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CSCU STAFF:

Terrence Cheng, CSCU System President
Jessica Paquette, Executive Director for Presidential Initiatives
Danny Aniello, Executive Director for System Project Management
Ben Barnes, CSCU VP of Finance and Administration
Dr. Rai Kathuria, CSCU Provost & SVP of Academic and Student Affairs
Dr. Paul Beran, Interim President, Western CT State University
Dr. John Maduko, President, CT State Community College
Dr. Dwayne Smith, Interim President, Southern CT State University
Ed Klonoski, President, Charter Oak State College
Dr. Elsa Nunez, President, Eastern Connecticut State University
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Pam Heleen, Secretary of the Board of Regents (recorder)
Manohar Singh, SCSU, Dean of Graduate and Professional Studies
Leigh Appleby, Director of Communications
Sean Bradbury, Senior Director of Government Relations and External Affairs
1. CALL TO ORDER
   Chair Ryan called the meeting to order at 10:02 a.m. Following roll call, a quorum was declared.

2. ADOPTION OF AGENDA
   Chair Ryan noted that one change needed to be made to the agenda; a second item needed to be added to the Executive Committee report concerning the consummation of the merger of the community colleges.

   The motion to adopt the amended agenda was made by Regent Howery, seconded by Regent Wright and adopted by unanimous voice vote.

3. CHAIR RYAN’S REMARKS
   - Chair Ryan thanked Regents Howery and Gray-Kemp for their service to the Board. The tenures end on June 30, 2023.

4. PRESIDENT CHENG’S REMARKS
   - President Cheng thanked everyone for attending in person and remotely.
   - NECHE’s approval of CT State’s third and final progress report:
     NECHE’s approval, received in mid-June, allows CSCU to end a six-year process that unifies the community college campuses into one singularly accredited institution. He noted the shared curriculum, fewer barriers for students, reduced duplication, as well as guided pathways advisors on each campus to help increase enrollment and retention. Faculty across campuses are collaborating, as CT State also established a new shared governance process, created and voted on in less than one year.
     President Cheng thanked President John Maduko, his team, faculty and staff for shepherding this process through its final stages. He also thanked the administrators who pursued this goal, all the way to its completion, specifically Presidents Michael Rooke of NWCCC and Mary Ellen Jukoski of TRCC, CT State CFO Kerry Kelly. President Cheng recognized the members of the BOR, both past and present, for their leadership, especially during the hardest of times. He also recognized Governor Lamont, his team, multiple legislators, business leaders, and community partners, who have lent their support.
     He noted that he hopes everyone will look to the future as an opportunity to create solutions together.
   - Major leadership changes at our institutions:
     • Dr. Joseph Bertolino took an opportunity to lead Stockton University in NJ, an institution in his home state. Dr. Bertolino’s leadership at SCSU for six years paved the way for Interim President, Dr. Dwayne Smith.
     • President Cheng thanked Interim President Paul Beran at WCSU, who in just one year reorganized the leadership team, engaged the faculty, built stronger relationships in the community, brought more support to key areas of health and safety that had been deprived of resources, and uncovered certain past practices that will be improved to the betterment of the university.
     • President Elsa Nunez of ECSU will be retiring at the end of the 2023-2024 academic year. For 17 years, she has been a staunch advocate and fearless leader for Eastern, and it shows in their academic outcomes and national rankings, the growth and development of their physical campus, and in the institution’s financial situation.
• President Cheng thanked all of institution presidents for their leadership, vision, collegiality, and partnership in not only doing what is best and right for their institutions, but for the system.

- Other system accomplishments:
  • At the May BOR meeting, the achievements and recognition of our faculty were recognized. They bring prestige and honor to CSCU institutions with their scholarship, research, creative work, and service, even as they serve CSCU students with rigor, compassion, and care inside and outside the classroom.
  • President Cheng thanked the collective bargaining unit and faculty leaders for their advocacy and diligence, specifically Louise Williams, John O’Connor, and Cindy Stretch of AAUP, Seth Freeman and Elle Vandermark of the 4Cs, Gregg Crerar of AAUP, Larry Salay and Dennis Bogusky of SUOAF, Colena Sesanker and David Blitz representing the FAC, and all campus-based leaders.
  • President Cheng thanked CSCU’s DEI leaders who created a remarkable day of training that nearly 400 managers from across our system participated in throughout the spring semester. He cited it as the kind of work that is emblematic of the power of a majority-minority system like CSCU.
  • He noted that CSCU made great strides in system-wide grants and extramural funding, enhanced external partnerships to the benefit of statewide workforce development, our communities, and our students. CSCU continued to improve upon existing and create new programs that best serve our students in the 21st century.
  • President Cheng also commented on CSCU 2030, noting that CSCU did not secure a major state investment in our system. The end of legislative session brought CSCU a budget that yielded approximately $160M more than the Governor’s originally proposed budget, helping to stabilize for FY24, and see FY25 and outgoing years soberly and honestly. The 2030 process and experience were also valuable as it recommitted CSCU to high-quality, affordable, accessible education, leading to life-sustaining wages and career growth, and socio-economic impact across Connecticut.

- Spending plan resolution:
  • President Cheng commented that, if approved, the spending plan resolution will allow CSCU to do the work of the system, while working to achieve savings targets at each institution.
  • After hearing from faculty and staff in person, and via email, and consulting with the BOR, there will be amendments to the resolution that will strike reference to consultants, and also strike the request for $4M from reserves.
  • President Cheng noted that he is committed to working with each president and their institutional leadership teams to follow shared governance in all processes, in a way that will allow for as much flexibility and latitude in local decision making, while remaining unified and accountable.
  • He continued by noting that this is not a two-year biennium budget problem. The demographics of Connecticut and the entire New England/northeast region show a decline in traditional college-age students for the next two decades. This is an opportunity, as institutions and as a system, to change, to evolve, and to meet the challenges that lie ahead while continuing to serve students and communities at the highest level, in new, innovative, and transformative ways.

- President Cheng thanked Regent Holly Howery and Regent Felice Gray-Kemp for their service to CSCU and to the Board.
- Dr. Colena Sesanker responded to President Cheng’s remarks, specifically to the opening of CT State, acknowledging the work that still has to be done. She mentioned that the shared governance structure is in place and the possible underestimation of the costs associated with the College.

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

The Board received hundreds of email communications prior to this meeting; in most cases, emails were identical. A sample, along with written communications in support of the public comment are included as Attachment A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Faculty/Public</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazel Hill Tunxis Community College</td>
<td>Louise Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(comments read into the record by Dr. David</td>
<td>President – CSU AAUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blitz)</td>
<td>History Dept. – CCSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John O’Connor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSU – AAUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sociology Dept. - CCSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Stretch CSU – AAUP Vice President</td>
<td>IN PERSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Dept. - SCSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan Cunningham VIRTUAL Treasur er - AAUP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics and Finance Dept. – ECSU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seth Freeman IN PERSON President, 4Cs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Japely VIRTUAL English Dept.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk Community College</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

President Cheng responded to remarks made during public comment.
- He thanked everyone who set time aside to provide public testimony.
- Leadership fully recognizes the strain that the proposed tuition increases would put on our students. Decisions related to this proposal were not made lightly. This is only one approach proposed to try to work through CSCU’s budgetary challenges.
- President Cheng agreed with Professor Stretch concerning CSCU 2030 and the inclusion of the faculty in the process. He expressed that as CSCU moves forward, we will work more diligently to include faculty partners and collective bargaining units in such processes.
- He would like to continue to drive forward a discussion of shared governance. Some public comments make this discussion challenging. We all need to push ourselves to uncover the bold, audacious thinking that will lead us to success.
- In respect to Professor Japely’s comments concerning the findings of consultants, President Cheng agreed that the right consultant is everything. If CSCU were to work with external partners, we would need a firm that understands our world.
One of President Cheng’s priorities going into the next academic year is to increase transferability within CSCU and to increase retention measurably. If improvements in these areas are achieved, marked increases in revenue and enrollment will be seen in performance metrics.

Regent Stewart thanked those who participated today to give the Board feedback.

Dr. Sesanker (representing the faculty at the community colleges) agreed that we cannot afford to be fighting each other right now. She stated that in regard to the fight for CSCU funding, its strategy and scope, needed to be significantly broader. The faculty and unions were quiet all session long because they didn’t know how to justify it (CSCU 2030). She continued by stating that many members didn’t know if they had a job in 2 days (in food pantries, libraries) which will ultimately affect students.

She asked if leadership has laid the groundwork for true collaboration if they feel like they are under attack and are not serving students. She stated that there is nothing more vicious than the politeness of a Board room if we understand structural injustice. We cannot face the challenges ahead unless we are all in with a vision that will actually benefit our students and State. She stated that we are not there right now.

President Cheng thanked Dr. Sesanker and committed to work to get the faculty and staff the resources they need to serve CSCU students. He mentioned that there is a legacy, a muscle memory, of how we deal with one another which is hard to break down and as long as he leads CSCU, he will always be professional, will always listen, learn, and find ways to do and be better. He asked that we all commit to doing this.

Dr. David Blitz provided commentary. The full text of his remarks can be found in Attachment B.

6. APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES
   - May 18, 2023 Meeting Minutes

   On a motion by Regent Stewart and seconded by Regent Wright, the May 18, 2023 Regular Meeting minutes were approved after a unanimous voice vote.

   - June 6, 2023 Special BOR Meeting Minutes

   On a motion by Regent Balducci and seconded by Regent Howery, the June 6, 2023 Special BOR Meeting minutes were approved after a unanimous voice vote.

7. CONSENT AGENDA

   On a motion by Regent Porth, seconded by Regent Bloom, the Consent Agenda was unanimously adopted.

   **Academic Programs**
   Discontinuations
   i. Supply Chain Analytics – Central CT State University
   New Program
   i. Business Analytics – B.S. – Central CT State University
   Modifications
   i. Graduate Reading – Remedial Reading and Language Arts Specialist – Graduate Certificate – Southern CT State University [Modification of Instructional Delivery]
ii. Masters in Arts in Teaching - Secondary Education – Western CT State University [Modification of Instructional Delivery]

**CT State Resolutions**

CT State Program Alignment
i. Health Science – A.S. Degree
ii. Photography - Certificate

CT State Policies
i. Academic Standing – New
ii. Associate Degrees – Revision
iii. Grading, Notations, and Academic Engagement – Revision

**CSU Professor Nomination**

**Finance Items**

i. CSCU 2020 Funding Reallocations
ii. Gateway Community College – Acceptance of Gifts
iii. Salary Approval for CCSU Chief Human Resources Officer

**RESOLUTIONS APPROVED ON CONSENT**

a. **Academic Programs – Discontinuations**
   i. **RESOLVED:** That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the discontinuation of the Supply Chain Analytics Official Certificate Program at Central Connecticut State University effective Spring 2022.

b. **Academic Programs – New Programs**
   i. **RESOLVED:** That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the licensure of a program in Business Analytics (CIP Code: 30.7001, OHE# TBD) leading to a Bachelor of Science at Central Connecticut State University; and grant its accreditation for a period of seven semesters beginning with its initiation, such initiation to be determined in compliance with BOR guidelines for new programs approved on or after April 3, 2020.

c. **Academic Programs – Modifications**
   i. **RESOLVED:** That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the modification of a program – MS in Graduate Reading - Remedial Reading and Language Arts Specialist – Graduate Certificate (CIP Code: 13.1315/ OHE# 18926), specifically a modification of instructional delivery from on ground to hybrid at Southern Connecticut State University.
   ii. **RESOLVED:** That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approve the modification of a program – Masters in Arts in Teaching-Secondary Education (CIP Code: 13.1205 / OHE# 18716), specifically a modification of instructional delivery from on ground to online, at Western Connecticut State University.

d. **CT State Resolutions – Program Alignment**
   i. **RESOLVED:** That the Board of Regents for Higher Education approves the licensure and accreditation of the following degree and certificate for Connecticut State Community College, developed from a degree and/or certificate previously approved by the Board for one or more of the 12 individually accredited colleges. These programs meet the specific requirements of the Board’s General Education (BOR 20-082) and CSCC College and Career Success 101 (BOR 20-099) policies. All programs also meet the Credit Normalization policy (BOR 14-111) or are within any credit exemptions previously approved by the Board, unless otherwise noted below:
Program | Program Type | Minimum # of Credits
--- | --- | ---
1. Health Science | A.S. | 60
2. Photography | Certificate | 18

e. **CT State Resolutions – Policies**

i. **WHEREAS**, The Board of Regents for Higher Education pursuant to its statutory authority in Connecticut General Statute Section 10a-6 shall “establish policies and guidelines for the regional community-technical college system” (CSCU’s 12 community colleges); and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Regents has resolved to consolidate the 12 individual community colleges within the Connecticut State College and Universities System into a singularly structured and accredited College with 12 campuses; and

**WHEREAS**, a comprehensive review of all community college policies appearing in the Board of Trustees of Community-Technical Colleges Policy Manual is underway, including review by the CT State Cabinet, committees of CT State faculty and administrative staff, CSCU Chief Financial Officer, CSCU’s General Counsel’s Office; and

**WHEREAS**, it has been determined by the above review group that Community Colleges Policy 3.8, Satisfactory Progress is complicated and leads to student confusion; and

**WHEREAS**, the CT State Senate has approved the attached new policy; therefore, be it

**RESOLVED**, that the Connecticut Board of Regents for Higher Education rescind BOT Community College policy 3.8; and be it further

**RESOLVED**, that the Board of Regents adopt the attached new policy effective with the fall 2023 semester which ensures that academic standing and satisfactory academic progress are distinct, deficit language is removed, and structured supports are provided to students; and be it further

**RESOLVED** that the Board of Regents charges CT State administration with the communication of the new policy to all CT State Community College staff.

ii. **WHEREAS**, The Board of Regents for Higher Education pursuant to its statutory authority in Connecticut General Statute Section 10a-6 shall “establish policies and guidelines for the regional community-technical college system” (CSCU’s 12 community colleges); and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Regents has resolved to consolidate the 12 individual community colleges within the Connecticut State College and Universities System into a singularly structured and accredited College with 12 campuses; and

**WHEREAS**, a comprehensive review of all community college policies appearing in the Board of Trustees (BOT) of Community-Technical Colleges Policy Manual has taken place, including review by the CT State Cabinet, committees of CT State faculty and administrative staff, CSCU Chief Financial Officer, CSCU’s General Counsel’s Office; and

**WHEREAS», BOT Policy 3.3.5 – Associate Degrees – Multiple (last amended in October 1987) was written to provide guidance for managing students earning multiple degrees from more than one Connecticut community college; therefore, updates to language appropriate for the merged college environment are required; and

**WHEREAS**, it has been determined that BOR Policy 1.13 which describes the CSCU Associate Degrees is the appropriate location to house such a policy; now let it be

**RESOLVED**, that the Board of Regents for Higher Education approves the rescission of the BOT policies 3.3.5; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents for Higher Education approves the revision of BOR Policy 1.13 as attached; and be it further
RESOLVED that the Board of Regents charges CT State administration with the communication of the rescissions to all CT State Community

iii. WHEREAS, The Board of Regents for Higher Education pursuant to its statutory authority in Connecticut General Statute Section 10a-6 shall “establish policies and guidelines for the regional community-technical college system” (CSCU’s 12 community colleges); and
WHEREAS, the Board of Regents has resolved to consolidate the 12 individual community colleges within the Connecticut State College and Universities System into a singularly structured and accredited College with 12 campuses; and
WHEREAS, a comprehensive review of all community college policies appearing in the Board of Trustees (BOT) of Community-Technical Colleges Policy Manual has taken place, including review by the CT State Cabinet, committees of CT State faculty and administrative staff, CSCU Chief Financial Officer, CSCU’s General Counsel’s Office; and
WHEREAS, BOT Policy 3.5.1 – Granting an “Incomplete” has been determined to be out of date and BOT Policy 3.5.2 – Administrative Transcript Notations – Letters Other Than A-F has been replaced by BOR Policy 1.19; and
WHEREAS, it has been determined that BOR Policy 1.19 requires revision to reflect current CT State Community College policy and clarification of process; now let it be
RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents for Higher Education approves the rescission of the BOT policies 3.5.1 and 3.5.2; and be it further
RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents for Higher Education approves the revision of BOR Policy 1.19 as attached; and be it further
RESOLVED that the Board of Regents charges CT State administration with the communication of the rescissions to all CT State Community College staff.

f. CSU Professor Nomination
WHEREAS, The President of Southern Connecticut State University, Dr. Joseph Bertolino, has recommended that Dr. David Pettigrew, Professor of Philosophy be appointed as Connecticut State University Professor and Connecticut State Colleges and Universities President Terrence Cheng concurred; and
WHEREAS, Dr. Pettigrew, a highly distinguished teacher and scholar, has served Southern Connecticut State University since 1987 as a member of the Department of Philosophy, while attaining extraordinary levels of achievement in research, teaching and service, and
WHEREAS, Professor Pettigrew has earned international recognition for his research and human rights activities related to the genocide in Bosnia and Herzegovina, therefore be it
RESOLVED, That the title of Connecticut State University Professor is herewith awarded by the Board of Regents to Dr. David Pettigrew of Southern Connecticut State University effective June 29, 2023, pursuant to the BOR/AAUP Collective Bargaining Agreement; and be it further
RESOLVED, That Professor Pettigrew be entitled to all the rights, privileges and responsibilities pertaining to this honor.

g. Finance Resolutions
i. WHEREAS, pursuant to CGS 10a-91d (c), the Board of Regents shall approve reallocation of CSCU 2020 program funds at the completion of a project to other CSCU 2020 named projects and programs; and
WHEREAS, four named “line item” projects that were funded between FY 2011 through FY 2020 as part of the CSCU 2020 Program are complete; and
WHEREAS, $6,786,965 of uncommitted funding for four projects will be reallocated to their respective Universities Code Compliance/Infrastructure Improvement programs; and
WHEREAS, the projects and associated funding are as follows:
1. FY 2016, 17, 19 & 20 – Central Willard and DeLoreto Hall, $804,006
2. FY 2011, 14 & 16 – Eastern Fine Arts Instructional Center, $402,641
3. FY 2011, 14, 16 & 17 – Eastern Goddard & Communications Building, $761,178
4. FY 2016, 17, 19 & 20 – Southern Health & Human Services, $4,819,140

Now therefore, be it
RESOLVED, $6,786,965 of uncommitted funds from completed CSCU 2020 projects will be reallocated to their respective University Code Compliance/Infrastructure Improvement programs.

ii. WHEREAS, Gateway Community College is the recipient of a generous donation of a 2021 GMC Terrain donated by Gallagher Buick, of New Britain, for laboratory and experiential instruction in the college’s Automotive Technology Program; and
WHEREAS, The donation will allow Gateway Community College to include the latest in the automotive technology curriculum and provide the students with learning and career opportunities that they previously did not have; now, therefore, be it
RESOLVED, The Board of Regents accepts and acknowledges with appreciation the following gift donated by Gallagher Buick:
Description: 2021 GMC Acadia, VIN: 1GKKNXLS3MZ111907
Total Current Market Value: $12,373.22

iii. WHEREAS, the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities sets forth a Management and Confidential personnel policy establishing the requirement for BOR approval of any planned hiring salary offer at or above the third (3rd) quartile of the grade; and
WHEREAS, the $198,000 salary offer proposed by President Toro for the Central Connecticut State University Chief Human Resources Officer candidate Christopher Wethje falls above the 3rd quartile of the FY24 Executive 1 classification level of $185,159; and
WHEREAS, President Toro has recommended that the proposed salary is necessary to secure the employment of the most qualified individuals; now therefore be it
RESOLVED, that the Board of Regents for Higher Education hereby approves the hiring salary offer of $198,000 to Christopher Wethje for the position of Chief Human Resources Officer for Central Connecticut State University.

8.  ACADEMIC & STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE – Committee Chair Bloom
The Academic & Student Affairs Committee met on May 5 and June 9 and Committee Chair Bloom thanks the Board for approving, on Consent, the items put forward. He called attention to the appointment of CSU Professor Dr. David Pettigrew.

9. AUDIT COMMITTEE – Committee Chair Elease Wright
No report.

10.  FINANCE & INFRASTRUCTURE COMMITTEE – Committee Chair Balducci
a. Tuition and Fee Adjustments – Regent Balducci made the motion and Regent McCarthy seconded it. Chair Ryan opened the item for discussion.
- Regent Balducci noted that Committee met on June 21 and considered 5 items; 3 were passed on the Consent Agenda and 2 will be presented during the Committee report.
- Regent Balducci summarized the Tuition and Fee Adjustment resolution.
  - Regent Stewart commented on her opposition to the resolution and noted for the record that she would be voting against the tuition and fee increases.
  - Regent Wright asked about previous years’ tuition increases/freezes and whether keeping tuition flat inevitably leads to increases to catch up. Discussion followed.
  - Regent Bloom asked for confirmation concerning the tuition increase (for most students) being covered by the increase in the maximum PELL grants and other financial aid set-asides. Discussion followed.
  - Regent McCarthy acknowledged the challenge CSCU faces and stated that a tuition increase is a difficult and complicated issue. He indicated for the record that he is ready to vote yes on the resolution with the understanding that the plans to address the larger issues are not clear as of yet.
  - Regent Santiago asked when the more in-depth plans will be ready. Discussion about deadlines and process followed.
  - Regent Porth noted CSCU’s very challenging environment, especially as it relates to the FY25 State budget. He appreciates the work of the Finance Committee and CSCU leadership put into the proposed resolutions. He indicated for the record that he plans to vote yes on both Finance resolutions.

On a motion by Regent Balducci and seconded by Regent McCarthy, the Tuition and Fee Adjustments resolution was approved with 11 Yea votes and 1 Nay vote (Regent Stewart).

b. CSCU Spending and Deficit Mitigation Plan – Regent Balducci introduced the resolution. The spending plan as presented includes a $13.7 million deficit in FY 24; projections for FY25 and FY26 show deficits of $147 and $210 million, respectively. The resolution includes additional steps that the Board is requiring of System and institution leadership to address the deficit.
   i. The System will establish procedures to require each institution to develop a deficit mitigation plan by November 1.
   ii. The System will lead a comprehensive program review of academic and student support programs by all 6 institutions and will conduct an analysis of the system organization.
   iii. The System will develop a plan for communicating with internal and external constituencies to ensure that this process is transparent and reflects our commitment to shared governance.

Regent Balducci introduced two amendments to the resolution as follows:
  - The removal entirely of the allocation of system reserves for costs related to the deficit mitigation effort. The system staff will return once specific costs have been identified.
  - The elimination of the requirement that the system engages a consultant to perform the system analysis.

On a motion by Regent Balducci and seconded by Regent Howery, the amendment to the CSCU Spending and Deficit Mitigation Plan resolution was adopted by unanimous voice vote.
Regent Balducci opened the item for discussion.

- Regent McCarthy noted that he was pleased that Regent Stewart had asked to have the consulting line removed during the Finance Committee meeting. He was happy to support the amendments and that the final resolution more clearly separates FY24 from the years that follow. He is supportive of the resolution as a way to move forward immediately. He expects that we will all be working to make FY24 even more positive than it is now and to make the prospects for future years more positive.
- Regent Stewart commented that she was pleased to see the amendments made and expressed her strong feelings about not having firm timeframes and was not convinced that the Board would be an active participant in the process. She noted for the record that she would be voting against the spending and deficit mitigation plan resolution.
- Regent Santiago appreciates the changes that were made and noted for the record that he would be voting against the spending and deficit mitigation plan resolution. Discussion followed.
- President Cheng noted that if needed, Special Meetings of the Board will be scheduled. In addition, any proposals submitted from the institutions will need to be review in light of the collective bargaining contracts.
- Regent Howery commented that business as usual will not be an adequate approach this year and that this resolution lays out clear expectations for the work ahead. She noted that for the record, she is in favor of the resolution.
- Regent Wright suggested that “holds” be placed on Regents calendars for possible Special BOR meetings.
- Dr. Blitz made suggestions to the resolution. Regent Balducci noted that Dr. Blitz’s suggestions were reviewed, and many are incorporated in the final wording of the resolution. President Cheng also noted that Dr. Blitz’s suggested revisions have been read and analyzed. Discussion followed.

On a motion by Regent Howery and seconded by Regent Balducci, the amended CSCU Spending and Deficit Mitigation Plan resolution was approved with 10 Yea votes and 2 Nay votes (Regent Stewart and Regent Santiago).

11. HUMAN RESOURCES & ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE – Committee Chair Howery
No report.

12. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE – Chair Ryan

a. Establish the Title “Chancellor” of the Connecticut State Colleges & Universities
Chair Ryan made the motion and Regent Howery seconded it. Chair Ryan opened the item for discussion.

- Regent McCarthy noted the Board’s need to rationalize the titles of executives across the System. Current organizational titles do not lend themselves to transparency and clarity. A comparison to other neighboring higher education systems indicates that the Chancellor is the single CEO of their systems.
- Dr. Blitz spoke in favor of the resolution.
- Regent Stewart noted for the record that she would be voting against the resolution to change President Cheng’s title to Chancellor Cheng given all the other discussion around the status of the institution.
On a motion by Chair Ryan and seconded by Regent Howery, the resolution to “Establish the Working Title of Chancellor” was approved with 11 Yea votes and 1 Nay vote (Regent Stewart).

b. Consummation of Merger of Connecticut Community Colleges – This item was added to the agenda at the beginning of the meeting; Secretary of the Board read the following resolution into the record:

WHEREAS, The Board of Regents for Higher Education is the governing body for the regional community-technical college system and is responsible for the development of the institutions within its jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents in accordance with Connecticut General Statute section 10a-6 resolved to merge the 12 individual regional community-technical colleges within the regional community-technical college system into a singularly structured and accredited College with 12 campuses (BR17-155); and

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents resolved to submit a Substantive Change request to the New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE), requesting accreditation of the single accredited college upon the merger of the 12 individually accredited regional community technical colleges; and

WHEREAS, on May 14, 2020 the Board of Regents authorized the merger of the 12 individual regional community-technical colleges into a single institution and named the successor institution Connecticut State Community College; and

WHEREAS, the Connecticut State Community College is established to serve all of the geographical regions of the state as provided by Connecticut General Statute section 10a-78; and

WHEREAS, the New England Commission of Higher Education (NECHE), at its June 16, 2023 meeting, voted to grant initial accreditation to Connecticut State Community College effective July 1, 2023; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Regents and CSCU leadership expect the official letter from NECHE at the beginning of July 2023 providing accreditation for the Connecticut State Community College; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, the Board of Regents consummates the merger of its twelve (12) regional community-technical colleges:

Asnuntuck Community College, Capital Community College, Gateway Community College, Housatonic Community College, Manchester Community College, Middlesex Community College, Naugatuck Valley Community College, Northwestern Community College, Norwalk Community College, Quinebaug Valley Community College, Three Rivers Community College and Tunxis Community College

to become a single college, Connecticut State Community College (“CT State”), an accredited institution within the constituent unit of the Connecticut State Colleges and Universities, effective July 1, 2023, and be it further

RESOLVED, that CT State, as the successor institution of the 12 regional community-technical colleges, assumes all assets, liabilities, rights and obligations of each of the legacy regional community-technical colleges, including but not limited to all contractual assignments; and be it further

RESOLVED that CT State President is the institution’s chief executive officer and executive authority financially, contractually, academically and administratively for all current and future campuses; and be it further
RESOLVED, that pursuant to the responsibility to confer academic degrees contained in section 10a-72 of the Connecticut General Statutes, the Board of Regents for Higher Education authorizes the CT State President, or their designee, to validate and award diplomas signifying the conferring by the Board of the associate degree or certificate upon students who have completed requirements of programs approved by the Board of Regents and who have been recommended for such degrees by the faculty of the college.

Regent Howery made the motion which was seconded by Regent Porth. Chair Ryan opened the item for discussion.

- Dr. Blitz commented that changes will also need to be made to the Connecticut General Statute. He also added that a guarantee to continue services at all of the existing community college campuses should be added.

*On a motion by Regent Howery and seconded by Regent Porth, the resolution for Consummation of the Merger of Connecticut Community Colleges” was approved by unanimous voice vote.*

13. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

At 12:54 p.m. on a motion by Regent Howery, seconded by Regent Balducci, the Board voted to go into Executive Session for the purpose of discussion concerning the appointment, employment, performance, evaluation, health or dismissal of a public officer or employee. Chair Ryan announced that no votes would be taken in Executive Session. Chair Ryan directed CSCU President Cheng to remain with the Board in Executive Session.

14. **ADJOURNMENT**

With the conclusion of the Executive Session, Chair Ryan declared the meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Submitted,

Pamela Heleen
Secretary of the CT Board of Regents for Higher Education
Dear Chair JoAnn Ryan,

Three years ago, when describing the envisioned merger of the twelve community colleges in a CT Mirror op-ed, leaders of the Connecticut Community College System (CCC) committed to erasing barriers that exist for many Black and Latinx students. They said that the merging of the two systems would be a way to "build a bridge across the divide in educational opportunity." One of the CCC’s reasons for merging was "to build a bridge across the divide in educational opportunity." One of the CCC’s reasons for merging was to "build a bridge across the divide in educational opportunity." One of the CCC’s reasons for merging was to "build a bridge across the divide in educational opportunity."

Unlike their earlier statements of commitment to erasing barriers to success, some of the first actions the CT State Community College Board of Regents (BOR) are taking include:

- Raising tuition higher for community college students than other students in the system
- Non-renewal of part-time staff that directly support students and contribute to their success, including academic advisors, known as GPAs, food pantry directors, librarians, public safety, and others.
- Spending $4 million on outside consultants and attorneys

I request that you:

1. Keep tuition flat,
2. Draw from reserve funds to renew staff contracts, and
3. Use the $4 million earmarked for outside consultants and lawyers on our students instead.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alan Teitleman
I am Louise Williams, a History professor at CCSU and President of CSU-AAUP.

I am here to express my concerns about the authorization of funds for President Cheng to hire an outside consultant to help devise a long-term mitigation plan for our system.

While I am not opposed to spending money on consultants, I believe that the choice of which consultant to hire is very important. And I think that choice must be made collectively, with your input and that of the university presidents, faculty, and staff.

I have this concern because of our history of hiring consultants in the past, and because I have read a number of scholarly studies recently about Higher Ed consultants.

According to these experts there are a handful of top consulting firms, but they all give almost identical advice regardless of the type of institution they consider. In fact, scholars conclude that they all use the same “playbook.”

- Some scholars conclude that because their common advice can be gotten from the consultants position papers and promotional literature or the scholarly studies there isn’t a need to hire them at all. (McClure 2017, 13) (Education Advisory Board Business Affairs Forum 2014, 6)

This playbook has a number of common elements.

First, fear and uncertainty about the future is created with “crisis narratives” that require drastic solutions. (McClure 2017, 4, 12)

- A very recent example of a common crisis narrative is the statement about the closure of Cabrini University and its purchase by Villanova this month (June 2023). Institutional leaders claimed that the institution faced “significant financial challenges, decreasing enrollment, and an increasingly competitive higher ed environment” that could not be overcome except by extraordinary measures.

Second, those solutions always involve server cuts in the name of containing costs and increasing efficiency. Consultants rarely emphasize efforts to increase revenue.

- As one scholar put it, “at no point in any of the documents was it considered a reasonable course of action to lobby state legislatures for more funding in the spirit of contributing to the public good.” (McClure 2017, 12)

While consultants recommend several ways to increase efficiency, they all boil down to reducing labor costs.

- This is hardly innovative. Everyone knows that personnel costs are 65-75% or more of the cost of running an institution of higher education.
• So it is not surprising that 60-65% of all savings recommended by consulting firms is in labor costs. (Education Advisory Board Business Affairs Forum 2014, 10)

In other words, almost all recommendations are ways to reduce the number of people employed at an institution.

• Savings on purchasing and energy costs are the only ones that do not require layoffs, but they do not save nearly enough.

For example, organizational restructuring, like back-office consolidation, shared services, automation, use of outside vendors, closer partnerships with private industry, primarily save money because it requires fewer employees.

Academic changes that consultants recommend include eliminating small majors, increasing class sizes, reducing reassigned time for faculty to work outside the classroom, or expanding online education. Again, they can call these “efficiencies” or even “new models of learning,” but really what they are intended to do is reduce the number of faculty employed.

And the savings promised by consultants are rarely achieved. One report concluded that savings from hiring these firms were “modest or even non-existent.” (Education Advisory Board Business Affairs Forum 2014) (See also, McClure 2017, 12 & 13)

And why is this? Mainly because the recommendations of consultants are rarely implemented in full, because they are made by firms that “lack of understanding of academic culture and shared governance” and do “not fully appreciate the complexities of higher education.” (McClure 2017, 3) (Education Advisory Board Business Affairs Forum 2014, 8)

In other words, the changes are much more difficult to implement than anticipated. They also are met with faculty and staff resistance and bad publicity that is impossible to ignore. So administrators either back down, or never even try to implement them. (Education Advisory Board Business Affairs Forum 2014, 12)

Scholars conclude: “it is not at all clear that spending money on consultants is an efficient or effective use of public resources.” (McClure 2017, 13)

So why do so many higher education institutions hire these consultants? This is not because they actually work, but because they are part of a “public performance.” It helps institutional leaders “maintain legitimacy by giving a public appearance of facing up to” the problems” and being efficient and effective. (McClure 2017, 5, 12)

We in the CSCU system should know this. We have “been there, done that.”

• For example, in 2014 the Boston Consulting Group was hired for $1.9 million to create the “Transform 2020” plan. None of its recommendations were implemented, there was serious faculty resistance, and the president even had to resign. (Blitz, n.d., 7 & 8)

• In 2017 the plan for Students First followed the consultant playbook very closely with its merger and back-office consolidation. It is questionable how much of a success it has been. It is still not finished 6 years later. And in spite of the report given to the FAC ten days ago, an independent report on the success of consolidations across the country in 2021 argued that in Connecticut
there were only “some cost-savings” achieved “through non-faculty employee attrition.” ("A Review of Consolidations of Postsecondary Systems: The Alaska, Minnesota, and Connecticut Cases. Prepared for the Community College System of New Hampshire” 2021, 23)

- Even worse, they claimed that the merger did not solve some serious educational problems of retention and completion especially in the community colleges, and they warned that the faculty resistance to it never went away and continued to this day.

Even last year we saw how ineffective it is to hire a consultant. The National Center for Higher Education Management Systems [NCHEMS] was hired to report on Western Connecticut State university. (“Western Connecticut State University Report” 2022) Even though they are a non-profit organization, their report follows the for-profit consultant play-book. It concluded:

- That there is no revenue problem at Western. Western had been given enough money.
- The problem is a spending problem, and the solution is cost-savings by cutting.
- But cuts to administration had already been made, so the only thing left to cut is faculty and staff.
- They admit this will be difficult for impossible because of our union contracts.
- So, in the short term they recommended reducing the number of part-time faculty and cutting low-enrolled programs and courses.
- They gave no indication of how much money those meagre solutions would save.

Not surprisingly attempts to implement this were met with serious faculty resistance and bad publicity. The efforts to carry out these recommendations were stopped or slowed down. Again, the hiring of a consultant was a failure.

Why was there such faculty resistance? There are two main reasons.

- One of the principles all faculty hold dear is that change the curriculum, programs and majors, class sizes, or modality (ex. to online) have to be made on “sound educational principles,” not just to save money. Our job is to educate students and we want decisions to be made to help our students learn and succeed. Cost savings are secondary.
- The other cause of resistance is the lack of real consultation with faculty. Faculty were not involved in the choice of a consultant, in planning changes, and our objections to them were ignored. We had no choice but to protest publicly.

So, it seems to me that to hire another consultant following the same playbook is a waste of money. If this Board and President Cheng think that cutting personnel is the only way forward, don’t waste the money. Just do and suffer the consequences.

- Take responsibility for that decision and don’t pretend that you were forced to do it by “expert” opinion.

And there will be consequences. You may contribute to the death spiral we outlined to the legislature when we asked for more money.

- The crisis narrative of inefficient and failing universities, and the public opposition to recommended changes by faculty and staff, will create bad publicity.
• Students don’t want to go to shrinking schools with fewer opportunities and unhappy faculty, and pay higher tuition at that. Who wants to pay more for less.
• New enrollment will decline, more students will transfer.
  o I have heard this is already happening at Western – advisors in high schools are telling students to stay away.
• We will have to make more cuts, until we no longer exist as a real system of higher education.

But there is another way.

Instead of focusing on cost savings and cutting, we need to look into creative ways to increase our revenue and do more with what we are lucky to have already.

Why not ask ourselves, and a consultant if we must have one, to help us expand rather than contract. Let’s do more with what we have, not more with less.

• Don’t ask what we did of NCHEMS for Western to come us with a plan “to live within its means.” Let’s expand those means as a way to be “fiscally sustainable” for the future. (“Western Connecticut State University Report” 2022, 1)

Most people claim that expanding the revenue is impossible if we can’t get more state support because of the supposed enrollment crisis of the future. We can’t get more money from students, because there will be less students.

This is the argument OPM and the Governor made when they refused to give us more state funding. This is also what Ben Barnes accepted as reality at the joint FAC-BOR meeting of June 16, 2023.

Barnes used figures from Nathan Grawe who argues in his book The Agile College that in the Northeast especially we will see a continued decline in traditional college going students at least until 2030. (Grawe 2021)

I read the book and am not convinced that Grawe’s dire predictions will apply to Connecticut, which is a state very different from most others in the Northeast. So, I would like our system to rely on a study of Connecticut in particular before jumping to conclusions and making drastic changes based on them.

• There are reasons it could be less severe for us based on what Grawe takes into consideration in his predictions.
• For example, unlike states such as Vermont, Maine, New Hampshire, we have larger urban populations, more Latinos, more Eastern European immigrants, and less out migration, all of which will create more potential students.

I also hope that everyone reads the rest of the book, which is subtitled “How Institutions Successfully Navigate Demographic Changes.”

Grawe thinks that we can deal with the decline if we focus on increasing the persistence and completion of existing students, and work harder at recruiting non-traditional and minority students who do not normally attend college or universities.

He especially thinks that our best bet is to keep our current students in school and paying tuition, and help them complete their degrees so they enter the workforce better prepared than others.
Other scholars say the same thing and argue for why increasing persistence and completion will also increase revenue.

- As one of them put it, “initiatives aimed at increasing retention are cost effective and lead to net revenue generation.” (Brown and Kurzweil 2018, 6)
- A student who remains at an institution for four years generates the same amount of revenue as four new students who leave after one year. But retention saves money because it costs 5 times as much to recruit a new student as to retain an existing one. (Brown and Kurzweil 2018, 5 & 6)

In fact, we could hire a consultant to help with this – if we must hire one.

In a quick internet search I found quite a few such consultants with many different plans and recommendations – not just one playbook.

For example, some consultants focus on educational data mining and learning analytics applied to current students in order to create individualized plans for the ones most at risk.

- Scholars note that this sort of thing has been used at Georgia State University and around 1,400 other colleges and universities successfully. (Shafiq et al. 2022)

One company even advertises that a 1% annual increase in student retention can gain $25 million over 7 years for an institution with an annual tuition of $10,000 and a student body of 10,000. (“Can Improving Student Retention Rates Increase Revenue?” 2023)

If this is true, CSCU with 32,000 ft and 32,000 part-time students could gain perhaps $100 million with a 1% increase in retention.

- But 1% is a very small increase. Many schools with serious retention initiatives have seen 5-7% increases. For us that would mean $500-700 million dollars.
- But even if we had a 2.5-3% increase we would get the $200 million dollars that was missing from what the legislature gave us in 2026.
- Granted we would need some time to see that return, but if it is true, then perhaps we could ask the legislature to tide us over until it is realized.

And compare this to the claim of other scholars that savings schools who hire top consultants saw was approximately 2% of their total operating budget. For us that may mean only $26 million dollars.

- We had $1,275,000,000 in expenses in 2022 and 2% if that is $26 million.
- But this would require massive layoffs that would take years to effect. (Education Advisory Board Business Affairs Forum 2014, 8)

I am not an expert in retention or in consulting companies. I don’t know if these companies are trustworthy or can do this. And I worry that some may recommend plans that faculty and staff will object to.

But I would like us to think about this as an option.
• I would rather gain money by helping students and using our existing faculty and staff to do so, than save money by hurting students, employees, and our institutions.

And perhaps we can even do it without a consultant at all.

• Our institutions already are working on it. We could find best practices in our system. There are many other institutions we could study and scholarship on persistence as well.
• For example, we could copy Goucher College. In 2018 the president created a “Goucher 2025 strategy committee” made up of faculty and staff to talk about choices to address the challenges they were facing. It was divided into multiple small groups that talked about the same questions and considered a wide range of options and what needed to be changed in their institutions for each. (Grawe 2021)

Ultimately this decision about a consultant is based on our vision of the value of our system of higher education and where it should go in the future.

• In fact, I think we must articulate that vision well before we hire a consultant. And it must be a vision that we all share – you the Board, President Cheng, the campus presidents, faculty, staff – and students.

We have to decide whether we want a smaller system that only provides second-rate worker training, or something else.

I, of course, want something else.

• I want a CSCU system that focuses on students -- that cares for, nurtures, and mentors them, and that treats them as individuals who have different needs and interests and are given personal attention.
• I want a system that provides access for as many people as possible, not just to any degree, but one comparable to that of the best schools out there.
• And I want us to embrace the fact that we have enough faculty and staff, who are well-paid and well taken care of and have the time and tools to help students.
• I would like to think of our existing personnel, our numerous and varied programs, our small class sizes as assets, something we are proud of, something that makes us unique and better than other institutions, not as a burden or liability.

If we can have such institutions, plus increase our revenue also, then we have a real vision of something better for the future, that is not just sustainable, but that contributes to the real well-being of our students and the state.

And I think it has a chance of success because faculty and staff will help rather than resist, students will be more likely to enroll and stay in our institutions.

It also is a solution that will send a positive message about the future of our system, which may in turn convince legislators to give us some extra funding to tide us over while we implement it.
It is your choice and a very serious one for our system, for higher education in CT and as a model for higher education in the entire nation. The nation will be looking at what you do.

I can guarantee that the faculty will be watching you very carefully as well. We are more than happy to help you if you make the right choice. But we are more than prepared to oppose anything that hurts our students and schools.

So please consider very carefully before you write a blank check to hire a consultant and make sure that everyone, especially faculty and staff are included in that decision.
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As current vice-chair of the FAC and previously (in even years) its chair, I three basic questions. After 12 years of the merged community colleges, state college and state universities into one overall system, 6 years of the planned merger of the community colleges into one institution, and the recent arrival of new leadership at the CSCU and BOR, the following need examination:

Three Basic Questions

1/ Did the merger into one system, Connecticut State Colleges and Universities achieve its objectives of cost savings and better services? After a decade of operation, is the currently structured Board of Regents able to fulfil its mandate as stated in section 185 of state statutes, including respecting the distinct missions of the universities and colleges?

2/ Will the consolidation of the community colleges into one Connecticut State Community College achieve its objectives of cost savings, greater equity and better services? Has it achieved these objectives to date? Can the serious transition problems identified by the FAC be corrected in time for the Fall 2024 session?

3/ Can we resolve the budget shortfalls endemic to our system, and in particular for FY25 with a new narrative and positive measures rather than following the negative model of the OPM? That says that enrollment decline must result in budget cuts. It elicited the equally negative response we saw in the April 24 press release by CSCU: budget cuts will result in forced layoffs of both full and part time faculty and staff, increases in student tuition across the board, and elimination of programs, especially high overhead employment focused ones?

The FY 24/25 Budget

At the immediate level of the recently adopted state budget, I note the following: While it is clear that the the increased FY 24 budget can sustain, if only at current levels, the institutions of CSCU, the decreased FY 25 budget compared to that of FY 24 is a significant problem. The solutions proposed in the April 24 press release are part of an old narrative which should now be retired, and I quote:

"-More than 650 full-time faculty and staff layoffs
-Nearly 3,000 part-time positions eliminated
-Five-percent tuition increase per year at the community college for the next two years and 5 percent increase at the universities for the 2024-25 academic year
-Elimination of high-subsidy programs, most of which are those which meet the state’s greatest workforce need"

Instead, we should consider measures such as the following:

1/ Use some of System Office, University and Community College reserves to offset part of the expected FY 25 deficit, while respecting the reserves of those member institutions which have budgeted adequately in the past;
2/ Retirements and resignations of senior faculty and staff are usually replaced at lower salary levels for new hires or can be deferred for a year;
3/ Adopt pension-based measures (additional years, AKA “golden handshake”) to encourage retirements of faculty and staff;
4/ Limit to existing numbers System Office personnel at all levels, since with a second system office in New Britain, the tendency may well be for each to expand into available space;
5/ Extend the 3 + 2 BA/MA programs already at some universities and programs to all eligible programs to attract additional students who might otherwise go out of state;
6/ Link employment oriented certificates to completion of the Associates Degree so as to retain students at the community college and better prepare them for possible career changes;

7/ Consider a 2+2 BA/MA for community college graduates who transfer into the major for which they have been fully prepared at the 100/200 college level;

8/ Incorporate sustainability in all building and renovation plans for both environmental protection and green energy economies;

9/ Develop a shorter term strategic plan (2-4 years) with a handful of priority objectives and specific metrics to be achieved in order to restore confidence with the executive branch and legislative leaders;

10/ Enlarge Honors Programs at universities to more students who might otherwise go out of state or to the private sector;

11/ On the basis of the above sort of measures in FY24, request mid-biennium adjustments for FY 25 as still needed.

These do not involve in any force layoffs, tuition hikes, or program elimination.

Basic Principles

There are a number of basic principles which should underly the work of the Board and its relation with its constituent units (community college(s), Charter Oak, 4 CSUs):

1/ Respect the distinct missions of the colleges and universities and Respect the autonomy and integrity of the constituent institutions: The CSCU system is a system of three component systems: the community college and its 12 constituent units, Charter Oak, and the four Connecticut State Universities. We should respect a system of systems or federated approach which combines respect for the autonomy and integrity of the constituent units with cooperation and leadership from the central administration; policy should be based on consultation and consent of the constituent units, faculty and staff.

As an added measure for the transition to the one community college, continued college campuses and full services at all existing locations should be guaranteed, and their individual accreditations maintained as a fall back measure even as CSCC itself is accredited.

3/ Respect shared governance: This implies a willingness to fully take into account the expertise of faculty and staff, and to focus on mutual agreement rather than imposed resolutions to make needed changes in the system. The history of Students First has been one of management asserting its authority rather than seeking cooperation, to the detriment of the educational experience of students, and career satisfaction of faculty, staff and administrators.

4/ Respect faculty control of curriculum and pedagogy: Faculty must, by dint of their expertise, control curriculum and pedagogy - subject to final approval and funding by administration. Imposing course such as CS-101 or the forced “alignment” of diverse programs for the sake of uniformity destroys the very foundation upon which the CSCU constituent units are based – the classroom, laboratory, seminar and other experiences to which students participate and which faculty prepare and lead.

5 Practice better communication and consultation and on that basis we can envisage increased cooperation and to the extent advisable, coordination. But the command and control practiced by the former administration with perhaps an echo remaining at the System Office has to go entirely.

The changes in the last two years to BOR and CSCU leadership are significant and should augur well for improved functioning of the system and relations with its constituent units, faculty, staff and students. But old habits persist and lack of mutual trust needs to be further addressed. Given the very different narratives of the various constituencies, some new form of meeting to address the current crisis is needed, beyond regularly scheduled public meetings.