

**Minutes – April 17, 2023 – 3:05 p.m.**

**Online through WebEx**

**CCSU Faculty Senate Meeting**

**Present:** Acharya, K.; Al-Masoud, N.; Amaya, L.; Andreoletti, C.; Baratta, C.; Bigelow, L.; Boone, N.; Benoit, D.; Boscarino, N.; Bray, A.; Broulik, W.; Cistulli, M.; Chakraborty, S.; Clark, B.; Cole, E.; Donohue, P.; Duquette, J.; Elfant, A.; Emeagwali, G.; Fallon, M.; Farrish, K.; J.; Flinn, B.; Foshay, J.; Foster, P.; Gamache, J.; Garbovskiy, Y.; Gonzalez, K.; Hazan, S.; Hernandez, R.; Horrax, S.; Hou, X.; Jackson, M.; Karas, R.; Kean, K.; Kelly, D.; King, A.; Kulesza, M.; Langevin, K.; Love, K.; Martin, K.; Matthews, S.; Meng, P.; Mitchell, D.; Moriarty, M.; Ning, W.; O'Connor, J.; Ofray, J.; Orange, M.; Oyewumi, Y.; Pana, E.; Park, S.; Paolina, J.; Patterson, Y.; Phillips, E.; Rahman, M.; Rivera, T.; Ruhs, T.; Savatorova, V.; Schenck, S.; Schmidt, S.; Smith, R.; Spinelli, A.; Styrzcula, S.; Sylvester, C.; Tellier, A.; Thamma, R.; Villanti, S.; Zadi, S.; Zhao, S.; Zhou, B.

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

**Parliamentarian:** Dimmick, C.

**President of the Senate:** Latour, F.

**Guests:** Alkabasi, H.; Aerni, G.; Bantley, K.; Broderick, D.; Bucher, L.; Byrd Danso, K.; Cintorino, S.; Claffey, G.; Gour, R.; Kirby, Y.; Leong, C.; McGrath, K.; McMahon, L.; Mendoza, D.; Merenstein, B.; Pincince, T.; Robinson, C.; Ross, J.; Russo, M.; Suski-Lenczewski, A.; Thomas, C.; Thompson, T.; Tucker, P.; Tully, J.; Veloria, C.; Votto, S.; Williams, C.; Wright, C.; Wu, S.

1. Minutes

- a. The minutes of April 3, 2023 were accepted as presented.

2. Announcements

- a. AAUP (T. Burkholder)
  - i. Reminder: An end of year social is May 12 from 3-6 p.m. at Alvarium.
  - ii. AAUP is reaching out to faculty to ask them to contact their legislators. The Appropriations Committee should be releasing their budget this week. Louise Williams wrote an Op Ed in the Connecticut Mirror about the underfunding of higher education across the state. The Governor's budget funds CSCU at a rate that is lower than last year, and the same for UConn, while looking at \$500M in tax cuts and billions in surplus. Members of the Senate were urged to contact their legislators to let them know why the State should be spending money on public higher education and our students. Unless CSCU is allocated more funding than is presently planned, CCSU students are looking at tuition increases, which will lead to more enrollment problems.
- b. SUOAF-AFSCME (L. Bigelow)

- i. SUOAF is working with AFSCME Council 4 to put an email campaign together to facilitate members reaching out to their representatives to seek additional funding for CSCU.
- c. SGA – J. Ross
  - i. Updates:
    1. The SGA successfully conducted elections for the upcoming academic year. Newly elected members will be introduced at the next Senate meeting.
    2. The SGA cannot survey undergraduate students this semester regarding academic advising. The World Cafés were successful; an SGA survey would be redundant to that effort.
    3. SGA is partnering with CT Transit to raise awareness of commuting options.
    4. SGA is supporting the Africana Center's Afro fest event this Thursday from 1-3 p.m. Students are encouraged to attend.
    5. SGA scholarship applications are now being reviewed. Winners will be announced shortly.
- d. Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC) to the Board of Regents (D. Blitz)
  - i. The FAC has continued to meet with the System Provost and are pleased and satisfied with the openness of the discussions.
    1. ECSU – An academic program was presented for approval to the Academic and Student Affairs Committee (ASAC) of the Board before being approved by Eastern's Senate. C. Sesanker brought this up at the ASAC and the committee informed her they assumed that the program had been approved at the campus level and had no way of knowing that it had not been approved. As a result, procedural changes are being made so that ASAC is informed of what individuals and bodies have approved programs prior to their receiving them.
    2. The FAC has begun a discussion on program assessment. The System Provost would like to see a common system of program assessment across all 6 institutions in the CSCU System as of July 1 (which includes the one community college, Charter Oak and the four state universities.) Consult the video of the FAC meeting for more details. There were interesting suggestions made for modification; changes would be made for the AY 24-25 academic year. What is the purpose and goal of the assessment? Should the same process be used for all institutions? These questions remain unanswered and will be pursued.
    3. The FAC hopes that the allocation for the CSCU System will be increased. D. Blitz is asking for a meeting with the Chair of the Finance

and Infrastructure Committee because the figures in the budgets (CSCU's and the Governor's budgets) do not add up.

- a. J. O'Connor noted that CSU AAUP will be meeting with Gov. Lamont next week. They will also be meeting with Martin Looney and Matt Ritter. The issue is the spending cap within the budget. As the recent email from L. Williams laid out, if CSCU is funded at the level the governor is proposing, it is going to be ugly. The union has been working the politics hard but needs help. The union also met with C. Osten, the Chair of Appropriations.
- b. D. Blitz opined that the System Office may have over-played its hand with the CSCU 2030 budget request. OPM and the Governor's office are not entertaining funding CSCU at the level requested. A clear objective, rather than a general ask, may have been better-received.
- c. J. O'Connor noted that a key issue is how fringe benefits are being handled.

e. President of the Faculty Senate (F. Latour)

- i. Reminder: CCSU is in the middle of student recruiting season. There are several Accepted Student Day events coming up, including one on April 29 and another on May 25. He encouraged faculty to participate.
- ii. Reminder: There are still quite a few items that will come to the Senate before the end of the semester, including the Athletics Strategic Plan. Given that, it is possible that a special meeting in addition to the regular meeting schedule will be necessary because some things must be dealt with before the semester ends.
- iii. An update on the Council of Academic Chairpersons Report along with Dr. Farhat's rebuttal was discussed. The decision made at the time the report was discussed in Senate was to return the report to the Committee and to the Senate Steering Committee. There was also a discussion that took place between the Chair of the Council of Academic Chairpersons and the Senate Steering Committee. Rather than asking that the report be revised, the decision was made to ask Sen. Farhat to prepare a rebuttal, which is posted on the Senate website and was also circulated with the agenda.
  - 1. D. Blitz noted that in the Council of Chairpersons Report circulated with the agenda, there is a paragraph in red. He asked if that was added or in the original. F. Latour indicated that it was in the original. D. Blitz underscored that the faculty control the curriculum and pedagogy, including in the mode of delivery. He thought that this point could have been made stronger in the Council of Chairpersons Report.

3. Call for Nominations – Standing Committee of the Faculty

- a. F. Latour noted that a call for nominations for standing committees of the faculty will be forthcoming shortly.

#### 4. Committee Reports

- a. Task Force on College of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences (K. Bantley) – K. Bantley introduced the draft report stressing that it is a draft and that the Senate is being consulted for its advisory opinion. She asked that the Senate's feedback be consolidated and representative of the Senate as a whole before being sent to her. She noted that the two-week delay in getting the draft report to the Senate was so that the Task Force could make sure that they had all of the input that academic departments wanted to provide and that the Task Force now feels that all faculty voices that wanted to be heard have been heard.

F. Latour asked what it means for a department to be "associated" with a college without being part of the college. K. Bantley said they used the term "housed" to denote our current structure. "Associated" would be similar to how programs in the Ammon College of Liberal Arts & Social Sciences also work with the School of Education and Professional Studies, using the BS Ed. programs as an example. The deans from each school would help hammer out what the relationships will look like. The associated departments would not get a budget under the new school; they would still work with their existing dean. Another "associated program" example given was the Department of World Languages, Literatures and Cultures giving the course *Spanish for the Health Professions*.

President Latour said that many faculty are concerned about how the "association" would impact things like promotion and tenure. For example, if a CLASS department has an association with the new college, would the dean of the new college have input into things like promotion, tenure, workload, etc.? K. Bantley said that faculty would still be working with the dean of the school/college where their department is officially located.

Sen. Smith asked two questions: (1) What is the square footage of Copernicus? (2) What is meant by "create a new entry point by the FastTrack". S. Cintorino did not know the answer to the question of square footage off the top of his head, but promised to get that information for Sen. Smith. K. Kostelis said that the community clinic is on the bus line; there are no plans for an additional building or change in the bus line.

Sen. Al-Masoud asked K. Bantley whether there are differences between the terms "association" and "affiliation" because both terms were used. K. Bantley said there are differences and the term is "association", citing that is how the charge to the Task Force was worded.

Sen. Andreoletti commented in the chat: "Gerontology and Psychological Science looks forward to the possibility of the opportunity to collaborate with

the new school in a variety of ways. Gerontology is an interdisciplinary program across schools and we've been able to work together quite well."

Sen. Smith asked if the pilot clinic is still planned for Spring 2023. K. Bantley noted that there was an Athletic Training pop-up clinic last week and Nursing will be doing a pop-up clinic soon.

Sen. Langevin noted the Nursing pop-up clinic is scheduled for Wednesday, April 26 from 5-7 p.m. She heard that about 75 people participated in the Athletic Training pop-up clinic. They will be doing education about topics in the news, such as STDs and COVID education, cancer education and screening, and healthy eating. There will also be an opportunity to be weighed and have BMI calculated.

Sen. Bray stated/asked in the chat: "In the report - it states with "solid base provided by the work groups ....with thoughtful input from the University Planning & Budget Committee...)" but we have been consulted once that I remember and did not include any figures of cost of this which we asked for an estimate. I understand that the cost was not part of the task force responsibility but will that be a consideration prior to any movement in this proposal?"

K. Kostelis indicated they did present figures to the UPBC and she will send the figures to K. Bantley to include in the Task Force's report.

Sen. Bray said she understands that they met with the UPBC regarding the pilot clinic, but she does not think that is consistent with the reference of "thoughtful consideration" by the UPBC. K. Kostelis noted that the budget proposal for the new college is the next step. K. Bantley also said the word "thoughtful" can be changed. F. Latour said he is assuming that the UPBC will be part of the conversation about the budgets of the new clinic and college.

Sen. Savatarova asked "last week there was a health and fitness screening event at the Applied Innovation Hub. Was it related to the pilot?" K. Bantley said yes, that was the Athletic Training and Human Performance pop-up.

Sen. Bigelow asked in the chat: "Do we yet have formal legal or medical opinions as to what services the official clinic will be able to offer?" K. Bantley said that conversations with outside counsel are in progress regarding this and that is why the pop-up clinics are being restricted to things that the participating departments already offer and that we will move forward with doing more when authorized to do so.

D. Blitz said the new building for the college is not included in the CSCU 2030 capital funding proposal. Will this be amended or is there another source of funding expected? Z. Toro said that there is another source of funding expected. The capital request submitted to the legislator is based on a request we made four years ago. The system didn't give us the opportunity to provide updated information. The funding for the science building is not likely to come and

funding for the building for the new college will not likely come from state resources.

F. Latour asked K. Bantley if she is available on May 1 to return to the Senate. She confirmed availability. Fred said that the Steering Committee will send a message to all senators asking for any and all feedback that is actionable by the Senate so that a response from the Senate can be consolidated. Fred asked if the message should go to all Senators or all faculty. He noted normally the Senate communicates with senators, who take things back to their departments. Fred thought it might be helpful to provide a form for all faculty to submit comments/concerns.

Sen. Chakraborty asked if constituents give feedback and feedback is incorporated, there could be new concerns. F. Latour stated this is a three step process: Step 1: Task Force presented draft to the Senate; Step 2: Senate provides advice to the Task Force; and Step 3: Task Force presents final document and Senate decides whether to support it. The final decision is not made by the Senate, but by the President, perhaps with the input of her Executive Committee. The advice of the Senate needs to be in the vote of the Senate which will take place at Step 3.

Sen. Andreoletti spoke in favor of having the Steering Committee communicate with senators and have senators go back to their departments to get feedback. She also liked the idea of a form that senators could use to submit feedback to the Senate Steering Committee.

Sen. Langevin stated she also likes having the senators use a feedback form and gather input from their faculty.

F. Latour reiterated: Step 1 is today; Step 2 is collection of feedback prior to the May 1 meeting; Step 3 is a vote on the final report. Hearing no objection, Fred declared that as the plan moving forward.

F. Latour thanked K. Bantley for coming to the meeting to present the draft report.

- b. Task Force on Academic Advising (M. Jackson and P. Tucker) - P. Tucker and M. Jackson presented highlights of the report of the Task Force on Academic Advising circulated with the agenda.

Sen. Smith asked Do we all have access to Cisco Jabber (Mac and PC) and can we use that to "text" students? Sen. Rivera confirmed access to Jabber. Sen. Bigelow urged caution when using texting as a means of communication as once a recipient Unsubscribes, they should not be texted again. G. Claffey confirmed this.

FAC Rep. Blitz said advising plays an important role in enrollment. It has been a big issue at the community colleges. There is an illusion that hiring 174 professional advisors will solve the retention problem. They set unrealistic metrics that were not achieved. That

said, faculty have an important role to play in academic advising. There is a role in professional advising in the area of Gen Ed. Faculty mentoring is one of the clearest indicators of student success. The question of mental health counseling is also important to consider. He said he appreciated the report, which was impressive, and the presentation of the report, which he considered excellent, but said there are four things that need to be considered in totality: faculty advising, professional advisor advising, mentoring relationships, and mental health counselling.

P. Tucker said that the concepts of collaboration and coordination emerged throughout the work of the task force. He summarized that point by saying we need to enhance information-sharing information and collaboration.

F. Latour asked whether the Task Force's recommendation on bylaws changes for the Committee on Academic Advising (CAA) have been accepted. M. Jackson said it was a recommendation that they have discussed with the chair of the CAA and that the CAA should make the final decisions concerning their bylaws revisions. F. Latour said that he would like to hear whether the CAA is supportive of that recommendation.

F. Latour asked whether the Task Force wanted the Senate to take action on the report today. The co-chairs indicated this report was intended to be the Final Report of the Task Force. F. Latour asked whether they wanted the Senate to accept or approve the report. M. Jackson said that he did not think there were actionable items in the report, and F. Latour agreed. F. Latour asked senators to look at the report (on the Senate's website) to see whether there was anything they wished to have the Senate take action on.

F. Latour thanked all members of the task force for their work.

- c. Task Force on Electrical Engineering (C. Leong) – C. Leong presented the report of the Task Force on Electrical Engineering. C. Leong said that the intent of the presentation is to inform the Senate of the charge to and work of the Task Force and that he is not seeking any Senate action today. However, he appealed to the Senate to enlist their support in getting the Computer Electronics and Graphics Technology (CEGT) to provide the task force with the data it has requested.

Dr. Wu spoke against the task force's report, which she said was not shared with the CEGT department prior to being posted just prior to the Senate meeting. She asked if this is about CCSU's strategic plan, why haven't task forces been created for other CCSU programs? Dr. Wu stated that the task force's report states that the CEGT department declined requests to meet and this is simply not true. The department did not decline any requests to meet and that the six charges to the task force are inconsistent with ABET standards.

Sen. Amaya stated she is a member of the task force and that this report is being presented only for the information of the Senate. She stated she does not feel that the

Senate is the venue to have a discussion about whether or not communication occurred between the task force and the CEGT department.

Dr. Wu asked the Senate not to approve the report and to withdraw its representative from the Task Force.

Sen. Amaya noted that there is a member of the CEGT department on the task force.

A point of order was made by President Latour.

Dr. Wu stated that the department needs to be truly involved in the work of the task force and a way to do this is to have a member of the department who is elected by the department serve on the task force.

Dr. Leong noted that the document presented does not have any recommendations, just preliminary findings based on data anyone has access to. Related to the involvement of the department, the report also serves to document the historical experiences that have taken place. Following the meetings where shared governance was agreed upon, no responses were received when the task force requested material. As regards the charge to the task force, the first four charges are very broad. The task force has not received any compliance or cooperation from the CEGT department, and Dr. Minkler has had this experience as he has tried to gather information for the task force as well.

Dr. Williams stated he is on the task force. He said that the aspect of shared governance would make this process smoother. It should not be phrased as "compliance," but more as "cooperation." He also said that it would have been preferable for the members of the department to have been part of the meeting when the task force was founded.

F. Latour said Dr. Wu, as chair of the department being asked for information, has two options: to provide the task force with the information they are seeking or to file a rebuttal where she explains why she believes that she should not be providing the requested information to the task force. He noted that if the report had been available earlier, he could have asked for the rebuttal to be submitted for today.

Dr. Wu asked (1) Why Electrical Engineering? (2) Why is the department being excluded by not being able to send a representative whom they select.

F. Latour asked Dr. Wu if she would provide the information requested if she received answers to these two questions.

D. Broderick stated he is a member of the CEGT department and is a member of the task force.

Dr. Wu stated the department has not selected Dr. Broderick, and that Dr. Broderick told her that the task force is confidential, therefore, the CEGT Department has no information about the task force's work. Dr. Wu said that the gist of the problem is that because the department did not designate Dr. Broderick to serve on the task force, there is no smooth communication or collaboration.



Sen. Amaya noted that the selection of the taskforce members is not done by department, it is done by the Provost.

K. Kostelis said she does not believe the Senate is the right forum to be airing this issue. She said there are a number of bodies represented on the task force, including AAUP, the Senate, and the CEGT department. She said she does not believe the department has been left out if there is a current member of the department on the task force.

Dr. Wu disagreed with the Provost's statement that there is a departmental representative on the task force because the department did not select that faculty member. She again asked, why has this task force been formed to hold the Electrical Engineering program responsible for guaranteeing student success.

Sen. Foster asked if a decision had been made as to where Electrical Engineering would be housed? K. Kostelis said no, there is no recommendation from the task force. She noted that the program was brought to the Board of Regents (BOR) before she was in her current role and Dr. Toro herself carried it over the finish line. She said this is a matter of gathering information so that the decision of next steps can be made. She reiterated her position that the Senate is not the forum for this discussion.

Dr. Wu spoke about enrollment in the program, which is thirty students and growing. She said no new faculty have been hired, so there is no cost involved. Before the task force was created, there was only one adjunct faculty. To be fair, if Electrical Engineering is to be criticized for enrollment, a comparison should be made with other programs in their first two years.

Dr. Leong noted that Fall 2023 enrollment as of April 10 is 1 student and that this data speaks for itself.

Sen. Bray called the question. F. Latour said there is no request on the floor to be called. He reiterated the two options Dr. Wu has: provide data to the task force as requested or provide a rebuttal. He noted that there is also a decision for the administration to make: whether to answer Dr. Wu's question about a department-elected representative on the task force. That having been said, there is really not much more that can be done in this forum.

5. Adjournment - A motion to adjourn was made to stop the discussion. A request was made to put the last item on the agenda for today's meeting at the top of the agenda for the next meeting. President Latour agreed. The motion to adjourn was approved and the meeting ended at 5:32 p.m.