

**Regular Meeting of the State of CT  
Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents for Higher Education  
Minutes  
February 19, 2021, WebEx**

**Present:**

Aime, Lois, Admin Fac, At-Large Rep, NCC  
Blitz, David, Fac, Chair, CCSU  
Breault, Benjamin, Admin Fac, Alternate, At-Large Rep, MCC  
Coan, Francis, Fac non-voting, TXCC  
Creech, Paul, Fac non-voting, CCC  
Emanuel, Michael, Fac non-voting, NWCCC  
Grace, Sean, Alternate, SCSU

Farquharson, Patrice, Fac, COSC  
Garcia-Bowen, Myrna, Admin Fac, SUOAF, CSU  
Long, Jennifer, Fac, Alternate, TRCC  
Picard, Ron, Fac, Alternate, NVCC  
Rajczewski, MaryBeth, Fac, ACC  
Richards, Barbara, Fac, HCC  
Sesanker, Colena, Fac, GWCC  
Stoloff, David, Fac, Alternate, ECSU  
Wilder, Linda, Admin Fac, COSC

**Absent:**

Brewer, Adam, Fac, non-voting, WCSU  
Gustafson, Robin, Fac, Alternate, non-voting, WCSU  
Kaufman, O. Brian, non-voting, QVCC

Ruggiero, Christine, Fac, Alternate, MXCC  
Shea, Michael, Fac, SCSU  
Wilson, Marvin, Admin Fac, Alternate, SUOAF, CSU

**Guests:**

Adair, Stephen, CCSU  
DeSantis, Greg, SO  
Gates, Jane, Interim President, CSCU

Klucznik, Ken, SO  
Latour, Fred, CCSU

[Voting Members: Aime, Lois, At-Large NCC; Blitz, David, CCSU; Farquharson, Patrice, COSC; Garcia-Bowen, Myrna, SUOAF CSU; ?, ECSU; Raczewski, MaryBeth, ACC; Richards, Barbara, HCC; Sesanker, Colena, GCC; Shea, Mike, SCSU; Wilder, Linda, COSC]

Meeting called to order by Chair, Colena Sesanker, at 1:06 pm. Meeting is being recorded as required.

- Approval of Agenda – Motion to approve: D. Blitz; seconded; approved unanimously
- Approval of 1/29/2021 Meeting Minutes – Motion to approve and seconded; approved unanimously
- Conversation with Dr. Gates
  - Wants to focus on ACME – CCET conversation – there were some misconceptions due to lack of clarity on the part of writers of ACME draft. GPA will not be used as sole placement measure. Default placement would be without supplemental support not accurate either. Another misconception was that draft was dictating curriculum. This was not what draft policy meant. Faculty will determine curriculum. Another misconception that algebra will be removed from math pathways. Misconception – draft policy dictates placement policies. ACME is an anti-racist policy. It sustains racial equality.
  - Comment – Doing away with developmental education would be detrimental to our students. Dr. Gates has research that states otherwise by giving students supplemental support.
  - Students who are at the lower level in developmental English/math will not be served well by eliminating developmental courses.
  - There was disagreement about how much math and English faculty were listened to in the creation of ACME policy.
- Chair Report:

**Regular Meeting of the State of CT  
Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents for Higher Education  
Minutes**

**February 19, 2021, WebEx**

- BOR ASA meeting on 2/05 – change to academic approval policy – concept papers are now optional. This was at request of some colleges.
- Update on SF – NECHE update will be in June, not April; 15 programs will be coming out in the next months – should follow TAP policy but it needs to be commented on in one month which does not allow it to go through a governance process.
- Email sent out to advise that many in Student Services will be reporting to an Assoc. VP of CSCC effective March 26
- FAC Chair & Co-Chair met with Matt Fleury, Merle Harris, Jane Gates, Alice Pritchard. They will meet again in a month. Trying to figure out how they provide input...not that it matters.
- Funding issues are a concern
- Co-Chair Report:
  - FAC report at BOR meeting was acknowledged as total report but not discussed nor incorporated into Minutes, while Mr. Ojakian's comments on report were included in minutes
  - FAC voiced a number of concerns. An amendment to the 12/17 minutes allowed these concerns to be entered (see page 2-3 of 12/17 minutes [https://www.ct.edu/images/uploads/BOR-Minutes\\_12-17-2020.pdf?110628](https://www.ct.edu/images/uploads/BOR-Minutes_12-17-2020.pdf?110628) )
  - Transition costs presented by Ben Barnes suspiciously low. Response was that ongoing costs are not being counted as transition costs. Example: printing new letterhead would be considered a transition cost while salaries for new college staff are not considered transitional.
- There was consensus on the fact that faculty and staff are being completely ignored in all processes pertaining to every consolidation committee.
- Will continuing this conversation be at all productive?
- Projection in 2017 missed actual cost of consolidation by about \$100M. Cost of SO keeps increasing and this year is up to \$69M with Shared Services projections.
- Fran Coan moves to endorse document created by Stephen Adair on costs related to consolidation (Response to Barnes). Seconded. Passed unanimously – linked:[[FAC RESPONSE TO BARNES FEB 2021 SF UPDATE](#)] and appended.
- Update on FAC resolution on relations with BOR and next steps:
  - Request joint bi-annual meeting with BOR
    - We are committee for the BOR and we requested same consideration as other committees to report on FAC issues at every meeting. Response – they are not ready to do this; re reporting – need to coordinate better with other committees
    - Will have another meeting after the next BOR meeting
- Should we send FAC minutes to NECHE? Perhaps we could synthesize minutes to highlight information that might pertain to NECHE standards.
- Resolution supporting proposed substitute language for placeholder study bill HB6402 and authorize Stephen Adair to meet with AAUP to make such revisions as may be required:

There shall be a study of the efficacy of the Board of Regents and the CSU system of governance from its inception in 2011 to the present especially since the inception of Students First in 2017.

The study shall include consideration of measures of student success, the relative cost of administration, and the effectiveness of communication, governance, and the setting of budgetary priorities between the Board of Regents and the 17 educational institutions.

The study may also include a review of the efficacy of alternative governance structures for public, higher education in other states.

The study will be conducted by a committee that shall consist of: X members of the Higher Education and Workforce Development Committee; 2 officials from the Office of Higher Education; 2 current members of the

**Regular Meeting of the State of CT  
Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents for Higher Education  
Minutes**

**February 19, 2021, WebEx**

BOR regents or their designees; 1 university President; 1 CEO or President of the Community Colleges; the chair and vice-chair of the FAC; and 4 faculty or staff (2 selected by CSU-AAUP, 1 selected by the 4Cs, and 1 selected by AFT);

In their report, the committee may include recommendations for reforms in the governance and/or budgeting structure of the Board of Regents and CSCU system or propose alternative structures of governance.

Motion made: David Blitz; seconded. Passed unanimously.

- FAC elections – need structure of committee for CCC elections
  - Concern was voiced about structure and process of elections
- There are lots of forms out there for curriculum submissions for new courses and new programs associated with the alignment of curriculum that should be filled out but it does not appear this is happening.
  - Response – no one seems to know what should be happening and how it should be happening
- Old Business – None
- New Business – None
- FAC Conference – 4/16 – save the date
- Motion to adjourn – David Blitz; seconded by Anthony – meeting adjourned 4:01 pm

**Next meeting: March 12, 2021**

Submitted by,  
Lois Aimé

**DRAFT**

## **RE      Comments and questions related to Ben Barnes's memo of February 8, 2021**

The memo dated February 8, 2021 by Ben Barnes to the BOR's Finance Committee compares the "Community College's actual performance over the past three years with the ... financial projections that were ... provided in our March 2018 submission to NECHE." We do not dispute any numbers provided in the document and concur that the actual expenses and revenues correspond quite closely with what was projected in March 2018.

The memo, however, invites the inference that the system office has been a careful and thoughtful steward of the system finances and that the implement of the consolidation corresponds closely to the expectations made in 2018. This inference is not warranted. The apparent accuracy of the 2018 projection is coincidental.

More importantly, the relative accuracy of the 2018 projections is of minor importance in comparison to the more urgent questions of the size of the state's investment in the consolidation and the relative likelihood of realizing a return on that investment in actual efficiencies and in student performance.

### **On the Apparent Accuracy of the 2018 Projections**

The 2018 report to NECHE projected that the total revenues for the Community Colleges would be \$492.1 million in FY 2021, which is now estimated as \$483.4 million – a variance of -1.8 percent. This is certainly within a range of reasonable expectations. On page 2, however, the Barnes memo reports that the projection for revenue from tuition and fees was \$185.9 million, but the actual revenue was \$155.2 million – a variance of -16.5 percent. The projected revenue for the state fringe support was \$132.0 million, but the actual revenue was \$170.9 million – a variance of 29.5 percent.

The memo also correctly points out that the 2018 projections did not and indeed could not predict the sharp drop in enrollment due to the pandemic that had a significant impact on the revenue from tuition and fees. Nor could it anticipate the increases in additional fringe support from the legislature to pay for fringe benefits out of the operating fund, which in FY 2021 stood at \$36 million. In other words, the gains in state fringe support were offset by the revenue loss from the sharp drop in enrollment. The confluence of these two unanticipated events – a coincidence – resulted in the FY 2021 total revenue being close to the 2018 projection.

This coincidence can be illustrated in a second way.

The Barnes memo reports that in March 2018 the total expenses projected for 2021 was \$502.6 million, which compares to the actual estimated expenses of \$512.2 million – a variance of 1.9 percent. This also seems in the range of any reasonable expectation.

The projected expenses for FY 2021, however, grew over time. In the April 2019 report to NECHE, the projected expenses for FY 2021 was \$526.7 M. In the June 2019 Finance Committee report, it was \$537.2 M. And in the June 2020, the Finance Committee budgeted \$544.2 M – a figure some distance from the \$502.6 million. In other words, the projection of expenses for FY 2021 proved to be much closer in March of 2018, than when the original budget was set in June. The sharp reduction in the actual expenses for FY 2021 followed the budget readjustment in the fall to address the significant enrollment declines due to the pandemic.

The apparent alignment between the projections in 2018 and the revenue and expenses in 2018 is coincidental.

There is also a rhetorical sleight-of-hand remark in the Barnes memo that warrants attention.

The footnote of page 1 reads:

“There was an earlier projection provided to the Board in December 2017 which assumed that the merger would be complete in 2019, but early discussion with NECHE led CSCU to extend the implementation to 2023. As such, these are the first detailed projections prepared in relation to the merger.

The footnote provides a rationale to ignore “the initial quantification of Students First” in December 2017 (which missed the June 2020 budgeted expenditures for FY 2021 by nearly \$100 million). The March 2018 projections, however, are taken from the original Substantive Change Application to NEASC (now NECHE). The 2018 application anticipated that the merger would be complete for the Fall 2020 semester. It anticipated that students graduating after July 1, 2020 would have degrees from the one college. The decision to extend the implementation to 2023 did not occur until after NEASC denied that application. The March 2018 projections were not made with an understanding that the completion date would be 2023. Thus, based on prudent planning, it would not be possible for the March 2018 projections to be accurate for FY 2021 because in March 2018 the expectation was that the consolidation would already be completed.

### **On the Cost of Consolidation**

The coincidental accuracy of the March 2018 projections, however, is of only minor importance. Of much greater significance for the legislature, for the Board of Regents, for Connecticut taxpayers, for students, and for all stakeholders in the Community Colleges is the total cost of the transition, the relative likelihood that real savings from that investment will be realized, whether or not the consolidated structure will eventually realize actual savings, and, most importantly, whether the state’s investment in the consolidation will result in improved student outcomes.

The CSCU system office and the Board of Regents has not yet produced such an accounting.

In “The Initial Quantification of Students First” in December 2017, zero dollars were allocated for the transition. In the Substantive Change Application to NECHE in March 2018, the total implementation cost for the consolidation was \$2 million. The June 2019 Finance Committee Report included implementation costs for the Student Success Center, Achieving the Dream, the Academic Consolidation, and Web Design that totaled over \$11 million from FY 2018-2024. In addition, it also budgeted for new positions that were more than offset by “eliminated positions.”

Not included in the list of expenses is the cost of the rehabbing of office space in New Britain for the one college; the changes in signage, stationary, and the multitude of new forms, brochures and documents; the cost of searches for the new senior positions; the ongoing transportation costs between the New Britain office and the campuses; the costs to create a single catalog, to recode all IT software, especially Banner, into a single instance, to unify student records, to institute common registration processes; and the costs of overtime to maintain necessary functionality when the new systems fail as happened with the BlackBoard interfaces at the start of this semester. Bureaucratic chaos is expensive.

The Barnes memo documents that full-time employees at the Community Colleges have been reduced by 153 non-faculty positions, a reduction of 7 percent. While this reduction reduced expenses by nearly \$14 million, it is likely that some portion of this reduction would have been necessary adjustments to the decline in enrollments. Total student FTE enrollment dropped from 27,532 in FY 2017 to 22,681 by October 2021, a reduction of 17.6 percent.

In addition, since 2017 the rate of growth in the Community College budget from 2017 to the revised budget of FY2021 has been greater at the Community Colleges than at the State Universities, 13.1 and 10.5 percent respectively. For comparison, the student FTE enrollment at the CSUs dropped from 26,308 to 23,692 over the same period, a reduction of 9.9 percent.

The Barnes memo also implies that there are no costs when someone is hired from within one of the community colleges to work at the system office or the new office for the one college. Although hiring within does save the cost of the recruitment and search for a new employee, it is not appreciably different from someone leaving a position and hiring someone from outside. The table on page 4 on Administrative Attrition would look different if it included the 46 employees hired into the system office from within.

In addition, hiring people from within has not been cost neutral, as it often has included a significant increase in pay. The table on the next page includes a partial list of employees hired from within to support the system office or the one college. The salaries were collected from the open payroll site on the State Comptrollers website.

The difference in the total salaries is \$990,107. If the fringe benefits are included the total expense for this partial list is roughly \$1.7 million. The cumulative cost of paying these salaries and fringe benefits through the transition is significant.

Finally, to the cost of the transition is the ever-increasing functional costs as people leave the colleges and are not replaced.

**Salaries of Recent Employees Added to System Office From Inside the System in 2018 and 2020 from a BOR Institution**

	<b>2018</b>		<b>2020 Title at System Office</b>	
Greg DeSantis	76,053	HCC	130,928	VP of Student Success and Academic Initiatives
Mike Buccilli	89,829	GCC	134,550	Assoc VP for Student Success Management
Francine Roselli-Navara	80,199	MCC	135,824	Interim Assoc VP of Academic Programs and Curr.
James Lombella	175,706	ACC	235,062	Regional President
Gayle Barrett	82,073	MxCC	134,550	Assoc VP for Enrollment and Retention Services
Tamika Davis	73,003	TxCC	134,550	Assoc VP for Recruitment, Admissions and Comm.
Ken Klucznik	102,918	MCC	134,550	Assoc VP for Academic Affairs
Diane Bordonaro	82,455	MxCC	130,000	Regional Workforce Development Officer
Leslie Cropley	80,233	COSC	89,932	Director of Project Management
Stephen Marcelynas	69,000	SCSU	107,610	Director for the Office of Transfer and Articulation
Eileen Peltier	106,816	ACC	150,632	Regional Workforce Development Officer
Kristina Testa Buzzee	95,000	NCC	130,000	Regional Workforce Development Officer
Carrie McGee-Yuroff	135,199	NCC	152,000	Regional Finance Officer
Jenn Gray	94,699	ACC	152,000	Regional Finance Officer
Gennaro DeAngelis	134,916	ACC	152,000	Regional Finance Officer
Margaret Van Cott	62,000	ACC	85,250	Admin Assistant to Regional President
Tanya Gibbs	52,764	GCC	79,693	Admin Assistant to Regional President
Kimberly Sorrentino	67,795	GCC	115,031	Interim Director of Regional and Specialized Accred.
Diane Clokey	70,699	ACC	87,916	Interim Director of the Course Catalog
Lori Angel	74,500	TRCC	86,298	HR Data Specialist
Mike Stefanowicz	71,877	ACC	134,550	Interim Assoc VP of Higher Education Transitions
Marlene Cordero	86,894	SCSU	98,739	HRSS Regional HR Manager
Tanya Millner	111,839	MCC	155,250	Interim Assoc VP of Teaching and Learning
Theresa Eisenbach	95,400	HCC	120,600	Direction of Recruitment and Talent Acquisition
Debra Freund	117,050	MCC	121,509	Manager of Diversity and Inclusion
<b>Totals</b>	<b>2,288,917</b>		<b>3,189,024</b>	

# Norwalk Community College Resolution on 6 Aligned Degrees and Certificates for the Proposed one-college –

The proposal by APRC (Aligned Program Review Committee) to align the below-listed programs in anticipation of the creation of one college, which, if established, will be made up of the remnants of the twelve currently independently accredited colleges, is fraught with any number of issues and concerns.

This group of six programs consists of: a) Criminal Justice AS Degree b) Criminology Studies AA (TAP) Degree c) Homeland Security Certificate d) Computed Tomography Certificate e) Mammography Certificate f) Magnetic Resonance Imaging Certificate. <https://www.ct.edu/curriculum>

In a different form, the two Criminal Justice associate degrees are part of the curriculum at Norwalk CC. None of the certificates are offered at Norwalk CC.

## General Statement on the Six Programs:

Norwalk CC will not approve any of these programs for several reasons. The most important being that none of these programs align with anything that is currently offered at Norwalk CC and we have not been given the needed time to review these courses and programs and have them work through our standard governance process. The courses that are not part of the current curriculum at Norwalk CC and the programs themselves, would have to go through a long, detailed, vetting process that would include a determination that these programs, including the courses that would be introduced as part of each of the programs, would be beneficial to the communities we serve and, thus, to the students we serve. In other words, would these programs and the courses that make up these programs provide our students with an education that would prepare them to be “active and responsible contributors to the global society,” as stated in the Norwalk CC Mission Statement, as well as prepare them for employment opportunities in the case of the Criminal Justice AS Degree and the Certificates, or prepare them to transfer to a four-year college, in the case of the Criminal Justice AA and AS Degrees.

## Specific Comments on Degrees/Certificates:

### a) Criminal Justice AS Degree:

- It does not meet the 30-32 Credit core required at Norwalk CC. Further,
  - There is no Inter-disciplinary course
  - There is no true science course
  - CCS 101 was not approved by Norwalk CC
- It does not match, in any way, the major requirements in the CJ AS degree currently offered at Norwalk CC
- Some of the concentrations offered as part of this degree would not be relevant to our students and to our communities in Fairfield County
- We are not interested in approving a “one size fits all” Criminal Justice degree that does not consider the needs of the communities we serve and the students we serve.
- We do not understand how the proposed Criminal Justice program could have “active articulation agreements” with the listed four-year schools when it has yet to be approved. In fact, we are concerned that our current articulation agreements would be in jeopardy based on this proposed curriculum.

### b) Criminology Studies AA (TAP) Degree:

- Norwalk CC has already approved the Criminology Studies AA (TAP) Degree. The proposed version is different than what was already approved. Therefore, Norwalk CC cannot approve this revised version for the reasons noted in the paragraph under *General Statement on the Six Programs* above.

### c) Certificates – Homeland Security; Computed Tomography; Mammography; Magnetic Resonance Imaging:

# Norwalk Community College Resolution on 6 Aligned Degrees and Certificates for the Proposed one-college –

- Norwalk CC has not been given enough time to research any of these certificates. Therefore, we do not know,
  - i. If these certificates will benefit the students who complete them by making them more employable in these fields
  - ii. If these certificates are relevant to the needs of the communities served by Norwalk CC and of the students served by Norwalk CC
- Some initial, basic research on the Homeland Security Certificate uncovered some issues. As stated in the documentation on the ct.edu website this certificate was developed with “Global Corporate College” and the TSA. We do not know what year this was, or how this was developed, but a search for “Global Corporate College” (already a suspect name), found a link that went to a “404 – Page Not Found” webpage that is somehow associated with College of Lake County, a community college in Graysville, IL. In addition, the address for this organization belongs to a doctor’s office, and the phone numbers listed on at least one website are not working. If this organization was viable at the time and is no longer in existence perhaps that should have been mentioned in the documentation. Although one might not know that by doing a superficial search on the internet.
- We are in no way insinuating that our sister colleges’ certificates are suspect. We are merely stating that for Norwalk Community College to approve any of these certificates we would need the time to thoroughly review them, their content, their value to Norwalk Community College communities and their value to Norwalk Community College students. We have not been allowed to do any of these things. Our shared governance process for doing this has been thoroughly disregarded.

---

Whereas the six degree and certificate programs submitted to the colleges for approval were not developed in an inclusive manner;

Whereas Norwalk Community College senate will not vote to approve any of these degrees or certificates as we have not had the time to review and vet these courses, degrees, and certificates to determine if they meet our criteria to support and benefit the communities and the students we serve;

Whereas there was no supporting curricular documentation submitted with these degrees and certificates that would have allowed us to review and vet these courses and programs if we had actually been given the necessary timeframe needed to do this properly; and

Whereas the shared governance process at Norwalk Community College has been effectively ignored by the System Office and the Board of Regents to move these programs through as quickly as possible and in so doing has attempted to disenfranchise and render meaningless our governance structure; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, that the Norwalk Community College Senate, as the shared governance body of Norwalk Community College, does not approve nor endorse the six degrees and certificates (a) Criminal Justice AS Degree b) Criminology Studies AA (TAP) Degree c) Homeland Security Certificate d) Computed Tomography Certificate e) Mammography Certificate f) Magnetic Resonance Imaging Certificate) put forward by the APRC (Aligned Program Review Committee).

---

**Approved by the Norwalk Community College Senate by a vote of 23 - 1**