to handle this influx." A subsequent conversation, though very brief, followed my remarks, and Regent Sharon Palmer asked about the emotional and mental health services that currently exist within the system. As I stated then and will reiterate now, we are not properly equipped to handle the needs of today's students. For example, none of our campuses have the ability to diagnose learning disabilities, and while today's elementary schools are doing a much better job with identification and diagnoses, many of our non-traditional students and even some of our recent high school graduates may have matriculated at our campuses without ever having been identified and properly trained to deal with their learning disabilities. Plus, diagnosis at private, external test centers is incredibly expensive, and to be honest, the students who were previously undiagnosed probably can not afford such testing. And if you question if this is a serious issue, think again: I am personally acquainted with a recent graduate from SCSU who had an undiagnosed case of ADD; in order to complete his assignments and barely scrape by his student teaching rotations, this student repeatedly borrowed – and occasionally stole – his roommate's Adderall. The abuse of prescription drugs is incredibly dangerous, as we all know, but this young man was desperate to focus and complete his academic requirements.

On a related note, for the last year, the SAC has been inquiring about the possibility for health resources at every campus, especially community colleges where there are no clinics or health centers currently available. As educational institutions, should physical health and health education not also be a provision – at least to a small degree – at our campuses? Likewise, we are facing unprecedented numbers of students who experience one or more emotional and mental health issues, but we have too few counselors and professional support staff at all of our campuses to work with these students. At many of our community colleges, in fact, there are little-to-no mental health support mechanisms in place. As we talk about security, we should keep in mind that "the number students seeking counseling for 'severe' psychological problems jumped from 16 percent in 2000 to 39 percent in 2012; the percentage of students who report suicidal thoughts has risen along with it" (Newsweek, February 11, 2014). And this first percentage only reflects the students already seeking counseling – not those who do not have the cognizance or resources to obtain such support. Increasing mental and emotional health

services and resources would likely improve retention rates as well as serve as a preventative measure.

Security, mental health, physical health, support services – these are all incredibly important issues for students within our system. These topics have arisen in conversations here at the Board of Regents, at the Student Advisory Committee, and among the students on each of our campuses. Yet we face a serious potential roadblock that may prohibit progress in any of these crucial areas – funding.

At the Student Advisory Committee meeting on Friday, October 10th, we had the great pleasure of conversing with Senators Beth Bye and Steve Cassano. While we covered many issues in higher education, one point became very clear: the legislature is going to think twice before granting additional monetary requests for security personnel or any other issue when the academic progress of students in CSCU is still hindered by problems like transfer of credits and lack of course offerings. Senator Bye quite clearly stated that the in-class experience of students is foremost, and while I personally agree, it would be shameful to sacrifice in areas of student wellness or student engagement because we continue to quibble over credits.

The Transfer and Articulation initiative is therefore vital to the success of our system, and it is crucial that we fully implement a process for easy and efficient transfer of credits – before our state sees legislative mandates for transfer and articulation like Florida did. Education should not be politically driven, and Connecticut's educational system is already too political, in my opinion. We need more than just general education requirements to transfer seamlessly too. We can not encourage and expect students to complete an Associate's Degree at a community college and transfer to a state university unless their general and major-specific credits will be accepted. They will simply go somewhere else. And my brother did just that; after taking an Anatomy and Physiology course at SCSU over the summer (because it was not offered at Gateway, where he was attempting to enter the nursing program), he was shocked and frustrated to find that the course did not meet Gateway's requirement. He proceed to retake Anatomy and Physiology at Gateway (which was not only redundant because he had just taken a nearly identical course at Southern but also because he had previously earned his EMT certification and had been working as a Patient Care Associate at Yale New Haven Hospital for four years). He eventually decided to enroll in the University of Bridgeport's program instead. Unfortunately, my brother's circumstance is not an exception in our system. Dr. Gray said it himself – without Transfer and Articulation, we might as well forget the rest of Transform.

As we think about enrollment and retention, it is hard not to become excited by the Regents Scholarship program. But its implementation may not be entirely well-received, as previously anticipated. What about the state universities, after all? The scholarship program inadvertently may cause students to begin at a community college who might otherwise have completed all four years at a state university. It is the transferring community college student who will receive the financial incentive – not a continuing junior at Eastern Connecticut State University. We can not assume that the student demographic will prevent such a problem, either, because not every student at a state university attends because he or she is seeking the traditional four-year residential experience. Southern is the perfect example; in 2013, just 37% of the undergraduate population lived in campus housing. The potential that the CSUs could lose first- and second-year students to the community colleges under this scholarship program is thus very real. What incentives might we consider developing for our faithful CSU students? What about the CSU undergraduates who immediately enroll in a graduate degree program at one of our universities? Graduate scholarships and grants are even less readily available than financial support for undergraduates, and our graduate programs are an area that could greatly benefit from increased enrollment. I fear that the commencement of the Regent Scholarship program may positively benefit one part of our system while negatively impacting another.

Finally, it is concerning that the current budgets for the majority of our institutions are in the red, even after the Go Back To Get Ahead initiative. Two of our state universities and eight of our twelve community colleges are facing deficits – up to $1.1 million dollars in some cases. I hope that our solution to our difficult financial situation will not be a tuition increase again. We must find other remedies, whether we look to recruit more out-of-state students through intentional, targeted marketing, or find innovative ways to draw more high school graduates from the decreasing pool of candidates to our system. It is still my sincere hope that we will keep tuition flat and move toward tuition decreases in the future – not continual increases.

Thank you.

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Stephen Adair, Chair of the FAC, read the following statement from the Faculty

Advisory Committee into the record:

"We have arrived at a critical moment in the new merged system.

After the rocky beginning due to the turnover in leadership, President Gray has now been in office for a year and a half. Over that time, he has brought stability to the system, assembled a new leadership team and administrative staff, secured additional state support that allowed this Board to limit tuition increases to 2 percent, launched a comprehensive planning process, and just completed a speaking and listening tour across the 17 institutions in the system.   As Transform CSCU 2020 moves from a list of initiatives to becoming concretized in roadmaps, action plans, system policies, and fiscal expenditures, the choices made by this Board, President Gray, the system leadership, and faculty in the coming months will have lasting consequence.

The FAC took advantage of the town halls to gather a sense of the concerns and issues of our colleagues. An FAC member or a designated representation attended each town hall and took notes that were shared, compiled and reviewed by the committee.   This report today aims to capture and represent that review.

On the initial charge to the FAC given by President Kennedy and Vice President Feroe, we were asked to bring faculty concerns to the Board and to be a window for the Board into the perspective of faculty.   The fulfillment of this responsibility requires candor, respect, and clarity.

1. Re-establish the distinct missions of the parts of the system.

When the new Board of Regents was proposed, perhaps the largest concern articulated in the state legislature was that the merged system might result in the conflation of our respective missions.   To prevent this, the legislation required that distinct mission statements be crafted, and established two vice presidential positions to advocate for the community colleges and the state universities respectively.

This board did pass distinct mission statements, but these are now just gathering dust. The separate statements were not used in the strategic planning process in 2012, and they have neither guided nor been integrated within the initiatives in Transform.   The two vice presidential positions remain, but their positions are not designated with essential functions in the organizational structure of the system office.

Having one plan, one set of initiatives, one set of metrics, and one value proposition for the system seems to bring clarity and simplicity to a very complex system, but the potential benefit of this clarity comes at a cost.

Last month, Provost Gargano reviewed the common metrics proposed in Transform. In his presentation, he indicated that some metrics would apply to the state universities and others to the community colleges or Charter Oak. Other common metrics, he stated, would be benchmarked differently by the type of institution. As a practical matter, then, the single set of metrics exists only as an abstract gloss that creates a mistaken impression that each institution is held to the same measures of accountability.

Transform includes one value proposition for the students, prospective students, parents, and the state, but this too, is more of an abstraction than an actual statement of the value the system offers. Students do not expect nor do they receive similar things from the community colleges, the state universities, and Charter Oak.   The strength of the system lies in the diversity of the educational experiences we offer students and the distinct contributions each type of institution brings to Connecticut citizens.   Homogenizing the value of the system into a single value proposition conceals the strength in that diversity.

If we suppose for a moment that UConn had also been merged into this system, then the problems of having one plan, one set of initiatives, one set of metrics, and one value proposition would be both more obvious and more acute.

In the town halls, many of the questions and concerns being articulated by faculty were a consequence   of conflating our distinct missions into a single plan. Faculty at the state universities were concerned that most of the initiatives were aimed at the community colleges, and that the plan failed to address both the chronic problems and the aspirations that faculty have for the universities.   Faculty at the community colleges often expressed concerns that their missions were being altered to serve as feeder schools for the state universities.

2. Academic Vision and Aspiration in Transform

Taken together, the 36 initiatives in Transform CSCU 2020 constitute a complex and ambitious platform for change, but it is difficult to discern an underlying academic and aspirational vision in the plan.

We believe that building faculty engagement and support for Transform will depend on establishing a clear and aspirational vision on how we can improve student learning and advance student success.

Throughout the town hall tours, President Gray has been generous and indicated that he is open to collaborating with faculty.

As part of your agenda, I have included as a supplemental document, "An Academic Imperative for Transform CSCU 2020." Responding to an invitation from Provost Gargano, a leadership group from CSU was assembled to craft an academic vision statement to guide change for the state universities. The group consisted of the faculty senate presidents, the chairs of the curriculum committees, the AAUP leadership and Chapter Presidents, and the CSU members of the Faculty Advisory Committee. The document provides a list of academic priorities that we see as essential to moving the system forward.

The FAC reviewed and supported bringing this document forward to the Board. The committee, however, chose not to endorse the document formally with a vote because there were no companion documents from the Community Colleges or Charter Oak at this time, and because it seemed inappropriate for community college faculty to vote on a document produced by the CSU group. Nevertheless, we invite the Board to adopt this academic imperative as a guide for change at the state universities.

We also encourage the faculty at the Community Colleges and Charter Oak to advance a similar vision statement.

Whether or not the Board is willing to adopt the academic imperative, we also urge that the Board and the administration maintain the pursuit of academic rigor, excellence, and quality as essential features of any aspirational vision. Retention and graduate rates can easily be improved by lowering academic standards.   Although accountability is important, the signature values for Transform should be changed from Affordability, Access, and Accountability to Affordability, Access, and Excellence.

3. System Integration

Rather than being organized by an academic vision, the core principle behind the 36 initiatives appears to be system integration and the process of linking 17 institutions into one system.

Many functions across the institutions might become more effective and efficient by becoming more integrated. For example, community colleges may be able to offer more opportunities for international education through affiliations with international education programs at the state universities.   Greater information sharing within offices of sponsored research might increase opportunities for external grants and encourage inter-campus collaborations.

System integration of functions, however, might also simply add additional levels of bureaucratic oversight, administration, and cost without any corresponding added service or value.

System integration of functions across campuses may also have the unintended consequence of making system administration stodgy, bureaucratic, and resistant to change. That is, if centralized procedures are institutionalized across campuses, then possibilities for further change would grow increasingly difficult because all the institutions would be dependent on the same structured process.

For each of the 36 initiatives in Transform, the integration of some function at the system level should be treated as a question rather than as an assumption, and deliberation on the question should be guided by careful needs assessment data and cost-benefit considerations.

Arguably the deepest antagonism revealed in the town halls between the interests of faculty and the vision included in Transform concerned the possibility of integrating courses and curricula across campuses. The idea that students enrolled at one institution would be able to take courses at any institution, the offering of a single course across multiple campuses through "genius" classrooms, and the proposal for a common catalog presume inter-campus agreements on course content, common sequencing of prerequisites and parallel program design across campuses.

The strength of the current transfer and articulation policy is that it preserves local control of curricula while clarifying student choices and reducing the likelihood that students will accumulate unnecessary credits when students move from the community colleges to the universities.

The overwhelming consensus in research on improving retention and graduation rates in higher education emphasizes the importance of building connections between students and the life of the campus. These connections might include building relationships between students or between faculty and students, as well as integrating students into clubs, sports, work-study opportunities, and rituals celebrating institutional identity.

Policies or incentives that encourage students to "swirl" between institutions contradict research findings regarding best practices on retention in higher education.   Much is risked and little is gained by encouraging students to identify with ConnSCU over their home institution.

4. Shared Governance

Faculty across the system expect that on all matters concerning academic standards and curricula design that principles of shared governance will be honored.

As the initiatives follow the road maps and become action plans, policies, and organizational structures, important academic and curricula questions will arise. Whether officially sanctioned or not, I am certain that faculty governance bodies across the system will be voting on a variety of resolutions addressing such matters.   I also anticipate that challenging questions will arise between the authority of system directives, Board policy, and the local votes on campuses.

Although not without its own tensions and problems, I believe the collaboration between the Board and faculty in designing, implementing, and reviewing TAP can serve as a useful model in addressing the governance matters.

The initial TAP policy was drafted by the system administration. The FAC solicited faculty feedback and brought ten specific revisions to this Board; eight of which were accepted into the policy. A faculty committee was subsequently supported by the Board to create a common GenEd framework for transfer. Tensions and differences arose regarding the necessity of campus votes on that framework, but we were able to work out a compromise that allowed the votes to continue with 15 of 17 campuses voting in favor.   In the resolution adopting the TAP framework, the Board acknowledged those votes without compromising its decision-making

authority. By working through this, we were able to avoid the type of enduring and bitter conflict between the Board and faculty that is still ongoing at CUNY over a less ambitious transfer policy.

Moving forward with Transform, we should seek to become a model for the nation on how principles of shared governance can be honored in the unfolding of a statewide higher education plan. A year from now I look forward to reading in the *Chronicle* a story that documents that model.

I hope this report has made clear what became evident from reviewing the notes from the town halls: the passion that both teaching and administrative faculty have for their craft and their dedication to serving students the citizens of the state. I am both honored and humbled to be here to represent their voices. "

Following the Advisory Committee's presentations, discussion ensued among Board members regarding the concerns addressed. Regent Greco reiterated the inability of the Student Advisory Committee to represent the concerns of the Board, without the assistance of the Board. She further noted that while some institutions had strong support by administration in support of the Student Advisory Committee, however, some campuses do not have active student government associations or student bodies. It was suggested to both the SAC and FAC that future reports be shared in advance with the Regents so as to facilitate a more meaningful dialogue at the Board meeting. Chairman Donofrio noted he would meet with the chairs of the SAC and FAC to hear their thoughts regarding opportunities for additional engagement.

APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES

On a motion by Regent Balducci, seconded by Regent Fleury, the following meeting minutes were approved as submitted, with Regent McGurk abstaining.

September 18, 2014

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Donofrio called for a motion on the Consent Agenda. **On a motion by Regent Cohen, seconded by Regent Bell, the items listed on the Consent Agenda below were** approved (McGurk abstained).

a) **Suspension of Existing Academic Program**
    i.   New Media Communication – Tunxis CC
b) **Modifications of Programs**
    i.   MBA Concentration in Accounting – Western CSU
c) **New Programs**
    i.   Business Administration – B.S. – Charter Oak SC
    ii.   Psychology – B.S. – Charter Oak SC
    iii.   Applied Behavior Analysis – M.S. – Western CSU
d) **Continuation of State University Centers and Institutes (5 year review reports)**
    i.   Center for Teaching and Faculty Development – Central CSU
    ii.   David M. Roth Center for Connecticut Studies – Eastern CSU
    iii.   Center for Communication Disorders – Southern CSU
    iv.   Center of Autism Spectrum Disorders – Southern CSU
    v.   Meteorological Studies and Weather Center – Western CSU
    vi.   Institute for Financial Literacy – Western CSU
e) **Discontinuation of State University Centers and Institutes (5 year review reports)**
    i.   David T. Chase Free Enterprise Institute – Eastern CSU
    ii.   Center for Financial Forensics and Information Security – Western CSU
    iii.   Center for Graphics Research – Western CSU
f) **Authorization to continue discussions re Middle College –** Capital CC
g) **Promotion & Tenure recommendation –** Central CSU
h) **FY15 Fee Adjustment** – Charter Oak State College

RESOLUTIONS ON CONSENT:

Suspension of Existing Academic Program
    New Media Communication – Tunxis CC
    RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve at the request of the institution to suspend a program in New Media Communications leading to an Associate of Science (AS) degree at Tunxis Community College for a period of not more than two years. The program must be reactivated or fully terminated by October 31, 2016.

Modifications of Programs
    MBA Concentration in Accounting – Western CSU
    RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve modification of the Masters of Business Administration program adding a Concentration in Accounting at Western Connecticut State University

New Programs
    Business Administration – B.S. – Charter Oak SC
    RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve licensure and accreditation of a new major in Business Administration, changing the current Concentration to a Major, leading to a Bachelor of Science degree at Charter Oak State College.

    Psychology – B.S. – Charter Oak SC
    RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve licensure and accreditation of a new major in Psychology, changing the current Concentration to a Major, leading to a Bachelor of Science degree at Charter Oak State College.

Applied Behavior Analysis – M.S. – Western CSU
RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve licensure of a
             program in Applied Behavior Analysis leading to a Master of Science (M.S.)
             degree at Western Connecticut State University for a period of three years
             until October 31, 2017.

Continuation of State University Centers and Institutes (5 year review reports)
Center for Teaching and Faculty Development – Central CSU
RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve continuation of the
             Center for Teaching Excellence and Leadership Development at Central
             Connecticut State University until December 31, 2021

David M. Roth Center for Connecticut Studies – Eastern CSU
RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve continuation of the
             David Morris Roth Center for Connecticut Studies at Eastern Connecticut
             State University until December 31, 2021

Center for Communication Disorders – Southern CSU
RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve continuation of the
             Center for Communication Disorders at Southern Connecticut State until
             December 31, 2021

Center of Autism Spectrum Disorders – Southern CSU
RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve continuation of the
             Center for Excellence in Autism Spectrum Disorders at Southern Connecticut
             State University until December 31, 2021

Meteorological Studies and Weather Center – Western CSU
RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve continuation of the
             Meteorological Studies and Weather Center at Western Connecticut State
             University until December 31, 2021

Institute for Financial Literacy – Western CSU
RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve continuation of the
             Institute for Financial Literacy at Western Connecticut State University until
             December 31, 2021

Discontinuation of State University Centers and Institutes (5 year review reports)
David T. Chase Free Enterprise Institute – Eastern CSU
RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve discontinuation of
             the David T. Chase Free Enterprise Institute at Eastern Connecticut State
             University effective December 31, 2014

Center for Financial Forensics and Information Security – Western CSU
RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve discontinuation of
             the Center for Financial Forensics and Information Security at Western
             Connecticut State University effective December 31, 2014

Center for Graphics Research – Western CSU
RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve discontinuation of the Center for Graphics Research at Western Connecticut State University effective December 31, 2014

Authorization to continue discussions re Middle College – Capital CC
RESOLVED: That Capital Community College continue discussions with the Hartford Public Schools Board of Education on the creation of Capital Community College Magnet Academy. Capital Community College will provide for review and approval by the System Office all contract terms and finance agreements. Upon review and approval by the System Office the formal review and approval will go back to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee and then the full Board.

Promotion & Tenure recommendation – Central CSU
RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the president's recommendations for instructional faculty tenure at Central Connecticut State University for William Fothergill and Jennifer Piatek.

FY15 Fee Adjustment – Charter Oak State College

WHEREAS,   The Board of Regents for the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities ("the Board") under its statutory authority - CGS 10a-6 - reviews and establishes fees annually for such purposes as the Board of Regents deems necessary, and

WHEREAS,   In March of 2014, the Board set Tuition and Fees for Fiscal Year 2015 for the Connecticut Colleges and Universities and Charter Oak State College (COSC), including a fee for portfolio assessment per COSC student per 3-unit class, and

WHEREAS,   COSC has reexamined its portfolio assessment fee as approved, and

WHEREAS,   COSC has determined that a per course fee is more accurate in relation to the intent of this assessment, therefore be it

RESOLVED,   That the Tuition and Fee Schedules adopted by the Board at their March 13, 2014 meeting are hereby amended, and be it further

RESOLVED,   That the rates reflected on the attached schedule (ATTACHMENT A) are effective at COSC as appropriate for FY2015, and be it further

RESOLVED,   That said rates may be reconsidered by the Board should circumstances warrant.

Attachment A – FY15 Fee Adjustment Charter Oak State College

Charter Oak State College		
FY2014 Actual Rates and FY2015 Proposed Rates		
		Proposed
	AY 2014 Rate	AY 2015 Rate
Tuition (Resident) per credit	$258	$263
Tuition (Nonresident) per credit	$339	$346
College Fee (Resident) per semester	$180	$184
College Fee (Nonresident) per semester	$240	$245
Tier II Fees		
Late Registration Fee per semester	$20	$40
Technology Fee per semester	$0	$50
Credit Assessment Program Review		
Nonprofit review of one Program or 10 courses and the 4 Year Review	$2,000	$2,200
For-Profit review of one Program or 10 courses and the 4 Year Review	$4,146	$4,229
Nonprofit additional review of up to 5 additional courses within 4 Years	$0	$475
For-Profit additional review of up to 5 additional courses within 4 Years	$0	$813
Credential Evaluation of License or Certification		
Matriculated students	$294	$300
CT non-matriculated students	$311	$317
Non-matriculated students, non-residents	$420	$504
Portfolio Assessment		
Assessment Fee for matriculated students per course	$273	$320
Assessment Fee for CT non-matriculated students per course	$354	$400

INFORMATION SECURITY POLICY (BOR CIO via Board-approved IT governance process)

Following an overview of the IT governance process by Chairman Donofrio, and a summary highlight of the resolution and proposed policy by CIO Joseph Tolisano, **on a motion by Regent Balducci seconded by Regent DeNardis, the following resolution was approved (McGurk abstained).**

INFORMATION SECURITY POLICY REQUIREMENTS TO PROTECT CONNECTICUT
STATE COLLEGES & UNIVERSITIES (CSCU)
INFORMATION ASSETS AND MEET FEDERAL AND STATE REQUIREMENTS
E.G., GRAMM-LEACH-BLILEY ACT (GLBA)

WHEREAS,   The Board of Regents (BOR) has set the National Institute of Technology and
          Standards (NIST) as the foundational requirement for data security, amongst all
          17 constituent units in their October 17, 2013 resolution.

WHEREAS, Prior to developing the necessary standards at the College and University level, an overarching policy must define the programmatic requirements of the Information Security Program, as set forth in the October 2013 BOR resolution.

WHEREAS, The Information Security Policy assigns ownership and accountability for meeting these Information Security requirements by delineating key roles and responsibilities in meeting CSCU Information Security objectives. Fulfilling these objectives will enable CSCU to implement a comprehensive system-wide Information Security Program.

WHEREAS,   The CSCU Security Program is framed on (NIST) and technical controls implemented based on SANS Critical Security Controls priorities. CSCU must develop appropriate standards and procedures required to support the BOR Information Security Policy**.** This policy will be further defined by standards, procedures, control metrics and control tests to assure functional verification.

WHEREAS,   The Information Security Policy has been developed through the Information Technology Governance Process; drafted by the Security Compliance Working Group, edited by the Information Technology Steering Committee and reviewed by the Investment Review Board; therefore be it

RESOLVED, The BOR Chief Information Officer recommends the adoption of the Information Security Policy attached hereto to protect CSCU information assets and meet our federal and state requirements, e.g. Gramm-Leach-Act (GLBA); therefore be it

RESOLVED, This policy fulfills the previously approved Board mandate that CSCU, through the IT Governance Process, shall have an Information Security Program that addresses the Availability, Integrity and Confidentiality of CSCU information assets and applies to all faculty, staff and students and is primarily administered by the campus leadership and local Data Stewards; therefore be it

RESOLVED, Detailed operating standards for each of the 17 critical areas outlined in the policy will be developed with specific procedures and guidelines necessary for each College and University to be complaint with the BOR security program; therefore be it

RESOLVED, Through the 17 standards, CSCU will protect resources from threats and ensure compliance with applicable laws and industry requirements, with the primary goal to guide users and administrators towards reasonable decisions and actions, within the framework of the standard.

SECURITY POLICY IS ATTACHED HERETO AS EXHIBIT A

ACADEMIC & STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Following an overview of the proposed policy by Academic and Student Affairs Committee Chair Merle Harris, **on a motion by Regent Fleury and a second Naomi Cohen, the following resolution was approved (McGurk abstained).**

Policy to Normalize Credit Hours for Associate and Baccalaureate Degree Programs

Whereas, the Board of Regents believes that public postsecondary education institutions must be concerned with issues and practices affecting access and affordability; and

Whereas, the Board of Regents' efforts to advance affordability could be enhanced by the institutions normalizing the credit required for completing an associate and baccalaureate degree; and

Whereas, the Board of Regents recognizes that normalizing associate and baccalaureate degree credit hours may significantly reduce the time to obtain a degree for many students; and

Whereas, the Board of Regents endorses a rigorous system-wide review of academic programs to be undertaken in collaboration between the institution's president and chief academic officer to determine if there are any excess credit requirements within their degree programs; now

Therefore, Be It Resolved that the Board of Regents authorizes and instructs the ConnSCU System President to require each President and Chief Academic Officer of a college offering an Associate and/or a Baccalaureate degree to:

1) Develop and implement a review process for each Associate and Baccalaureate degree program with the goal of normalizing the number of credits at 60 and 120 credit hours respectively without compromising accreditation and certification requirements. The review should also include the identification of institution and department policies that might contribute to excess credit hours required for graduation.
2) The campus excess credit hour review process should include a multi-year phased strategy that allows for sufficient time for the campus review committees to thoroughly consider excess credit hours.
3) Provide compelling rationale to maintain Associate and/or Baccalaureate degree programs with more than 60 or 120 credit hours following the completion of a campus-based review. In addition to accreditation requirements extenuating circumstances might include industry requests, labs and first year experience programs.
4) Campus appeal to continue offering Associate and Baccalaureate degree programs with more than 60 or 120 credits respectively will be presented to the System President and Provost. Upon consultation with the Academic and Student Affairs Committee a final recommendation will be offered and forwarded to the Board of Regents.
5) Effective with the Board of Regents approval of this policy all new program proposals are expected to meet the 60 or 120 credit objective unless there is substantiating rationale for additional credits.
6) Develop a communication process so that students understand the consequences of taking credits beyond those required for graduation, and

Be It Further Resolved that each affected campus will present its findings and recommendations to the System President and the Board of Regents for the initial set of academic programs

with excess credit hours no later than completion of the fall semester, December 2016, and;

Be it Further Resolved that approved recommendations to normalize Associate and Baccalaureate degree programs to 60 and 120 credits be implemented, no later than with the entering freshmen class for fall 2017 or the entering class of students appropriate for the campus.

FINANCE AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

Finance and Infrastructure Committee Chair Matt Fleury provided an overview of the FY2016-2017 Biennial Budget Expansion Options request. Additionally, staff members were on hand to provide detailed information regarding the following aspects of the proposal: security & safety; Regents Scholarship Program; Academic Advising; Early College; Developmental Education; Veterans Outreach; P20 WIN program.

FY2016/FY2017 BIENNIAL BUDGET EXPANSION OPTIONS

WHEREAS,   The Board of Regents for Higher Education (BOR) under its statutory authority shall "prepare a single budget request itemized by [constituent units]... and shall submit such budget request displaying all operating funds to the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management…", and

WHEREAS,   A proposed FY2016/FY2017 Biennial Budget Capital Request and Current Services Request, which includes continuation funding for positions projected to be funded through the General Fund and the Operating Fund; funding to meet known collective bargaining requirements; and funding to meet operating costs for new General Fund facilities projected to go on-line, has been submitted to the Office of Policy and Management (OPM), and

WHEREAS,   OPM has provided the Board the opportunity to request additional funds through Expansion Options for strategic initiatives and other currently unfunded priorities, targeted at student welfare; therefore be it

RESOLVED,   That the Board of Regents for Higher Education hereby approves and submits for review and recommendation to the Office of Policy Management a Biennium Budget Expansion Option request of $30.2 million and $45.4 million for FY2016 and FY2017, respectively.

and be it further

RESOLVED,   That these requests may be adjusted by the President of the Board of Regents as a result of guidelines issued by or discussions with the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management or for other technical purposes.

HUMAN RESOURCES & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Committee Chair Naomi Cohen provided an overview of the proposed policy, after which, **upon a motion by Richard Balducci seconded by Naomi Cohen, the following resolution was approved (McGurk abstained).**

Pre-Employment Background Verification Policy

WHEREAS,   The Board of Regents for Higher Education, in accord with the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities, comprised of seventeen institutions and a System Office, is committed to providing a safe learning and working environment for its students, faculty and staff, and

WHEREAS,   The Connecticut State Colleges and Universities seek to hire employees of the highest integrity in order to maintain a safe educational community, and

WHEREAS,   The Board of Regents for Higher Education has established a process to create and adopt policy that would supersede policies of the Boards of Trustees of the Connecticut State University System, the Connecticut Community Colleges and the Board for State Academic Awards; now therefore, be it

RESOLVED,   That the Board of Regents for Higher Education rescinds the following policy, "Pre-Employment Background Verification Policy at the Connecticut State University System" adopted pursuant to BR#05-008; and be it further

RESOLVED,   That the Board of Regents for Higher Education formally adopt the attached Pre-Employment Background Verification Policy effective November 10, 2014

Pre-employment Background Verification Policy
Connecticut State Colleges and Universities

Introduction/Purpose:

The Connecticut State Colleges and Universities System ("CSCU") is committed to providing a safe learning and working environment for its students, faculty and staff. Therefore, in order to ensure the hiring of employees of the highest integrity and to maintain a safe educational community, the CSCU System, comprised of its seventeen institutions and the System Office, will conduct pre-employment background investigations on all individuals for whom employment is to be tendered.

This policy sets forth the requirements and guidelines for performing such background investigations.

Scope:

Upon adoption by the Board of Regents for Higher Education, all full-time and part-time external candidates for employment with a CSCU institution or the System Office, as well as potential re-hires with a break in service of more than one year, shall undergo a pre-employment background investigation pursuant to this policy as part of the employment screening process. This policy covers all full-time and part-time employees, including University Assistants, Educational Assistants, Adjuncts/Lecturers and other temporary and contracted employees. Student workers, graduate assistants and graduate interns are not covered by this policy.

It is understood that there is movement in the CSCU workforce between institutions (including the System Office) due to transfer and promotional opportunities, as well as dual employment situations. This policy applies to these situations as detailed below:

The following CSCU employees shall be covered by this policy:
- CSCU employees who *apply for and are offered a transfer or promotional opportunity to a different CSCU institution and have not already undergone a background investigation.*
- CSCU employees who are candidates for *transfer or promotion to a management position at the level of dean or above* and who have not previously undergone a CSCU background investigation.

The following CSCU employees shall not be covered by this policy:
- CSCU employees who *apply for transfer or promotion within the same institution.*
- CSCU employees who *transfer to or become dually employed at a different CSCU institution and have already had a background investigation* done at the former CSCU institution.
- Former CSCU employees who are *rehired at the same or different CSCU institution* after a break in service of less than one year *and have already undergone a background investigation.*

Policy:

No external employment candidate may begin work for an institution or the System Office until the appropriate screenings have been completed. The background investigation may reveal certain information that may disqualify the candidate from further consideration for the position. Special circumstances may, on occasion, require an applicant to start work before all pre-employment background checks are completed.   Such exceptions may occur only with prior approval by the chief human resources officer at the institution, or the Vice President for Human Resources at the System Office. Written notification will be sent to the applicant that continued employment is contingent upon completion of a pre-employment background investigation acceptable to the institution or the System Office.

Elimination of a candidate from consideration for hiring on the basis of information revealed by the background investigation must be reviewed and approved by the chief human resources officer at the institution, or by the Vice President for Human Resources at the System Office. Access to the background investigation report shall be handled with the strictest confidence and be limited to the President and the chief human resources officer or their designees at the institution or the President of the Board of Regents for Higher Education or Vice President for Human Resources at the System Office or their designees.

Procedure:

The CSCU System shall select and contract with an approved background investigation vendor. All institutions and the System Office must utilize the approved designated background

investigation vendor for pre-employment background investigations and shall comply with this procedure.

1.   Notification & Authorization

Candidates will be informed during the pre-employment process that selection is subject to completion of a background investigation acceptable to the institution or the System Office. Applicants who have been designated as finalists for positions will be provided a disclosure and will be required to consent to a background investigation. Applicants will be required to provide information for use by the approved background investigations vendor. The institution's or System Office's chief human resources officer or designee will initiate all background investigations.

2.   Collecting Background Information

Before awarding the position, the institution or System Office will conduct the following Level I pre-employment background check of all candidates:

Level I Screening

- Social Security Trace;
- Prior Employment Verification (prior 7-10 years);
- Education Verification (highest degree attained or highest education level if no degree attained);
- Professional Reference Checks;
- County/Statewide Criminal Search (where lived, worked, attended school – as obtained from disclosure form or Social Security Trace);
- Federal Criminal Search (where lived, worked, attended school – as obtained from disclosure form or Social Security Trace); and
- Multi-Jurisdictional Criminal Search (includes National Sex Offender).

Before awarding the position, the institution or System Office will conduct the following Level II pre-employment background check on all candidates for executive-level positions (Dean and above) and at the option of the institution or System Office other positions that direct a substantial operational unit as designated by the institution's or System Office's chief human resources officer or president:

**Level II Screening
for Executive–Level Positions**

- Includes all elements of the Level I Screening; AND
- Motor Vehicle Record;
- State/Federal Civil Litigation;
- Credit Verification (in accordance with state and federal laws); and
- Media Search.

In addition, candidates for designated positions may also be subject to the following types of screenings, depending on the requirements of the position:

Position-Specific Screening

- Motor Vehicle Record (for positions that require driving as part of the job);
- Credit Verification (for positions that have a fiduciary responsibility, handle cash or credit transactions, or have a primary responsibility related to finance or budgets, in accordance with state and federal laws);
- Professional Licensing Check (for any positions that require a professional license); and
- International Screening – criminal search and credential verification, as needed.

Prior employment verification, education verification, professional reference checks and media searches may be conducted by the background investigations vendor or the institution/System Office at the option of the institution/System Office.

3.   Use of Background Investigation Results

Listed below are examples of factors that may disqualify an applicant for employment. This list is not an all-inclusive list, but is provided merely as examples):

- Inconsistency of information provided by the candidate versus that obtained by the background investigation. (Examples might include, but not be limited to, significant differences in prior employment dates, education obtained, or licenses held.)
- Omissions of significant information by the candidate. (Examples might include, but not be limited to, failure to disclose being dismissed for cause or loss of certifications qualifying the applicant for the position.)
- Unsatisfactory information uncovered by the background investigation. (Examples might include, but not be limited to the following: Felony or misdemeanor convictions related to the position applied for; unsatisfactory job performance on a prior job; poor attendance or disciplinary problems on a prior job; record of moving violations (for a job requiring driving an institution or state vehicle); credit history that would indicate an inability to manage finances or which would create undue personal financial pressure (for jobs handling management of significant financial resources).

4.   Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA") Compliance:

The FCRA and the regulations promulgated thereunder are intended to give a candidate for employment the opportunity to correct any factual errors in his or her consumer report, as defined in the FCRA, before an adverse employment action is taken. The candidate must be provided notice of any disqualifying information revealed by the consumer report, including, but not limited to, credit history information, and a reasonable period of time to correct discrepancies.

When the institution or System Office receives information in a consumer report that will potentially disqualify a candidate from consideration, the institution or System Office will comply with the following FCRA protocol:

- The candidate shall be sent a letter notifying him/her that the institution or System Office has received disqualifying information from the consumer report.
- To the letter shall be attached a copy of the report and a summary of the candidate's rights under FCRA and any relevant state required forms.
- The notification shall be sent to the candidate before any adverse employment action may be taken based on the consumer report.
- After five (5) business days, barring the receipt of any new information that changes or clarifies the consumer report and eliminates any discrepancies, the institution

or System Office shall send the candidate a second letter rejecting his/her candidacy based on the disqualifying information generated by the consumer report.

Services of the approved background investigation vendor may be utilized to produce the adverse action notifications, or the institution or the System Office, may produce the notifications themselves.

5.   Record Retention:

All information obtained, as part of a background investigation, shall be held in strictest confidence. Documentation of a successfully completed background investigation shall be retained for the appropriate retention period for employment records promulgated by the State of Connecticut and by institution or System Office personnel search policies and procedures. The detailed background investigation report shall be retained by the approved background investigation vendor in compliance with state and federal retention requirements and shall not be included in an employee's personnel file. Unauthorized disclosure of information gathered through the background investigation will not be tolerated and may subject the discloser to disciplinary action.

6.   Use/Review Criteria:

a.   Criminal Convictions: The institutions and the System Office will not knowingly hire applicants who have been convicted of job-related crime within the allowable reportable time period for reporting such offenses. This time period is normally seven (7) years. This also applies to those situations when the date of disposition, release, probation, or parole (whichever is most recent) relating to the crime occurred within the past seven (7) years.

Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes Sections 46a-79 and 46a-80, in determining whether conviction of a criminal offense will disqualify an applicant for a particular position, the following three factors will be considered:

- The nature of the offense and its relationship to the position;
- The degree to which the applicant has been rehabilitated; and
- The length of time elapsed since conviction.

Notification of rejection of employment will be sent via registered mail and will specifically describe the evidence presented and state the reason(s) for disqualification.

b.   Pending Criminal Charges: If the institution or System Office becomes aware that the applicant has criminal charges that are currently pending, but no court disposition has yet been made, the institution or System Office shall assess the criminal charges on a case-by-case basis to determine if the charges are job-related or would otherwise impact the potential employee's ability to serve in the position.

Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes Section 46-80(d), no record of arrest that was not followed by conviction, or record of conviction that has been erased, shall be considered in connection with an application for employment.

c.   Accelerated Rehabilitation: The institution or System Office is not prohibited from considering accelerated rehabilitation or other alternative dispositions when

evaluating an applicant. The institution or System Office shall consider the accelerated rehabilitation as it would a pending charge.

d.   Motor Vehicle Records Check: Motor vehicle records which evidence a revoked or restricted driver's license, invalid driver's license, or traffic violations (including, but not limited to, alcohol-related violations) shall be reviewed as they relate to positions requiring driving duties and in conjunction with all other factors disclosed by the background investigation.

e.   Credit History: An applicant's credit history shall be reviewed as it relates to jobs requiring financial responsibilities. An applicant's credit history shall be considered in conjunction with all other factors disclosed by the background investigation and shall not be a solely determining factor in denying employment.

Statutory/Administrative Regulation:

Fair Credit Reporting Act
Connecticut General Statutes, Sections 31-51i, 46a-79, 46a-80, 46a-80(d), 46b-146,
      54-760, 54-142a

Responsible Function Area:

Office of Human Resources

At 12:24 pm. on a motion by Regent Cohen, seconded by Regent Bell, the Board voted to go into Executive Session for the purpose of #1) discussion concerning records of standards, procedures, processes, software and codes, not otherwise available to the public, the disclosure of which would compromise the security or integrity of an information technology system and #2) for discussion concerning strategy with respect to collective bargaining. Chairman Donofrio announced that no votes would be taken in Executive Session. Chairman Donofrio directed President Gray, Erin Fitzgerald and Joe Tolisano to remain with the Board for the 1st discussion, after which Joe Tolisano would leave and then Michael Gargano, Ernestine Weaver, Steve Weinberger, David Levinson, Laurie Dunn would join the Board

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION

At 12:20 p.m. Chairman Donofrio announced that the meeting was in Open Session and that no votes were taken in Executive Session, which was limited to #1) discussion concerning records of standards, procedures, processes, software and codes, not otherwise available to the public, the disclosure of which would compromise the security or integrity of an information technology system and #2) for discussion concerning strategy with respect to collective bargaining

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Donofrio declared the meeting adjourned at 1:25 p.m.

Submitted,

Erin A. Fitzgerald, Associate Director, Office of Board Affairs
Secretary of the CT Board of Regents for Higher Education

s:\board of regents\bor meetings\2014\october 16\bor-minutes-10-16-2014.doc

Information Security

Identifier: IT-003	
Revision Date: October 16, 2014	Effective Date: March 1, 2015
Approved by: BOR	Approved on date: October 16, 2014

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

This Policy governs Information Security requirements to protect Connecticut State Colleges and Universities (CSCU) information assets and meet our federal and state requirements, e.g. Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (GLBA). CSCU is required to have an Information Security Program that addresses the Availability, Integrity and Confidentiality of CSCU information assets. These policies apply to all faculty, staff and students and are primarily administered by the campus leadership and local Data Stewards. This policy outlines 17 information security standards, from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), which form the foundational architecture of the security policy. Each security standard will have a more detailed standards developed to explain the specific implementation and policy requirements that each institution must meet to be in compliance.

Although no set of policies can address all scenarios of IT security, these policies and their subsequent detailed standards will outline procedures to secure CSCU data and assets. Their primary goal is to guide users and administrators towards reasonable decisions and actions, within the framework of the standard. The Chief Information Officer, working with the Chief Information Security Officer oversees information security activities and the development of these 17 detailed security standards. Through the 17 standards, CSCU will protect resources from threats and ensure compliance with applicable laws and industry requirements. CSCU IT resources, whether owned or contracted, will be configured to meet the requirements set forth in the 17 security standards. Agreements that involve a third party assessing or managing CSCU IT resources shall require the third party to be responsible for complying with the requirements within the various standards. The BOR, University and College are responsible for keeping computer systems protected from activities that could compromise the confidentiality, integrity and availability of the resource.

2. Purpose

The CSCU Information Security Policy is the cornerstone for the CSCU Information Security Program. The purpose of this Information Security Policy is to define what must be done to protect CSCU information assets for availability, integrity and confidentiality.

Secondly, the Information Security Policy assigns ownership and accountability for meeting these Information Security requirements by delineating key roles and responsibilities in meeting CSCU Information Security objectives. Fulfilling both of these objectives will enable CSCU to implement a comprehensive system-wide Information Security Program.

3. Implementation Methodology

CSCU needs to protect the availability, integrity and confidentiality of data while providing information resources to fulfill our academic mission. The information security program will be risk based. Implementation decisions will be made based on addressing the highest risk first. Using a layered ring approach, this policy will secure the inner ring, high risk data and systems,

with the tightest controls and the outer ring, public data, with lower controls. This strategy allows the CSCU system to protect the availability, integrity and confidentiality of our system while using the least restrictive controls on academic systems and public networks.

CSCU recognizes that at times implementing the NIST standards will not be possible because of technical or administrative limitations. CSCU will, whenever possible, implement the NIST standards and if unable to meet the NIST standards, document the exception. Exceptions because of technical limitations, e.g. legacy system cannot meet password requirements, will only need to be documented and submitted to the ISPO.

4. Policy Authority

This policy is issued by the Board of Regents for Higher Education for the Connecticut State Colleges & Universities.

5. Scope

- This policy classifies networks, access, and security standards based on the data classification that resides on that network. This policy requires a level security protection on all internal networks, but places the greatest security requirements on networks which contain and process confidential data.
- For contracted and third party services, it is recognized that the CSCU will protect data transported via a secure internet connection. The third party is responsible by BOR contract for the protection and management of confidential data per federal and state statute, this policy and mandatory terms and conditions.
- This policy applies to all information assets and IT resources operated by the CSCU;
- This policy applies to all information assets and IT resources provided by CSCU through contracts, subject to the provisions and restrictions of the contracts ; and
- This policy applies to all authenticated users of CSCU information assets and IT resources.

The CSCU Security Program is framed on National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and technical controls implemented based on SANS Critical Security Controls priorities. CSCU must develop appropriate standards and procedures required to support the Board of Regents (BOR) Information Security Policy**.** This policy will be further defined by standards, procedures, control metrics and control tests to assure functional verification.

The CSCU Security Program will be based on NIST Special Publication 800-53; this publication is structured into 17 control groupings, herein referred to as Information Security Standards.

6. Roles and Responsibilities

a. **Board of Regents (BOR):** (i) Issues Information Security Policy; (ii) Sponsors the Development and Implementation of a Comprehensive Information Security Program; (iii) Oversees the security of all CSCU Information Resources.

b. **BOR Chief Information Officer (CIO):** The BOR Chief Information Officer is responsible for the design, implementation, operations and compliance functions of the BOR Information Security Program for all CSCU constituent units. Their responsibilities include:

1. Establish the Information Security Program Office to assist in all the responsibilities and functions related to the BOR Information Security Program.
2. Designate a Chief Information Security Officer (CISO) or appropriate third party to manage the Information Security Program Office.
3. Annually provide the Board of Regents a report detailing the security program effectiveness and the risk.

c. **College and University Presidents:** The College and University Presidents are responsible for assuring that their respective institutions are complying with the BOR Information Security Program inclusive of all policies, standards, and procedures including managerial, administrative and technical controls for their institutions.

d. **Chief Information Security Officer (CISO):** The Chief Information Security Officer is appointed by the BOR CIO and manages information security throughout CSCU. The CISO, under the direction of the BOR CIO, is responsible for the development, implementation and maintenance of a comprehensive Information Security Program for the CSCU. This includes security policies, standards and procedures which reflect best practices in information security. The program with be based on standards developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

e. **Security Compliance Working Group (SCWG):** The Security Compliance Working Group will be advisory to the CISO, BOR CIO, local IT Leadership and the College and University Presidents. Their primary function is to develop and draft policy requirements working closely with the CISO and campuses based on the security standards. The SCWG will be available to perform security assessments of the standards at their respective campuses.

f. **Contact Information:** To report security incidents, abuse or questions. Please ensure you include your local University or College reporting structure.

ISPM, Jeff Clark: jclark@commnet.edu
CIO, Joseph Tolisano: tolisanoj@ct.edu
General Email: SecProg@ct.edu

7.   Information and Information System Classifications

CSCU will establish security categories for both information and information systems. The security categories will be based on the potential impact on CSCU should certain events occur which jeopardize the information and information systems need by the organization to accomplish its mission, protect its assets, fulfill its legal responsibilities, maintain its day-to-day functions, and protect individuals. Security categories will be used in conjunction with vulnerability and threat information in assessing risk and controls.

8. Provisions for Information Security Standards

Access Control

CSCU will limit information system access to authorized users, processes acting on behalf of authorized users, or devices (including other information systems) and to the types of transactions and functions that authorized users are permitted to exercise.

Awareness and Training

CSCU will: (i) ensure that managers and users of information systems are made aware of the security risks associated with their activities and of the applicable laws, Executive Orders, directives, policies, standards, instructions, regulations, or procedures related to the security of CSCU information systems; and (ii) ensure that CSCU personnel are adequately trained to carry out their assigned information security-related duties and responsibilities.

Audit and Accountability

CSCU will: (i) create, protect, and retain system audit records to the extent needed to enable the monitoring, analysis, investigation, and reporting of unlawful, unauthorized, or inappropriate information system activity on protective enclave systems, specific to confidential data and confidential networks, at a minimum; and (ii) ensure that the actions of individual information system users can be uniquely traced for all restricted systems.

Assessment and Authorization

CSCU will: (i) periodically assess the security controls in CSCU information systems to determine if the controls are effective in their application; (ii) develop and implement plans of action designed to correct deficiencies and reduce or eliminate vulnerabilities in CSCU information systems; (iii) authorize the operation of CSCU information systems and any associated information system connections; and (iv) monitor information system security controls on an ongoing basis to ensure the continued effectiveness of the controls.

Configuration Management

CSCU will: (i) establish and maintain baseline configurations and inventories of organizational information systems (including hardware, software, firmware, and documentation) throughout the respective system development life cycles; and (ii) establish and enforce security configuration settings for information technology products employed in organizational information systems.

Contingency Planning

CSCU will establish, maintain, and effectively implement plans for emergency response, backup operations, and post-disaster recovery for CSCU information systems to ensure the availability of critical information resources and continuity of operations in emergency situations.

Identification and Authentication

CSCU will identify information system users, processes acting on behalf of users, or devices and authenticate (or verify) the identities of those users, processes, or devices, as a prerequisite to allowing access to CSCU information systems.

Incident Response

CSCU will: (i) establish an operational incident handling capability for CSCU information systems that includes adequate preparation, detection, analysis, containment, recovery, and user response activities; and (ii) track, document, and report incidents to appropriate CSCU officials and/or authorities.

Maintenance

CSCU will: (i) perform periodic and timely maintenance on CSCU information systems; and (ii) provide effective controls on the tools, techniques, mechanisms, and personnel used to conduct information system maintenance.

Media Protection

CSCU will: (i) protect information system media, both paper and digital; (ii) limit access to information on information system media to authorized users; and (iii) sanitize or destroy information system media before disposal or release for reuse.

Physical and Environmental Protection

CSCU will: (i) limit physical access to information systems, equipment, and the respective operating environments to authorized individuals; (ii) protect the physical plant and support infrastructure for information systems; (iii) provide supporting utilities for information systems; (iv) protect information systems against environmental hazards; and (v) provide appropriate environmental controls in facilities containing information systems.

Planning

CSCU will develop, document, periodically update, and implement security plans for CSCU information systems that describe the security controls in place or planned for the information systems and the rules of behavior for individuals accessing the information systems.

Personnel Security

CSCU will: (i) ensure that individuals occupying positions of responsibility within organizations are trustworthy and meet established security criteria for those positions; (ii) ensure that CSCU information and information systems are protected during and after personnel actions such as terminations and transfers; and (iii) employ formal sanctions for personnel failing to comply with CSCU security policies and procedures.

Risk Assessment

CSCU will periodically assess the risk to organizational operations (including mission, functions, image, or reputation), organizational assets, and individuals, resulting from the operation of organizational information systems and the associated processing, storage, or transmission of organizational information.

System and Services Acquisition

CSCU will: (i) allocate sufficient resources to adequately protect CSCU information systems; (ii) employ system development life cycle processes that incorporate information security

considerations; (iii) employ software usage and installation restrictions; and (iv) ensure that third-party providers employ adequate security measures, through federal and Connecticut state law and contract, to protect information, applications, and/or services outsourced from the organization.

System and Communications Protection

CSCU will: (i) monitor, control, and protect CSCU communications (i.e., information transmitted or received by CSCU information systems) at the external boundaries and key internal boundaries of the information systems for confidential data transmissions; and (ii) employ architectural designs, software development techniques, and systems engineering principles that promote effective information security within CSCU information systems.

System and Information Integrity

CSCU will: (i) identify, report, and correct information and information system flaws in a timely manner; (ii) provide protection from malicious code at appropriate locations within CSCU information systems; and (iii) monitor information system security alerts and advisories and take appropriate actions in response.

9. Enforcement

Enforcement is the responsibility of the local University or College president or designee. For purposes of protecting the CSCU network and information technology resources, the BOR Chief Information Officer will work in conjunction with College/University President and the respective campus IT department, as requested remove or block any system, device, or person from the CSCU network that is reasonably suspected of harming or causing potential risk to CSCU information technology systems or network. These non-punitive measures will be taken to maintain business continuity and information security; users of the College/University information technology resources will be contacted for coordination and assistance.

10. No Expectation of Privacy

There is no expectation of privacy in the use of CSCU IT resources. CSCU reserves the right to inspect, monitor and disclose all IT resources including files, data, programs and electronic communications records without the consent of the holder of such records. Please see the State of CT Electronic Monitoring Notice.

11. Exceptions

Compliance with this Information Security Policy is mandatory. All CSCU entities must comply with the roles, responsibilities, and security policies statements set forth in this document to ensure the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of institutional information. Further, CSCU entities must ensure that contractors engaged by them are aware of the security controls required by federal and Connecticut state laws and regulations and these controls are agreed to within the contract. CSCU recognizes that some portions of the Information Security Policy may have to be bypassed from time-to-time because of technical or business reasons.

Accordingly, exceptions may be made provided:

1. The need for the exception is legitimate and approved by the BOR CIO or designee and local University or College president, who ultimately holds the risk
2. The exception does not disrupt or compromise other portions of the CSCU service delivery capability.
3. The implementation of the exception is vetted through and approved by the IT Steering Committee.
4. The College/University IT department must be able to establish a monitoring function to assess the operations of the implementation exception. Monitoring will be approved by the BOR CIO.
5. The exception has a defined lifecycle, in that the "retirement" of the exception is scheduled (e.g., "when Release 4.9 is implemented," "at contract termination," etc.)

12. Exception Request

To request an exception, please submit the Information Security Exception request to, secprog@ct.edu that is responsible for briefing the BOR CIO and appropriate administrators.

The requestor and BOR Information Security Program Office will define the approved alternative configuration if different than the original proposal of the requestor.

The exception process is NOT an alternative to the Change Control Management process.

13. Disclaimer

CSCU disclaims any responsibility for and does not warrant information and materials residing on non-CSCU systems or available over publicly accessible networks. Such materials do not necessarily reflect the attitudes, opinions or values of CSCU, its faculty, staff or students.

14. Related Publications and Guidance –

NIST 800-53, FIPS-199

This Information Security Policy defines mandatory requirements for protecting information. It is issued in accordance with:

- Board of Regent Policies and Resolutions Connecticut General Statutes Code of Federal Regulations United States Code
- State Data Retention Schedule S6

15. Revision History

Previous versions of this policy

- None

Policies superseded by this policy

- CSU – Supersedes BOT Resolution 06-9 and 06-10 for the policy only.
- The CSCU Information Security Standard is not superseded by this policy. As standards are developed in support of this policy they will supersede sections of the standard.
- CCC – 1.1 IT Policy Common Provisions is superseded by this policy. Remaining CCC policies will remain in effect until standards are developed to support this policy.

16.   Definitions

Access Controls: The technology, processes, and procedures used to limit and control access to information technology (IT) resources; these controls are designed to protect against unauthorized entry or use.

Accounts: User accounts are the means of access for real people to a computer system, and provide separation of the users' activities with the system environment, preventing damage to the system or other users. User accounts are assigned a username

Active Directory: A software system that stores, organizes and provides access to information in a directory created by Microsoft. It is responsible for authenticating and authorizing all users and computers within a network.

Administrator: See System Administrator.

Authentication: The act of verifying the identity of a user and the user's eligibility to access computerized information.

Authorization: The function of specifying access rights to resources.

Availability: The state of a system in a functioning condition.

Business Continuity Plan (BCP): A document describing how an organization responds to an event to ensure critical business functions continue without unacceptable delay or change.

CAS: Known as Central Authentication Service, CAS permits a user to access multiple applications while providing their username and password only once.

Chief Information Security Officer (CISO): Head of the Information Security Office.

Computer Maintenance: Tasks that must be performed on computers in order to keep them running at optimal efficiency. These tasks include applying security patches, running and maintaining antivirus software, and keeping the computer and data secure.

Confidentiality: Secrecy

Credit Card Data: Data that identifies a credit card account. This data includes primary account numbers (PAN), service codes, expiration date, magnetic stripe or storage chip data, and card validation codes.

Critical Systems and Data: Systems and data that are essential to the operations of the University of to a specific department.

Data: Records and information in a form suitable for use with a computer.

Data Administrators: People who are responsible for applying appropriate controls to data based on its classification level and required protection level. These people are usually system administrators

Data Stewards: People with the responsibility of ensuring the proper handling of administrative, academic, public engagement, or research data.

Data Restoration Procedures: The process used to reinstate data that has been backed up.

Data Users: People that read, enter, or update data.

Desk Audits: The act of reviewing documentation to verify technical and procedural details.

Development Environment: Software staging system, where development takes place that is separate from the actual system

Disaster: A negative event that lasts longer than the maximum tolerable downtime

Recovery (DR) Plan: A document that outlines how the University will respond to a disaster and resume critical business functions within a predetermined period of time with minimum amount of loss.

Electronic Protected Health Information (ePHI): Electronic confidential patient information that must be secured against unauthorized exposure as per HIPAA.

Encrypted Data: Data that has undergone the process of encryption

Encryption: A technique used to transform plain text so it is unintelligible but recoverable.

Encryption Key: The input into an encryption algorithm that allows the data to be encrypted.

File Auditing: The logging of opening, modifying, or deleting files on a computer.

File Sharing: Distributing or providing access to electronic data files, usually via a network connection.

Firewall: A network device used to block network access to Information Technology resources

HIPAA: The Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act address the security and privacy of health data.

Incident: An attempted or successful event resulting in unauthorized access, use, disclosure, modification, or destruction of information or interference with systems operations in an information system.

Information Security: Administrative, physical and technical controls that seek to maintain confidentiality, integrity, and availability of information.

Information Security Awareness Training (ISAT) Program: Training of University faculty and staff regarding the protection of various information technology resources.

Information Security Office (ISO): The unit responsible for overall information security functions for the University.

Information Technology: The act of managing technology, including computer software, information systems, computer hardware, and programming languages.

Information Technology (IT) Resources: Tools that allow access to electronic technological devices, or are an electronic technological device themselves These resources include data; computers and servers; desktop workstations, laptop computers, handheld computing and tracking devices; cellular and office phones; network devices such as data, voice and wireless networks, routers, switches, hubs; and peripheral devices.

Insecure Communication Networks: Data networks that are designed without security requirements in mind.

Integrity: The trustworthiness of information technology resources.

Live simulations: Imitating certain events in order to help test processes and procedures

Log Harvesting: IT resources used to collect logs from various information technology (IT) resources.

Logging: The process of electronically recording activities of IT resources.

Malware: Malicious software designed to disrupt computer operation, gather sensitive information, or gain unauthorized access to information technology (IT) resources.

PCI-DSS: An IT standard for organizations that handle credit card data.

Personally Identifiable Information (PII): Data that can be used to uniquely identify, contact, or locate a single person or can be used with other sources to uniquely identify a single individual.

Production Environment: Final working stage of software development or network planning when product is rolled out to users.

Protected Health Information (PHI): Confidential patient information that must be secured against unauthorized exposure as per HIPAA.

Public computers: Computers that may be used by anyone in the general public

Recovery Point Objective: The maximum tolerable period in which data might be lost from an IT Service due to a breach or malfunction.

Recovery Time Objective: The duration of time and a service level within which a resource must be restored after a disaster (or disruption) in order to avoid unacceptable consequences associated with a break in availability.

Regulated Data: Information whose dispersal is determined by permission constraints, some users have access, while others do not.

Remote Desktop: The ability to control the keyboard and mouse of a computer from a remote location.

Restricted Data and Protective Enclave Networks: Networks and Systems that process and access confidential data, on restricted and isolated networks, with unique logins, restricted systems and white listed to only site required for restricted processing.

Risk Assessment: An analysis of the potential risks and vulnerabilities to the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of IT resources.

Security Vulnerability: A security exposure in an operating system or other system software or application software component which an attacker can exploit to gain access to the systems programs or data.

Server: A computer program running to serve the requests of other programs, the "clients".

Screen Lock: An automatic lock of a computer such that it may not be accessed without a username and password.

Shibboleth: A method of allowing sites to make informed authorization decisions for individual access of protected online resources in a privacy-preserving manner.

Software Patches: A piece of software designed to fix problems with, or update a computer program or its supporting data.

Spam Messages: The use of electronic messaging systems (*e.g.*, email) to send unsolicited bulk messages indiscriminately.

Strong Password: A password that requires extensive resources to guess using either brute force algorithms or human common sense.

System Administrator: A person employed to maintain and operate a computer system or network.

Tabletop Testing: A gathering of relevant individuals to review a specific process in order to improve or update the process.

Test Environment: Staging software development or network construction where the product is stress tested and bug tracked before final deployment.

Third Party: not the original creator of a product.

Threat: An action or event that possess a possible danger to a computer system and the potential for exploitation of vulnerability.

Unencrypted Data: Plaintext data that has not undergone the encryption process.

Users: People authorized to use information technology (IT) resources.

Virus: Malware that uses it host to propagate itself to other hosts.

Walkthroughs: A simulation of a process via a gathering of individuals in order to test and improve the process.

Whole Disk Encryption: Process by which the entire hard drive of a computer is encrypted