

**Regular Meeting of the State of CT**  
**Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents for Higher Education**  
**Minutes**  
**August 19, 2022 WebEx**

**Present:**

Aime, Lois, Admin Fac, At-Large Rep, NCC  
Blitz, David, Fac, Chair, CCSU  
Cunningham, Brendan, Fac, ECSU  
Dunne, Matthew, Fac, HCC  
Emanuel, Michael, Fac, alternate, NWCCC  
Goh, Bryan, Fac, alternate, MXCC  
Long, Jennifer, Fac, alternate, TRCC  
Lumbantobing, Rotua. Fac, WCSU

Muldoon, Linsey, Fac, Alternate, MCC  
Picard, Ron, Fac, alternate, NVCC  
Rajczewski, MaryBeth, Fac, ACC  
Robinson, Dyan, SUOAF, CSU  
Sesanker, Colena, Fac, Vice-Chair, GWCC  
Shea, Michael, Fac, SCSU  
Stoloff, David, Fac, alternate, ECSU  
Trieu, Vu, SUOAF, CSU alternate

**Absent:**

Andersen, Jonathan, Fac, alternate, QVCC  
Blaszczynski, Andre, Fac, alternate, TXCC  
Farquharson, Patrice, Fac, COSC  
Fisher, Mikey, alternate, SCSU  
Gustafson, Robin, Fac, Alternate, non-voting,  
WCSU

Jackson, Mark, Fac, Alternate, CCSU  
Perfetto, Linda, Admin Fac, alternate, COSC  
Wilder, Linda, Admin Fac, COSC  
Yiamouyiannis, Carmen, Fac, alternate, CCC

- Meeting called to order by Chair Blitz, at 1:05 pm. Meeting is being recorded as required.
  - Approval of July 15 minutes – Motion to approve – Colena Sesanker, seconded – approved unanimously
  - Approval of Agenda – Motion to approve – Lois Aime, seconded – approved unanimously
- Co-Chair Community Colleges Report –
  - “Realignment” of Regional Presidents – the 3 regional presidents moved into roles as Executive Vice-Presidents – see attached announcement of 8/12/22 re these positions along with others. In this Nicole Esposito was reinstated as CEO of Manchester CC
    - The Regional Vice President reorganization was predicated on the Nicole Esposito lawsuit settlement which, as part of that settlement, noted that the Regional VP in that area was not allowed to supervise her in any way.
    - Unclear right now how or if the regional structure will continue to function
    - New structure should also have to go through BOR approval
  - Resolution on Dept. Chairs
    - Believe this was distributed last May and was approved in some form by about 10 colleges. (see attached). Motion to endorse resolution – Lois Aime, seconded – no discussion; approved unanimously with one abstention
  - Accreditations of constituent 12 CT community colleges –
    - Is NOMINALLY retained right now, but decision-making on most levels has been taken away from the individual community colleges
    - Might look at alternative option of maintaining accreditation of the individual community colleges during the transitional period and even as CSCC becomes accredited in case this does not work out. Don’t really know if this is legally feasible or would be entertained at all by the System.
- Co-Chair Report on Universities
  - WCSU – Rotua Lumbantoging of WCSU presentation -

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

**August 19, 2022 WebEx**

- 2012-2021 – Reserves (UNP) dropped from \$24.5M to **-\$2.3M**
- May 13 – met with Cheng and was told WCSU would not get any help from CSCU System
- May 18 – WCSU senate passed vote of No Confidence in President John Clark
- Faculty/staff/some administrators working to evaluate long and short term solutions for solvency
- June 16 – Clark resigned as President; Interim put in for 2-year period
- BOR balanced budget for FY23
- Management – declining enrollment, high labor costs, and running 2 campuses contributed to financial issues; Labor – mismanagement, lack of transparency, lack of communication, lack of shared governance contributed to financial issues
- Management refused to supply financial data to working groups; work with students; families, and community; inform public through media outlets, local politicians, etc.
- Questions – Why no support from CSCU? Isn't that why they exist? Shouldn't they have seen this unraveling? They should have been reviewing these issues on an annual basis. If they refuse to release financial data, why not FOIA it? They are working on that.
- Question – What do you see solution? They want to see real data behind this to find out what's going on. They have not been able to get these numbers. 1) need to find out what happened 2) do a cost-benefit analysis of all the ideas of the working groups. Where do we go from here?
- Question – The BOR appointed this President as they do all of the Presidents/CEOs and they evaluate them on a yearly basis. How can they abdicate responsibility for any of this or say the support WCSU in cleaning this up?
- There are reserves at CSCU SO of \$10s of Millions. There is a statutory requirement that the BOR look into the distinct missions, including funding.
  - New funding formula for CSUs – CCSU – reduced by \$1.35M; ECSU increased by \$200,000; SCSU – reduced by \$3M; WCSU – increased by nearly \$4M
  - This could be a wedge-issue in pushing to consolidate state universities next
- COVID-19
  - BOR Executive Ctte. Resolution of 8/19/22 – relinquishes responsibility from BOR/CSCU SO to Governor's office with additional Resolve that would require CSCU President to act on issues within the system as necessary.
- FAC Conference
  - Dyan Robinson, Mary Beth R. and Carmen Y. have met to speak about what this might look like. Some ideas might be something on consolidation, ACME, something with relevance, but unsure if this could be on-ground or virtual. Fall semester might present a “teaser” and have something more comprehensive in the spring.
- Question – was there a response to the email from the FAC regarding the statement in the Introduction to the Strategic Plan about the FAC giving such valuable input, when this was patently untrue? No, there was no response.
  - As an FYI, this has been sent to NECHE, with that statement still there, as part of the report they were required to submit on 9/01/22. See below email to CSCU and BOR.

**Next Meeting: September 09, 2022;** submitted by FAC Secretary, Lois Aimé

§

**From:** Blitz, David (Philosophy)

**To:** Cheng, Terrence; Ryan, JoAnn (External Contact); CTState-President

**Cc:** Kathuria, Rai; Bloom, Ira; Balducci, Rich (External Contact); Sesanker, Colena; Heleen, Pamela

**Subject:** FAC comments on "Draft Strategic Plan"

**Date:** Thursday, July 21, 2022 10:34:28 AM

From: David Blitz, Chair of the FAC to the BOR

Re: CT State Community College Draft Strategic Plan

Date: July 21, 2022

The FAC at its meeting of July 15th discussed the "CT State Community College Draft Strategic Plan through Academic Years 2023-2025", which I had obtained and previously circulated to members of the FAC. While I realize that the document is marked "Draft (for Review and Feedback)", it contains serious errors reflective of the kind of problems faculty and staff have faced in the "Students First" process. I will focus on just the cover letter as this is indicative of the flawed process that underlies the document as a whole, and renders it of no value. On p.1 the draft states the following about the CT State Executive Strategic Planning Council that prepared the draft:

"The inclusiveness of this process cannot be overstated or underestimated. More than 50 people have served on the, and membership consisted of faculty, staff, and administrators, with representatives from all the campuses and CT State. Importantly, students have also served as council members. We are thankful to all the Council members, as well as to all the individuals who provided feedback to council members. On p. 2 this is followed up with a list of 48 individuals, none of whom are identified as to their status – either in terms of their status as faculty, staff, administrators or students, or in terms of their affiliation to one of 12 "campuses" or "CT State". It is therefore unclear how many or what proportion of the Council are in any of the constitutive groups previously mentioned. The consequence of this is not just lack of clarity. There is an obscuring of relevant information, which clearly was available to the drafters but which they saw fit to exclude. A preliminary search for affiliations of the indicated individuals reveals very few faculty, and none from the FAC. The paragraph from the draft continues: "We want to also express our deep appreciation to the Faculty Advisory Council to the Board of Regents, who provided honest and earnest feedback during the development of the plan. Each time we engaged the FAC, we got useful feedback from them, and the Council subsequently incorporated their comments into our planning work."

As chair of the FAC, I can state without hesitation that this is simply false. In the first place, the FAC is the Faculty Advisory *Committee* to the BOR, not the Faculty Advisory *Council*. This might be considered as a mere slip (which is repeated twice) or simple ignorance, but the authors of this document compound the error with the claim that the FAC (however designated) provided substantial ("honest and earnest") feedback, "comments" which were "subsequently incorporated... into our planning work". This is not the case.

While we did invite at their request and on one occasion each, Tanya Milner (past chair) and Terry Brown (co-chair) to meetings of the FAC, we indicated at both meetings that the content of their presentations were inadequate to anything we could consider to be a framework for a strategic plan. In particular, we noted the lack of any reference to the determining role of faculty in developing curriculum and pedagogy, the lack of guarantee for the continuation of the existing colleges, vague terminology without content about shared governance, and more. Not only is the document fundamentally flawed as to content or lack thereof, the FAC never had any follow-up, or saw, never mind commented, on the draft plan.

Therefore, to claim that faculty in any significant way participated in the draft is unsubstantiated, and the further claim that the FAC contributed in any meaningful way to the draft is incorrect. If this were just a one-off the matter it might be less significant than it is. To the contrary, the problems illustrate a strategy that has been persistently used by the System Office – claiming faculty participation in committees from which faculty have withdrawn or merely attended on one or a few occasions, and then claiming – as has been done above --, that dozens or more faculty have participated in preparing a document which most have never seen or approved. As a result, please withdraw any statement or implication that the FAC has participated in the drafting of the “Draft Strategic Plan”, and in particular that we provided “feedback ... subsequently incorporated... into our planning work”. I remain available to discuss this matter in greater detail and to consider constructive proposals that could redress the situation. But as it stands, the “Draft Strategic Plan” is unacceptable for the reasons stated above. Best wishes: /d

David Blitz, PhD,  
Chair, Faculty Advisory Committee to the BOR/CSCU  
Professor of Philosophy, CCSU  
President, Bertrand Russell Society  
Member, Editorial Board, Journal of Bertrand Russell Studies  
Member, Community Editorial Board, Connecticut Mirror