

CT BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
MINUTES – REGULAR MEETING - 10:00 AM., THURSDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2015
61 Woodland Street, Hartford, CT

REGENTS PARTICIPATING

Nicholas M. Donofrio, Chair	Sarah Greco <i>via teleconference</i>
Yvette Meléndez, Vice Chair	Matt Fleury
Stephen Adair*	Merle W. Harris
Richard J. Balducci	David R. Jimenez
Robert E. Brown* ¹	Gordon Plouffe
Naomi K. Cohen	JoAnn H. Price ²
Lawrence J. DeNardis	Elease E. Wright

REGENTS ABSENT

William J. McGurk	Catherine H. Smith*
Jewel Mullen*	Dianna R. Wentzell*
Sharon Palmer*	

**ex-officio, non-voting member*

CSCU SYSTEM STAFF

Mark E. Ojakian, President
Estela Lopez, interim Provost & Senior Vice President, Academic and Student Affairs
David Levinson, VP Community Colleges & President, Norwalk Community College
Erin A. Fitzgerald, Associate Director of Board Affairs/BOR Secretary
Michael Kozlowski, Director of Strategic Initiatives
Alice Pritchard, Chief of Staff
Erika Steiner, Chief Financial Officer
Joe Tolisano, Chief Information Officer
Ernestine Weaver, Counsel
Candace Barrington, TAP Program Co-Manager and CCSU Professor of English
Ken Klucznik, TAP Program Co-Manager and MCC Professor of English

STATE UNIVERSITY/COMMUNITY COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

James Lombella, Asnuntuck Community College
Wilfredo Nieves, Capital Community College
Paul Broadie, Housatonic Community College
Gena Glickman, Manchester Community College
Anna Wasescha, Middlesex Community College
Daisy Cocco De Filippis, Naugatuck Valley Community College
Michael Rooke, Northwestern Connecticut Community college
Carlee Drummer, Quinebaug Valley Community College
Cathryn Addy, Tunxis Community College
Edward Klonoski, Charter Oak State College
John W. Miller, Central Connecticut State University
Mary Papazian, Southern Connecticut State University
John Clark, Western Connecticut State University

¹ Regent Brown exited the meeting at 12:19 pm

² Regent Price exited the meeting at 12:11 pm

CALL TO ORDER/ADOPTION OF AGENDA

Chairman Donofrio called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and, following roll call, declared a quorum present. **On a motion by Regent Balducci, seconded by Regent Harris, the agenda as presented was unanimously adopted.**

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At 10:04 a.m. on a motion by Regent Balducci, seconded by Regent Fleury, the Board voted to go into Executive Session for the following purposes

- 1 discussion concerning records related to security manuals or reports as well as Internal security audits of government-owned or leased institutions or facilities;
- 2 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
- 3 discussion concerning strategy related to collective bargaining.

Chairman Donofrio announced that no votes would be taken in Executive Session and invited FAC Chair Stephen Adair and FAC Vice Chair Robert Brown to remain with the Board for the first discussion topic. The following staff members were also directed to remain with the Board and CSCU System President Mark Ojakian in Executive Session.

Estela Lopez, interim Provost & Senior Vice President, Academic and Student Affairs
David Levinson, VP Community Colleges & President, Norwalk Community College
Elsa M. Nuñez, VP State Universities & President, Eastern Connecticut State University
Erin A. Fitzgerald, Associate Director of Board Affairs/BOR Secretary
Michael Kozlowski, Director of Strategic Initiatives
Alice Pritchard, Chief of Staff
Erika Steiner, Chief Financial Officer
Joe Tolisano, Chief Information Officer
Ernestine Weaver, Counsel

RETURN TO OPEN SESSION

At 11:43 am, 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 related to security manuals or reports as well as Internal security audits of government-owned or leased institutions or facilities (concluded at 10:40 am, after which, Stephen Adair and Robert Brown exited executive session);
- 2 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 (concluded at 10:58 am); and
- 3 discussion concerning strategy related to collective bargaining (concluded at 11:32 am).

CSCU SYSTEM PRESIDENT MARK E. OJAKIAN

President Ojakian introduced Alice Pritchard as his Chief of Staff and Sean Bradbury as the System's Legislative Program Manager. President Ojakian offered the following statement providing an update on collective bargaining and the ongoing labor negotiations with employee unions.

Starting with the faculty, the sixth bargaining session with AAUP is taking place today. The discussion is civil and professional, the atmosphere in the room is positive, and the parties are making meaningful progress on number of issues.

Tentative agreements have been reached on items that pertain to process and procedural improvements, clarification of ambiguity, and corrections that need to be made for the benefit of both parties. Tentative agreements on more substantive matters are in the works.

Negotiations with our other two major employee groups are also underway and Steve Weinberger, VP of Human Resources and Labor Relations is moving forward on that front.

A considerable amount of misinformation about the Board's goals in the AAUP negotiations has made its way into public discussions and, in an effort to correct it, I'm going to highlight some of the objectives we are **not** seeking to accomplish.

We are not looking to destroy public higher education.

We are not looking to privatize public higher education.

We are not looking to corporatize public higher education.

We are not looking to shift instructional delivery to an on-line platform.

We are not looking to reshape the workforce so that tenure stream faculty are replaced by adjuncts and other contingent employees.

We are not looking to strip or otherwise eliminate tenure rights.

We are not looking to terminate important faculty programs such as research, research grants, curriculum development, market adjustments, and conference funds.

Our objective in these negotiations is to produce a financially sustainable agreement that balances the interests of the faculty, the students and the taxpayers.

It is also our objective to obtain a reasonable amount of flexibility to allow the System to effectively respond to challenges and changes likely to face public higher education in the future.

These objectives will remain the same in all of our negotiations with our employee unions.

In closing, I am encouraged by the progress we have made with the faculty to date, and we remain committed to bargaining in good faith until a bilateral agreement is reached.

To that end, I will continue to update the Board on the status of our negotiations.

FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

FAC Chair Stephen Adair and Vice Chair Bob Brown referenced their previously provided report ([below](#)). Stephen Adair addressed the Board first providing an overview/framework of their report, followed by Bob Brown, who read a statement ([also below](#) following the FAC report). Following mutual commentary referencing their report, a discussion ensued among all Board members responsive thereto. Chairman Donofrio, at the conclusion of commentary, thanked the FAC members for their input and stressed that the Board's goal is, working together, to make the system the most effective and efficient system possible and work to provide maximum resources on the ground, to faculty and students, which will facilitate achieving that goal.

Faculty Advisory Committee Remarks to the Board of Regents for Higher Education – 12/3/15

On The Strategic Vision

Chair Donofrio, President Ojakian and members of the Board of Regents, we thank you for this opportunity to present.

We once again are here at a difficult moment for our system. Our colleagues and students in red and the noise from the patio are indicative of the challenges we collectively face and of the importance of the choices before you in charting a course for the future of public higher education in Connecticut.

All of us, the Board, the system administration, the faculty, and all support staff ought to be working toward an explicit, common purpose that is widely supported and guides decision-making.

That purpose is contained in our vision statement: "A continually increasing share of Connecticut's population will have a high quality post-secondary education that enables them to achieve their life and career goals and makes Connecticut a place of engaged, globally competitive communities."

To the extent that we realize this vision, we open economic opportunities, expand social mobility, enliven cultural expression, and improve the quality of life in Connecticut.

--

Two generations ago, many people realized economic security for themselves and their families through unionized work producing material goods. As we know, this once broad avenue of opportunity has been reduced to a narrow alley. Businesses and industries that once trained their own workers, now expect that their future workforce will receive training prior to employment. For the vast majority of the state's citizens, achieving a higher education degree or certificate is now the only route to economic security³, and for much of that majority, affordable and accessible public education is the only practical option.

³ See for example the recent report by Connecticut Voices for Children, "The State of Working Connecticut," November 2014. Available at <http://www.ctvoices.org/sites/default/files/State%20of%20Working%20CT%202015.pdf>

Nationally, the growing reliance on education as the only route to economic security is both cause and consequence of growing income inequality that has arguably become the biggest economic, political and social challenge of our time. In Connecticut, the problem is especially acute. While every state has seen income inequality grow over the last four decades, Connecticut, by far, has experienced the sharpest increases. We are the wealthiest state in the nation, yet we also have three of its poorest cities. Income inequality directly contributes to the significant educational achievement gap in this state.

The BOR system cannot solve the problem of income inequality on its own, but it cannot be meaningfully addressed without this system realizing its vision. If we fall short, we may continue to provide opportunities for the students who come to our doors – which is important -- but we will not have a meaningful impact on the overall quality of life in the state. Is there not a cruel irony in the fact that productivity and overall wealth continue to increase in Connecticut, while a growing portion of the population finds the ladder for mobility no longer supports the weight it should bear?

Over the last few years, this Board has watched with concern as student enrollments have declined across our institutions, and especially at the community colleges. The erosion has typically been attributed to the declining number of high school graduates. This attribution seems to invite this Board to reassess our fiscal condition and address declines that seem inevitable. But is not this sober bow to our demographic condition also a retreat from the promise of the system's vision?

The FAC recommends and encourages the Board to pursue policies and proposals to address and overcome the demographic challenge. We make this recommendation not only because we need to reanimate our common purpose under new leadership, but also because we believe in the moral imperative contained in our vision statement (which is unique to this system of public higher education).

We believe this system is well-positioned to expand enrollments for the following reasons:

- The most recent data from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) indicates that 44.3% percent of Connecticut's high school graduates who pursue a higher education degree leave the state. This is the fourth highest rate in the country.
- NCHEMS data also rank Connecticut last in the country in terms of the import/export ratio of college-going students.⁴
- A 2014 Connecticut General Assembly Report found that "private occupational schools accounted for about three quarters of the approximately 25,000 certificate program enrollments and 19,000 awards in academic year 2013." The report also found that the vast majority of these students are under thirty, and that "private occupational schools' student bodies were more racially and ethnically diverse than those of the for-credit community college programs."⁵

⁴ National Center for Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) Information Center. Data is available at www.higheredinfo.org. See data and graphs under tabs for College Access and College Participation Rates and Import/Export Ratio of College Going Students. Retrieved November 15, 2015.

⁵ Legislative Program Review and Investigations Committee of the Connecticut General Assembly. "Higher Education Certificate Programs," December 2014. Retrieved on November 15, 2015, p. Available at

- The General Assembly Report also found that costs per credit were on average about three times as much in private occupational schools as in the community colleges. The total cost for certificate programs in Dental Assisting, Medical Assistant, Paralegal, and Medical Coding, for example, were many thousands of dollars more in the private occupational schools than in the community colleges.⁶

Just as importantly, the decline in enrollments in recent years must be attributed, at least in part, to the rapid turnover in leadership at the system office that has hampered our ability to counter the trend with effective and decisive action plans. Since the merger four years ago, personnel changes have occurred in every senior administrative position. We now serve under our fourth President and our sixth chief academic officer, and these are both interim appointments.

Three years ago, in response to the demographic change, President Austin hired Maguire Associates for \$1.4 million to develop a marketing plan to shore up enrollments. Before their work was completed, President Gray pursued a different plan that led to ignoring the Maguire report. President Gray also sought the assistance of outside consultants to assemble a plan that never materialized.

These facts suggest that if the system can come together around a common purpose to realize the system's vision and its corresponding five goals, we can reverse enrollment declines.

--

The FAC offers the following suggestions:

1. Deepen our commitment to the success of under-served students

Expanding access to higher education will require the system to recruit students from across the state's education achievement spectrum. This needs to be more than simply a marketing plan (although we need that too). We must provide guided pathways to student success.

Our system should consider integrating aspects of programs developed at Georgia State University (GSU). From 2003 to 2014, GSU increased its graduation rate from 32 percent to 54 percent, while its share of Pell-eligible students increased from 31 percent to 58 percent. This remarkable achievement was based on a series of integrated strategies to improve achievement while reaching out to under-served student populations.⁷

The system response to PA 12-40, the developmental educational bill, led to a wide array of initiatives and strategies across the system. Because we are now developing the data

<https://www.cga.ct.gov/pri/docs/2014/Final%20Higher%20Ed%20Certificate%20Report%20for%20PUBLICATION.pdf>, p. 27.

⁶ See pages 32-33.

⁷ See Martin Kurzweil and D. Derek Wu, "Building a Pathway to Student Success," *Ithaca S+R*. April 23, 2015. Available at http://sr.ithaca.org/sites/default/files/reports/SR_Case_Study_Building_Pathway_Student_Success_042315_0.pdf

and the capacity to track student achievement across this array, we will soon be able to assess the relative merits of these diverse strategies to aid us in developing focused and effective interventions to build the skills and confidence necessary for student success.

The FAC sees much promise in the developmental programs at Middlesex Community College, as well as the academic and curriculum bridges between higher-ed institutions and area high schools in places like New Haven and Danbury.

We also could seek political support to supplement the Governor's scholarship program to target students in priority school districts who might otherwise see little hope or promise in educational attainment.

The FAC also fully endorses the recent initiative announced by President Ojakian to provide educational opportunities to people in correctional facilities.

2. Expand student services in targeted ways to improve student retention

Too often, students grow frustrated trying to navigate academic requirements, library and technological resources, and student financial aid. Targeted support services can be the critical difference in helping students overcome these obstacles.⁸

Dollar for dollar, perhaps the most effective way to improve student recruitment and retention would be to provide subsidized child care and child drop-in centers on campus. Many students are unable to pursue higher education or complete their degrees because of child-care responsibilities. In addition, families with young children and unmarried mothers may constitute the single most important population group in need of higher education opportunities. Subsidized child care would require considerable public support and investment. Perhaps the system could, at the least, initiate a cost-benefit study as a first step.

TANF recipients bound by work requirements that do not include schooling often find the pursuit of higher education impossible. Is it possible to redefine or re-categorize the requirements to open more opportunities for our poorest citizens?

Although modest in scope, the Go Back to Get Ahead Program seems to have achieved some success in bringing students back to complete their degrees. Perhaps we could follow this up with a small grant program to catch students before they go. All too often students nearing the completion of their degrees encounter short term financial problems that result in them leaving college, such as being barred from enrolling in classes because of small unpaid bills. Could we create a small supplemental support fund to help students of good academic standing overcome temporary financial obstacles that block them from completion?

⁸ See especially the work of the Community College Research Center at Columbia University. In *Redesigning America's Community Colleges: A Clearer Path to Student Success* (Harvard University Press, 2015), CCRC provides guide on student support services that are worth considering for implementation at CSCU.

3. Build certificate and degree programs to address workforce needs

The community colleges, state universities, and Charter Oak have long understood their responsibility to meet workforce needs. Many excellent programs across our system do just that.

The General Assembly Report on higher-education certificate programs, however, makes it abundantly clear that a large market remains for which the community colleges and COSC can offer a better value for Connecticut citizens.

Today's agenda includes a new certificate program at Three Rivers for precision sheet metal manufacturing and a new linked AS and BS degree at Gateway and Southern for public utilities management. These two programs have been thoughtfully crafted through collaboration with business and industry to meet critical workforce needs and to provide opportunities for students that tie academic attainment with employment.

Most importantly, as we continue to expand and pursue new programs in healthcare, gerontology, finance, biotech, infotech, construction management, engineering, advance manufacturing, and other fields, we need to simultaneously insist on social, political and economic support from the businesses and industries we serve. If students are now spending and incurring debt to receive the education and training they once received directly from their employer, then, we should - at the very least - request that business and industry acknowledge and support the public investment that makes this possible.

CBIA, more than anyone, should be our biggest cheerleader, and should be called on to support continuing public investment in higher education.

4. Maintain the commitment to a liberal arts education

Every degree student is required to complete a general education program to build academic skills and to provide a broad-based understanding of academic disciplines and realms of knowledge. The commitment to a liberal arts education is a hallmark in American higher education goes back to the turn of the last century when great waves of European immigrants came to settle in our cities. Among others, John Dewey reasoned that a broad-based education was necessary to inspire people to reach beyond ethnic parochialism to create a rational, democratic public and an educated citizenry. Echoes of Dewey remain in our vision statement, and his aims are as vital now as they were a century ago.

As the BCG survey of leaders of businesses, industries, and non-profits makes clear, employers seek employees with writing and speaking skills, numeracy, critical-thinking habits, and problem-solving abilities, which is what a liberal arts education provides.

A recent AAC&U report demonstrated that students who graduate with professional degrees are more likely to be employed and earn higher salaries in the years immediately following graduation, but in their peak earning years, people with liberal arts degrees on average earned more than those with professional degrees.⁹

⁹See "The Economic Case for a Liberal Education" Association of American Colleges and Universities, Revised 2015. Available at <http://www.aacu.org/leap/economiccase>

Emphasizing the false dichotomy between liberal arts education and workforce development is both cause and consequence of an impoverished utilitarianism that obstructs our vision. At the heart of the study of the sciences, the arts, human history, math, literature, and philosophy is the joy that comes with understanding the conditions of existence.

5. Build for academic excellence

As we expand our marketing efforts, develop programs to advance under-served students, target support services to improve retention, create new academic programs to meet critical workforce needs, and provide pathways to academic achievement and employment opportunities, we must, at the same time, pursue excellence. Quality matters.

The 44 percent of college-bound high school graduates who decide to attend an out-of-state institution constitute our largest potential market. Their decision is certainly not because CSCU institutions are more expensive than their out-of-state option, nor is it because these students are seeking an innovative low performer elsewhere. Instead, these students and their parents are making decisions based on their perceptions of academic quality, where we fall short.

At the state universities, building an academic reputation requires recruiting and retaining a highly skilled and diverse faculty. It requires the facilities and the institutional support for pursuing creative activity, extending community outreach, and securing external grants. It also requires the publication and dissemination of intellectual products, as well as the successful marketing of these achievements.

For the community colleges, excellence is achieved by the diversity of the educational services it provides to students and its communities. When students gain new vocational skills, learn and refine a craft, transfer into a four program before completing an associate degree, or gather supplemental course credits for their BA programs, the community colleges provide a necessary service not captured in a graduation rate.

In both the state universities and the community colleges, full-time faculty are a necessary element. Full-time faculty integrate individual courses into coherent departmental requirements, they provide better advice and guidance to students about their progress, and they stay abreast of advances in their discipline, which are all conducive to improved student success.

--

The system leadership and this Board face important choices. Each comes with certain costs and benefits.

Recently, management emphasized the need for greater "flexibility," an element not currently in the system's strategic plan.

There may well be broad support for flexibility if it is understood to mean a broadly trained faculty that makes our academic programs more robust and expands

interdisciplinary initiatives to advance our educational mission. If, however, flexibility is viewed as a management tool that will weaken tenure, reduce academic freedom, and minimize the role of faculty in defining the curriculum or in the hiring and review of colleagues, then you should anticipate a contentious and divisive struggle. We understand this latter notion of flexibility is of much greater value as a management tool in a context of declining enrollments. But we are offering an alternative. By uniting with a common purpose, the Board of Regents, the system administration, the faculty and support staff can realize the promise of our shared strategic vision.

I think I speak for all of my colleagues here in red, when I say that while the system office has been foundering these last four years, faculty and support staff have been working hard and effectively to meet the needs of our students, to move students to graduation, and to fulfill the missions of our institutions. I am confident I speak for all teaching and administrative faculty when I report that we perceive that we are now being asked to pay for an ineptitude not of our own making.

FAC Vice Chair Brown's Statement To The Board

I'm on this board as the co-chair of the FAC, representing the 12 community college. I'd like to take a few minutes to elaborate on our remarks as they pertain to the community colleges.

The first point I'd like to make is that our report is built on a foundation of optimism. It describes a series of steps that may, if implemented, lead to increased enrollments—reversing the defeatist outlook that, in recent years, has held that enrollments probably will shrink and the best that we can hope to do is maintain current enrollment levels

As our report points out, citing a 2014 General Assembly analysis, private occupational schools in Connecticut provide for three quarters of the approximately 25,000 certificate program enrollments in the state. At the same time, costs per-credit at the occupational schools were three times as high as at the community colleges.

Certificate programs are short-term training programs designed to provide skills that lead to jobs or that permit employees to advance in their companies. Often, they can be offered through our continuing-education, or not-for-credit programs. Even a credit-bearing certificate can be earned with 30 credits or fewer.

Our colleges have produced some glittering successes in occupational training.

I can cite the advanced manufacturing initiatives at Asnuntuck, Housatonic, Naugatuck Valley, Middlesex, and Quinebaug; the dental assisting and continuing education for electricians programs at my own institution, Tunxis Community College. These barely scratch the surface. Each community college offers career and occupational training on both the credit and continuing-education sides of the house. Today's board agenda, as our report mentions, includes a new certificate program for precision sheet-metal manufacturing at Three River and a linked AS and BS degree at Gateway and Southern for public-utilities management.

We can provide high-quality occupational training at a third the cost of the private occupational programs—yet three-quarters of the students in these programs attend the state’s private schools. Surely, there is opportunity for growth there in both students and, ultimately, finances.

To take advantage of these opportunities requires close collaboration with state employers who themselves once provided a substantial portion of their own employee training.

We must jointly identify immediate, short-term needs as well as pay attention to long-term trends. If employers will not provide job training for their workers, then we are the obvious candidate to do so—far more obvious than the private occupational schools. And it seems only appropriate that we should request employer support for these programs.

State business associations like CBIA and the Connecticut Manufacturing Alliance are our natural allies. They should be called upon to provide support for the programs that benefit their member businesses as well as lobbying assistance in the General Assembly. They should be, as our report states, our biggest cheerleaders.

There has been much discussion over the past couple of years about the “permanent fiscal crisis” facing both Connecticut government and the state college and university system. While state budget director Ben Barnes has backed away a bit from the phrase as it applies to the state as a whole, it is the case that the community-college system does exist at least on the fringe of crisis.

Yet the fact is that we remain the least expensive educational opportunity in Connecticut.

My Tunxis colleague, Bryan Bonina, is also state president of the Congress of Connecticut Community Colleges, which represents a large number of faculty and professional staff in the community-college system. In a series of op-ed articles that appeared in multiple Connecticut newspapers, he pointed out our importance.

We are not as affordable as we used to be. Tuition has risen over the past half-decade—though consistently less than for the University of Connecticut, which recently released a plan for multiple increases in tuition over the next four years.

Some figures:

UConn served 17,671 undergraduate students in 2013. That year, it spent \$514 million in instructional dollars. The community colleges, by contrast, serve more than twice as many students yet spent \$285 million.

UConn educates half as many students and spends almost twice as much on instruction.

The same circumstance holds true in the area of funds for student services—the libraries, tutoring services, and academic-support facilities that aid students who come to college lacking not the will but the preparation and resources to succeed from the start.

UConn spent \$50 million, or \$2,015 per student on these services. The community colleges spent \$42 million—or \$1,419 per student.

Student services at the community colleges have taken major hits during the years of enforced austerity. At Tunxis, our library is closed on Saturday—often the only day of the

week that our part-time students who work full-time can do their library research. Our academic-support center has reduced its hours. Tutoring services have been slashed even as more students arrive from high school in need of those services.

Student services shouldn't be viewed as superfluous to academic endeavors but rather vital components of a successful educational career. Fitness centers, libraries, academic support centers, and the child-care services that we mention in our report, aren't simply indulgences or niceties on campuses. They remove barriers to students' success.

Perhaps philanthropy or public/private collaborations between the community colleges and state businesses can close some of the budget gap. Certainly these opportunities should be pursued, especially since we are training employees who were once trained by their employers

Yet that is only half the story—perhaps even less than half.

For the reality is that our fiscal crisis is also a matter of flawed state priorities in which the community colleges, that serve the greatest number of students, continue to receive less than does a sister institution that serves far fewer students.

This is a case that must be made both to the state's private sector and to its public sector—the governor and the General Assembly.

We are in a fiscal bind because of priorities that must be re-examined and altered.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On a motion by Regent Balducci, seconded by Regent Fleury, the [October 15, 2015, Regular meeting minutes](#) were unanimously approved as submitted.

CONSENT AGENDA

Chairman Donofrio called for a motion on the Consent Agenda. **On a motion by Regent Harris, seconded by Regent Balducci, the items listed on the Consent Agenda below were unanimously approved.**

Terminations

Computer Aided Drafting Certificate – ACC
Publications Certificate – ACC
Software Development Certificate – ACC
Child Development Associate Prep Certificate – ACC
Community-Based Corrections Certificate – ACC
Fine Arts: Photography Option – QVCC
Fine Arts: Graphic Arts Option – QVCC

Modifications

Modern Languages-Specialization in Spanish – MA – CCSU
Health Information Management – Cert – COSC

New Programs

Environmental Systems and Sustainability Studies – BS – SCSU
Public Utilities Management – AS & BS – GCC, SCSU
Precision Sheet Metal Manufacturing Cert – Three Rivers CC

RESOLUTIONS APPROVED ON CONSENT:

Modification

International and Area Studies – BA – CCSU

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve modification of a program in International and Area Studies leading to a Bachelor of Arts degree at Central Connecticut State University to substantially change the curriculum and change the title to “International Studies.”

New Program

Dance Education – BS – CCSU

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education license a program in Dance Education leading to a Bachelor of Science in Education degree (BSED) at Central Connecticut State University for a period of three years until October 30, 2018

Terminations

Computer Aided Drafting Certificate – ACC

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the discontinuation of a program in Computer Aided Drafting, leading to a Certificate at Asnuntuck Community College effective December 15, 2015

Publications Certificate – ACC

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the discontinuation of a program in Publications, leading to a Certificate at Asnuntuck Community College effective December 15, 2015

Software Development Certificate – ACC

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the discontinuation of a program in Software Development, leading to a Certificate at Asnuntuck Community College effective December 15, 2015

Child Development Associate Prep Certificate – ACC

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the discontinuation of a program in Child Development Associate Preparation (CDA), leading to a Certificate at Asnuntuck Community College effective December 15, 2015

Community-Based Corrections Certificate – ACC

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the discontinuation of a program in Community-Based Corrections, leading to an Certificate at Asnuntuck Community College effective December 15, 2015

Fine Arts: Photography Option – QVCC

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the discontinuation of a program in Fine Arts-Photography Option, leading to an Associate of Arts degree at Quinebaug Valley Community College effective January 1, 2016

Fine Arts: Graphic Arts Option – QVCC

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the discontinuation of a program in Fine Arts-Graphic Arts Option, leading to an Associate of Arts degree at Quinebaug Valley Community College effective January 1, 2016

Modifications

Modern Languages-Specialization in Spanish – MA – CCSU

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve modification of the Masters of Arts in Modern Languages to allow for a wholly online option in Spanish at Central Connecticut State University.

Modifications (cont.)

Health Information Management – Cert – COSC

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve modification of the Health Information Management program to add a post-baccalaureate certificate at Charter Oak State College

New Programs

Environmental Systems and Sustainability Studies – BS – SCSU

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the licensure of a new program in Environmental Systems and Sustainability Studies leading to a Bachelor of Science (BS) degree at Southern Connecticut State University for a period of three years until December 30, 2018.

Public Utilities Management – AS & BS – GCC, SCSU

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the licensure of a new program in Public Utilities Management leading to an Associate of Science (AS) degree at Gateway Community College and a Bachelor of Science (BS) degree at Southern Connecticut State University for a period of three years until December 30, 2018.

Precision Sheet Metal Manufacturing Cert – Three Rivers CC

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the licensure and accreditation of a new program in Precision Sheet Metal Manufacturing leading to a Certificate at Three Rivers Community College.

ACADEMIC & STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

ASA Committee Chair Merle Harris spoke favorably regarding several of the items approved on Consent, noting the programs are evident of the innovative and vibrant institutions with the CSCU System: Southern's new program leading to a Bachelor of Science degree in Environmental Systems and Sustainability Studies as well as Southern's partnership with Gateway Community College and the utility company resulting in the Public Utilities Management Associates and Bachelors Degrees.

Following an overview by Committee Chair Merle Harris of the **proposed resolution concerning a New Doctorate of Nurse Anesthesia Practice (DNAP) – CCSU, on a motion by Regent DeNardis and a second by Regent Wright, the following resolution passed unanimously.**

New Doctorate of Nurse Anesthesia Practice (DNAP) – CCSU

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the licensure of a Doctorate in Nurse Anesthesia Practice (DNAP) degree at Central Connecticut State University for a period of three years until December 30, 2018.

Following an overview of the **proposed resolution approving a TAP Biology Pathway – CSCU** by Committee Chair Merle Harris, **on a motion by Regent Harris and a second by Regent Cohen, the following resolution passed unanimously.** As requested by Regent Cohen, the meeting minutes reflect and acknowledge the appreciation of the Board for the exemplary efforts of the TAP Co-Managers: Dr. Candace Barrington, TAP Program Co-Manager and CCSU Professor of English and Dr. Ken Klucznik, TAP Program Co-Manager and MCC Professor of English.

Resolution on TAP Biology Pathway – CSCU

RESOLVED: That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approves the Transfer and Articulation Policy Biology Pathway agreement developed by discipline faculty from the 17 Connecticut State Universities and Colleges. This pathway meets the specific requirements of the Board’s Transfer and Articulation Policy for seamless and transparent transfer in biology for students from any of the Community Colleges to each of the State Universities and Charter Oak State College.

Following ASA Committee Chair Harris’ overview of the proposed **resolution concerning Armed Police and Special Forces – CSCU (community colleges), on a motion by Regent Cohen and a second by Regent Fleury, the following resolution passed unanimously.** .

Armed Police and Special Police Forces – CSCU System (community colleges)

WHEREAS, In 1990 the Board of Trustees for the Community Colleges enacted Policy Manual section 4.20 “Weapons Policy - Central Naugatuck Valley Region Higher Education Center,” which allowed Police Officer Standards Training (POST) certified officers employed by the College the ability to carry firearms while on duty at NVCC; and

WHEREAS, In 1992 the Board of Trustees for the Community Colleges enacted Policy Manual section 4.23 “Weapons on College Campuses,” which prohibited the use or possession of weapons on college campuses or at college activities except as authorized by the Board; and

WHEREAS, Public Act 13-3 section 94 requires the Board of Regents for Higher Education in consultation with the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection to evaluate the effectiveness of establishing a special police force for each community college and replacing campus security personnel with a special police force; and

WHEREAS, In 2013 Elert & Associates (“Elert”) was consulted to assess safety and security at the twelve Connecticut Community Colleges and following its one year analysis presented its findings to the full Board in executive session; and

WHEREAS Elert recommended that campus security would be greatly enhanced with human assets, specifically armed POST certified officials who should be deployed at community college campuses; and

WHEREAS, In order to arm POST certified officials, the Board of Regents must amend its policy to allow such officers to carry weapons; and,

WHEREAS, The Board seeks to deploy state contracted security services as well as establish special police forces on community college campuses; and

WHEREAS, The President of the Board of Regents has designated administrative staff to consider issues as set forth in the Community College Safety Planning Outline and to provide recommendations for the President’s consideration; therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Board of Regents for Higher Education rescinds Community College Policy “*Weapons Policy – Central Naugatuck Valley Region Higher Education Center*” and adopts the following policy entitled “*Weapons Policy - Armed POST Certified Officers and Special Police Forces*”,

Those persons employed by Naugatuck Valley Community College as police officers, having been certified through Police Officers Standards Training, pursuant to Connecticut General Statute 29-18 are authorized to carry firearms while on duty on the premises of the college.

Those persons employed by a Community College, other than Naugatuck Community College, as police officers, having been certified through Police Officers Standards Training, are authorized to carry firearms while on duty on the premises of the college they serve provided that the college’s police department is designated a special police force pursuant to Connecticut General Statute section 10a-156b.

Those persons employed under contract to serve the College as police officers, having been certified through Police Officers Standards Training, are authorized to carry firearms while on duty on the premises of the college they serve provided that they are indemnified by their private employer under the employer’s contract with the State of Connecticut to provide security personnel.

and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Regents will seek amendment to Connecticut General Statute section 10a-156b “Special Police Forces” so that its statutory language includes community college campuses, to the extent that the individual colleges have need of special police forces, demonstrate readiness to operate a special police force, and agree to participate in ongoing training with the CSU institution in its region, in addition to required POST training.

AUDIT COMMITTEE

No report or action items for Board consideration.

FINANCE AND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE

No report or action items for Board consideration.

HUMAN RESOURCES AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

No report or action items for Board consideration.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

On a motion by Regent Wright, seconded by Regent Balducci, the 2016 Board Meeting Schedule (Attachment A hereto) was unanimously approved..

ADJOURNMENT

On a motion by Regent DeNardis seconded by Regent Wright, the meeting adjourned at 12:40 pm.

Submitted,

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

o:\board meetings\2015\december 3\bor-minutes-12-03-2015.doc

CT BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
REGULAR MEETING - 10:00 a.m., Thursday, December 3, 2015
61 Woodland Street, Hartford, CT

Attachments to Minutes and Meeting Handouts/ Presentations

Posted online at <http://www.ct.edu/regents/minutes>

A. **2016 BOR Meeting Schedule**



ATTACHMENT A TO 12/3/15 BOR MTG MINUTES
Board of Regents for Higher Education
2016 Meeting Schedule

Academic and Student Affairs 9:30 am	Audit 10:00 am Tuesdays unless otherwise noted	HR & Administration 1:00 pm Thursdays unless otherwise noted	Finance & Facilities 10:00 am Thursdays unless otherwise noted	Executive Comm. Meets when called. 10 am placeholders added to schedule on months Board is not in session	Board of Regents 10:00 am Thursdays unless otherwise noted
Friday, January 8		January 7	January 7		January 21 Hartford
Tuesday, March 8		March 3	February 18 after Exec.	Thurs., February 18	March 17 Central CSU
			March 10		
Thurs., March 24	March 15				April 7 Middlesex CC
Friday, April 29		April 28	April 14		Tuesday, May 10 Hartford
Friday, June 3	June 14	June 2	May 11, 12, 13 – W, R, F 9 AM Spending Plan ½ days		June 16 Hartford
			June 9		
<i>August full Board meeting is for consideration and adoption of Biennium budget; no other items anticipated moving forward.</i>			August 18	Thurs., July 21	August 25 Hartford <i>approve Biennium</i>
Thurs., August 25 [after BOR mtg]	September 13	September 1			September 15 Quinebaug Valley CC
Friday, Sept. 30		October 6	October 13		October 20 Southern CSU
Friday, Nov. 18		November 10	Friday, November 17 after Exec Committee	Thurs., November 17	December 8 Hartford
Friday, January 13	December 13	January 12	January 12, 2017		January 19, 2017 Hartford

12/3/15 APPROVED; 11/9/15

Unless otherwise noted, meetings are held at the Regents' Offices – 39 and 61 Woodland Street, Hartford (agendas will specify address and room location)

Info/contact: Erin Fitzgerald fitzgeralde@ct.edu, or 860 723-0013

w:\fitzgerald\board of regents\bor meeting schedules\2016 bor calendar 12032015.docx