**Minutes – January 30 – 3:05 p.m.  
Online through WebEx**

**CCSU Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Present**: Acharya, K.; Al-Masoud, N.; Amaya, L.; Andreoletti, C.; Barrington, C.; Bartone, M.; Best, F.; Bigelow, L.; Boone, N.; Boscarino, N.; Bray, A.; Broulik, W.; Chakraborty, S.; Cistulli, M.; Cole, E.; Donohue, P.; Duquette, J.; Elfant, A.; Emeagwali, G.; Farhat, J.; Farrish, K.; Foshay, J.; Foster, P.; Gamache, J.; Garbovskiy, Y.; Gardner, P.; Gonzalez, K.; Gunter, M.; Hazan, S.; Horrax, S.; Jackson, M.; Karas, R.; Kean, K.; Kelly, D.; King, A.; Langevin, K.; Love, K.; Lui, R.; Martin, K.; Matthews, S.;; Meng, P.; Mitchell, D.; Moriarty, M.; Nicastro, M.; Ning, W.; O'Connor, J.; Ofray, J.; Orange, M.; Oyewumi, Y.; Paolina, J.; Phillips, E.; Rahman, M.; Rivera, T.; Rodgers-Tonge, D.; Ruhs, T.; Santilli, M.; Savatorova, V.; Schenck, S.; Schmidt, S.; Smith, J.; Smith, R.; Sogunro, O.; Spinelli, A.; Sylvester, C.; Villanti, S.; Wang, W.; Zhao, S.; Zhou, B.

**Ex-Officio**: Blitz, D.; Burkholder, T.; Frank, L.; Kostelis, K.; Minkler, S.; Mulrooney, J.; Olamuyiwa, O.; Wolff, R.; Toro, Z.

**Parliamentarian:** Dimmick, C.  
**President of the Senate**: Latour, F.

**Guests**: Boncoddo, R.; Bucher, L.; Byrd Danso, K.; Cintorino, S.; Claffey, G.; Kirby, Y.; Kirk, B.; Jarrett, J.; McGrath, K.; Merenstein, B.; Moore, N.; Mooreland, D.; Pincince, T.; Robinson, C.; Soper, C.; Suski-Lenczewski, A.; Tucker, P.; Tully, J.; Veloria, C.; Votto, S.; Wright, C.; Wu, S.

1. Minutes
   1. The minutes of the meeting of December 5, 2022 were approved as presented.
2. Announcements
   1. AAUP (T. Burkholder)
      1. The legislative session has begun. AAUP will be going to the legislature to testify on a number of bills this semester and we will need member involvement. We need money to operate the universities; we will be arguing for additional State support in this environment. The governor’s budget cuts the CSUs and it is not exactly clear how that will play out.
      2. Question from S. Hazan: there was a meeting at Southern this morning about reducing tuition. Do you know what that was? T. Burkholder said he did not know about it. K. Martin said it involved Rosa DeLauro’s office and was about increasing federal aid. J. O’Connor noted AAUP has met with President Cheng twice on CSCU 2030 and also talked with the Higher Education and Labor committees.
      3. To underscore what Tom said, J. O’Connor said we are seeing, for the first time, the System Office making a multi-year, multi-billion dollar ask to fund our institutions and we need to be involved in that process. We have to separate the ask (the level of which we have never seen) from the details of the 2030 proposal. There are things that AAUP believes are non-starters, such as the consortium degree concept and the online consolidation involving Charter Oak. The proposal focuses on three key things: student support, new academic programs all about workforce development and capital investment. AAUP is speaking with Woodland Street about how we can help make the ask. There is an internal split within the Legislative Office Building with regard to what the Governor and OPM want (OPM has called us a ‘system in decline”), and what Terrence Cheng wants is involvement of all the bargaining units. Can we work together to bring more money to the institutions that have been flatlined since 2007? There is a desperate need. If we think about Appropriates and Finance, the chairs know we need more funding, but they have to build consensus within their committees. AAUP will meet with CFO Barnes in the future on one of the key problems that the union had with the expansion of the PACT program (which could have an impact on enrollment), but they have a very narrow definition of “workforce development.” We need to have a discussion about the importance of expanding the PACT program and we have to engage legislators about why that is so important. Woodland Street pitched this based on equity and said they could use as much help as we can give them. AAUP will certainly ask you to get involved and it is an important time for you to be involved. There is a lot of money around right now.
   2. SUOAF-AFSCME (S. Villanti)
      1. SUOAF is hosting a workshop on Social Security for members on February 2. The presenter is a CCSU alum who works for the Social Security Administration.
      2. SUOAF is offering a workshop on Emotional Intelligence and Stress Management on February 27.
      3. SUOAF is expecting to hear a response from the State Supreme Court on the matter involving Chris Dukes anytime now.
      4. Our next Chapter meeting is February 9 at noon on Teams.
   3. SGA (O. Olamuyiwa)
      1. One of the main agenda items of the SGA is to provide scholarships for undergraduate students. The SGA could not finalize this last semester but is are looking to disseminate materials to students this week.
      2. The SGA is also working on creating a platform for discussions surrounding Black history and the ongoing problem of police brutality in this county. The idea is to have a panel discussion to which members of the CCSU community and alumni are invited.
      3. The SGA is also working on issues relating to our commuter population. Some of them do not feel like they are a part of our community. We are exploring what SGA can do to bring them onboard. This was discussed with the new Vice President of Student Affairs when she first arrived, so we will be working on this together, along with the Commuter Council.
      4. O. Olamuyiwa expressed thanks for the Senate’s continued support of SGA and helping them make a positive impact on campus.
         1. Sen. Langevin asked how the SGA receives its information from commuter students. O. Olamuyiwa said that during his time at CCSU as a resident student, he saw that computer students do not participate in events and activities. During his campaign for SGA president, he spoke with a number of commuter students who told him they come to campus to go to class and then leave. He also reflected on the dates and times of the events that the SGA sponsors, and that is not always at times convenient for commuter students. There are also senators who are commuter students and they have expressed their feelings as well. SGA is also looking into deploying a survey to the commuter students on how their collegiate experience could be improved.
         2. Sen. Best said that he is interested in promoting the panel discussion being planned in the wake of the Memphis tragedy. He suggested SGA develop a poster about the event and email it to all students.
         3. S. Hazan asked to clarify a couple of things related to commuter students. He said he is not here to say all commuters are involved or to take away from what Ola said. However, no commuter students being involved is a myth. There are involved computer students – over 600+ of them responded to a survey last semester and over 70% of them were commuter students. We are always looking for more ways to engage students and each student has his or her own reasons for participating or not participating. This is only for clubs and organizations. It does not include students who work on campus or participate in intramurals or recreation programs.
   4. FAC to the Board of Regents (D. Blitz)

D. Blitz provided the following report on behalf of the FAC.

* + 1. NCHEMS Final Report on WCSU – This issue has largely been successfully resolved in favor of the programs. After a lot of meetings and expenditure of effort on the part of AAUP at Western and throughout the System, the Anthropology and Sociology major will be continued. The Economics major will be continued but the Economics department will be moved from Arts & Science to the School of Business. The Social Sciences minor has been eliminated. Meteorology will be redesigned for implementation in 2024. In general, it was favorable to what faculty wanted, with some setbacks.  
         
       Faculty Senate Resolution FS.12.13.002R

F. Latour read excerpts from the NCHEMS recommendations, indicating that some would have a negative impact on the universities’ autonomy. He also noted mentions of collective bargaining agreement being construed as obstacles. He asked whether the CCSU Senate wants to provide a response to the consultant’s recommendations. In addition, he noted a Senate Resolution in 2012 and the fact that Senates and the FAC are not being consulted on important matters that should involve senates and the FAC. He said it could first be discussed at the next Senate Steering Committee meeting.

* + - 1. D. Blitz agreed. He said we keep repeating the same three core elements of shared governance. He believes a discussion at the next steering committee meeting is an excellence idea. F. Latour said he would be happy to invite guests to the next SC meeting; if anyone wants to attend, they should contact him.
    1. CSCU 2030 Proposal and Capital Projects – This was developed, presumably, by the System office. The FAC was not consulted, nor was it presented to the Budget and Infrastructure Committee. To focus on the parts that will affect us: they are proposing an increase to the base budget at the level of funding that was provided by the federal government. That is $183M additional by 2025. PACT, a last-dollar supplement available to community college students who are recent high school students registered for at least 12 credits, may be extended to all community college students. PACT+ would be targeted to all students at the CSUs and Charter Oak who were in certain majors tied to workforce development needs. It would assist more than 7,000 students but result in some students having free tuition and others not. In addition, there is a plan for buildings and infrastructure for the community colleges, the CSUs and Charter Oak. The ask is $1.1B for the community colleges, $1.0B for the CSUs and $5.1M for Charter Oak, which is moving into the former CCSU building downtown. There is something referred to as the COT (College of Technology??) – the proposal there for a $350M building complex presumably in downtown Hartford. For CCSU there is Phase 1 and 2 of a STEM building. Perhaps our UPBC or Facilities Management Committee knows something about that.
       1. President Toro said CCSU submitted a proposal over 3 years ago for a new science building. The cost at the time was $235M. This has now been adjusted downward (some things we proposed have been cut.)
    2. In total, there is just over $300M per year for 7 years for “projects and programs” related to buildings and infrastructure (not academic programs.)
    3. David also referred people to certain sections of the brochure shared with the agenda.
       1. Page 10: Consortia degrees with faculty coming together from “all corners of the State.” This relates to faculty control over curriculum and pedagogy.
       2. There is also a plan included to offer online education through Charter Oak, where faculty would be paid less than they are at the CSUs and any material brought to those courses would become property of Charter Oak.
       3. As J. O’Connor mentioned, President Cheng is very eager to have the unions endorse this. The FAC has not been asked to approve or disapprove of the plan. We do plan to discuss suggestions for improvements at our next meeting.
    4. The FAC will be sponsoring a conference on shared governance in April 2023.
    5. D. Blitz and C. Sesanker now meet regularly with the CSU Provost, who has expressed considerable interest in getting faculty feedback on assessment. He is interested in common metrics.
    6. The narrative: we get two: (1) we are going under, enrollment is down and (2) we are doing so well, and we are so important to the state, we should get significant increases in funding. Can we agree on one narrative, and one that does not blame faculty and accuse them of being obstacles? For example, fringe benefits are mentioned, but that is part of a CBA which has been approved by the System Office and the Legislature.
    7. The current State surplus is at $3.2B and the Rainy Day Fund is $3.3B and $104M of pandemic relief funding has been held back from the State. The governor has said he will not touch the Rainy Day Fund. There are other groups asking for considerable funding, such healthcare services and NGOs, plus there is the proposed middle class tax cut. How much for CSCU 2030 will materialize remains to be seen. That is a matter between the System officials, their legislative staffs and gubernatorial staff.
       1. J. O’Connor said we have to celebrate the big ask from the System Office, but also point out there is a missed opportunity. L. Williams’ Op Ed in the Courant last week made a much more passionate defense and an argument about why the work we do matters.
  1. President’s Announcements (F. Latour)
     1. Some faculty have expressed concerns about the availability of AI online, such as ChatGPT, which students may be able to use to get test answers, etc. He has been in touch with the Committee on Academic Integrity and asked them to come up with a statement about following ethics rules, even in the face of an ever-increasing stream of new tools to threaten academic integrity.

1. Elections
   1. Call for Nominations: The University Planning & Budget Committee is in need a School of Education ad Professional Studies representative to serve for one semester. A call for nominees will come out and we will, hopefully, have an election at the next meeting.
2. Committee Reports
   1. Academic Standards Committee (R. Boncoddo) – R. Boncoddo reviewed the report distributed with the agenda. The single item proposed by the Committee is a revision of the Course Repeat Policy. The change is that the highest grade earned, not the last grade earned, would be what is calculated in the student’s GPA and this would go into effect this coming Fall. The proposed change also moves the decision to prohibit someone from taking a class for the third time away from the Registrar’s office to the Department Chair.

Discussion:

* + 1. Is this policy only for Undergraduates? Yes, the Committee on Academic Standards does not have any responsibilities related to graduate studies policy, that is the work of the GSC.
    2. Sen. Best asked for the rational for making students take the lower grade? He also said he does not feel we should stand in the way of a student wanting to take a course again to get a better grade. He is in support of making the change to allow the higher grade to prevail.
    3. Sen. Jackson sought clarification: would the change permit a student to repeat a course once with no prohibition, but allow the student to take a class 5 times as long as the department chair doesn’t prohibit it? F. Latour said that the 17 credit limit is only for inclusion in the GPA. There is really no limit to the number of times a student can retake it (so long as the Chair does not prohibit it), but so long as you have not exceeded the 17 credit limit, the higher grade will prevail. Now the practice would be that the Department Chair could say “no, you cannot keep retaking this course.” R. Boncoddo confirmed that to be correct.
    4. F. Latour asked whether we should ask the Registrar if there is a way to automate this?
    5. Sen. Smith asked whether the student would have to get the department chair’s signature on the 3rd or 4th time trying to register for a course? F. Latour said it is his understanding that chairs wishing to enforce this policy could ask the Registrar for a report of students taking a course for the 2nd, 3rd, or 4th time. R. Smith said she has never received such a report but has had students take a course multiple times (beyond 2). On a procedural note: she asked whether there will be a form that the Chair has to sign, giving the student permission to take the course for the 3rd, 4th or 5th time.
    6. P. Tucker said there is a process in place for repeating courses in programs that have special accreditation requirements or other accreditation-related issues.
    7. K. McGrath noted that there could be a reason we would want to adopt this policy, even if Banner cannot accommodate it. It is more student-friendly. In terms of accepting the highest grade, this is a policy already in place at the community colleges.
    8. Sen. Smith: you might want to note in the catalog that outside organizations and entities may not accept this policy. For example, the Law School Admissions Council calculates a student’s GPA and includes all courses taken. F. Latour noted that all courses and grades earned will be on the transcript.
    9. Sen. Best said that he is strongly in favor of students being able to retake courses and receive the higher grade computed into their GPA.

**MOTION**: To approve the proposed policy and send it to President Toro for her signature. Motion passed.

1. Update from Curriculum Committee (N. Moore) – N. Moore updated the Senate on irregularly offered courses. Right now, we keep them forever. If you are in a program that has electives, you may have a student asking for a course that will probably not be offered in their lifetime. We have an opportunity. Y. Kirby noted that NECHE standards says we have to remove courses within a certain timeframe. He presented a slide deck aimed to convey a plan that could work. The current process to bring an archived course back is lengthy. The Provost and Registrar are open to an alternative process. One option was reviewed, noting it is an option, not a proposal. The plan is to have a bylaws committee with a representative from each school that could bring a proposal to the full Curriculum Committee and then on to the Senate.
   1. Sen. Jackson thanked N. Moore for the report and reiterated that it is false advertising when we are listing things in the catalog with no intention to offer them. We made a change in 2012. Before that, we looked back 2 years. There were a lot of Fall-only or Spring-only; in the case of someone going on sabbatical or into administration for a year, it could exceed two years. That drove the policy change to increase the two years to four years. In sum, he stated his support of this work being done by the Curriculum Committee.
   2. D. Blitz note that sometimes the course is run, but the enrollment is below 9, so it is offered under an independent study number. He asked the Curriculum Committee to take that into account. F. Latour asked whether that still counts as the course being offered? R. Wolff said yes, it counts.
   3. Sen. Duquette said the key is that when you do the independent study, to not to offer it under the Independent Study designation but list it with the course’s actual course designation.
2. Academic Assessment Committee – F. Latour said the Committee has a brief report about an event they are organizing. C. Soper thanked Senators and the departments for submitting their reports on time (97% response rate, the highest ever). This Friday there is an event sponsored by the Davis Foundation grant to CCSU. We are working to align assignments to the rubric shared with the agenda. We are hoping to have more faculty involved. We have 107 from 38 departments and all 4 schools. The flyer for the event was shown. The event was described as part of our ongoing process to assess our programs and their learning outcomes. F. Latour encouraged faculty to participate.  
   1. F. Latour asked if any students’ artifacts could be included? C. Soper said she would get clarification on that. Y. Kirby clarified that we don’t have the resources to evaluate every student on campus, so what we chose to do is look at freshmen and seniors. She said that fits in our NECHE guidelines and gives us a good idea of what a student’s first-year and student-year look like. We will accept every single artifact in the case we do have the opportunity to assess every student, but we will initially sort out the first-year and senior students. Then, if there are resources and time to go beyond that, we will.
3. Council of Academic Chairs – F. Latour presented a report from the Council of Academic Chairs. The Council sent him a report, with a request that it be shared with the agenda and accepted as an informational report. It has been taken off the consent agenda because someone has a question about it. The Chair of the Council of Chairs is not here today but has been asked to attend the next Senate meeting to take questions.
   1. Sen. Blitz asked whether the correct terminology would be to receive the report. Fred acknowledged that. He also said he found the report interesting and it is worth a discussion at the next meeting, as it relates to shared governance, which is not only an issue at CCSU, but also at other CSUs, such as Eastern.
   2. Sen. Barrington said she feels this is an important issue and that it should be put as high as possible on the agenda for the next meeting. F. Latour noted that he received similar requests for today’s meeting and that is why it is where it is on today’s agenda. He said he will endeavor to accommodate her request.
   3. Sen. Jackson agreed with both prior comments and said that he had asked it to be removed from the consent agenda. He feels this absolutely deserves to be discussed and appreciates it will be on the agenda in two weeks.
4. New Business
   1. Student Opinion Surveys – Fred noted that those on the list serv noticed there was a lot of discussion about student option surveys over the recent break. Some faculty are concerned the results are not available earlier enough and would like to have the results in time to revise Spring courses. Others are concerned with low response rates and how to improve them. He proposed to charge the ITC with working on that policy. He is particularly concerned about how the surveys impact new and part-time faculty because the surveys may be used to determine renewals. C. Barrington asked whether this could be brought back to departments. F. Latour agreed and said to take the matter back to departments and send him comments. This way, he could consolidate the concerns and give the ITC one charge. He reminded the Senate what the AAUP contract says about the survey instrument. C. Barrington asked when Fred would like the comments. Fred said before the next meeting in two weeks.
5. Senate Steering Committee – F. Latour sought the approval of two new steering committee members. Two previously approved members are not able to participate in the spring. One is from School of Business and the other represents part-time faculty. The nominees are Weihong Ning from the School of Business and Ann Marie Spinelli as a representative of the part-time faculty.
   1. MOTION: To approve Weihong Ning and Ann Marie Spinelli as members of the Senate Steering Committee for the Spring 2023 semester. Motion approved.

F. Latour asked the Senate if there is any other business? No response was received.

1. Adjournment

**MOTION:** To adjourn (F. Best). Motion passed. Meeting adjourned at 4:43 p.m.