

PA12-007

SB0042

Higher Education	527-534, 585-598, 610-614, 633-637	32
House	2142-2145	4
<u>Senate</u>	<u>831, 924-925</u>	<u>3</u>
		39

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**HIGHER EDUCATION
AND
EMPLOYMENT ADVANCEMENT
PART 2
369 - 735**

2012

And so next on the list is Stephen Adair.

A VOICE: (Inaudible).

SENATOR BYE: Thank you.

Your -- Stephen can you put your mic on please.

STEPHEN ADAIR: Okay. Thank you Senator Bye, Representative Willis and members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on S.B. 42, An Act Concerning the Selection Process for Members of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents.

SENATOR BYE: Steve I'm going to interrupt you one more time. Just because your mic wasn't on will you identify yourself again for the record?

STEPHEN ADAIR: Yup -- yup. I'm -- my name is Stephen Adair, professor of sociology and chair of the sociology department at CCSU. Last fall I was also elected to the Faculty Advisory Committee for the Board of Regents and have been nominated for chair of that -- of that committee.

First -- first before -- I guess -- testimony -- I just want to thank this Committee for having the foresight of creating the Faculty Advisory Committee. As you all know when we had the system faculty did not have the same kind of access to the -- to the Board as -- as is now. And in -- in that capacity I do hope and expect and intend that we can make meaningful contributions in all matters but especially in the particular issue that has come on to us which is the new articulation policy and transfer policy.

But I have -- I have two suggestions regarding S.B. 42. First I support revising the original language that established the FAC to make the selection process uniform across the three systems. This year each university and CSU elected one representative through a faculty-wide vote organized through the faculty senates.

One of the four representatives was identified by a random process to serve as an alternate which will rotate each year. This year the representative at -- from Western is the alternate. I will be the alternate next year.

In contrast the community colleges ran a election process for their three representatives through each faculty bargaining unit and elected one representative and two alternatives for each of the three seats.

While the Faculty Advisory Committee is constituted according to the legislation with three voting members each from CSU and the community technical college and one from Charter Oak, at the first meeting there was an imbalance of representation at the table as the community of colleges had six alternatives and CSU had one.

Having four elected members with a rotating alternate works well for CSU. I recognize that such a configuration would be more challenging for the community colleges. I've heard a number of different suggestions. One that CSU increase the number of alternates or even that there be a committee of 25, one elected from each of the community colleges, three from each CSU university and one from Charter Oak.

While I support the current size of the committee, the more important issue is that the

selection process be uniform.

And second in -- in our first and only meeting this -- last month, the Faculty Advisory Committee agreed to operate with co-chairs, one from CSU and one from comm -- the community colleges. The legislation requires us to name a chair and a vice-chair which we intend to identify at our next meeting on March 2nd but would recommend that S.B. 42 be changed to identify co-chairs rather than rotating between chair and vice-chair.

So I thank you for the opportunity to testify.

SENATOR BYE: Those are very pragmatic suggestions and -- and if you have other ideas about how it could be uniform -- thank you for the suggestions that you gave -- appreciate that. And -- and we are happy that there is a faculty representative process, if you will, in the Board of Regents. And that was something that was important to this Committee last year.

I have a question for you which isn't on your testimony because -- and -- and I think we'll hear more testimony about it today but because I have a teaching faculty member in front of me I'll ask now.

There -- there has been some concern that the way that the legislation is drafted limits it to teaching faculty and there are also administrative faculty on various campuses. I'm -- I'm not exactly sure how it's structured. I'm sure by the end of this hearing I will know very well how it's structured.

But my question to you as a teaching faculty is do you think it should be opened up to both administrative and teaching faculty? And I'll -

- I'll give you a little caveat, a little bit of my thinking, before you answer.

Having worked in universities, there are two very different pieces of most universities. I -
- I've worked at a private college where you have the administrative folks on one side and the faculty senate on another side and they're two very different worlds. Now it may not be that way but, you know, I think our intent was to represent teaching faculty but I -- there have been some important questions raised about why not administrative faculty as well.

So if you want to answer that loaded question, you know --

STEPHEN ADAIR: It's -- it's a loaded question and it -- and it's -- it's complicated I think also by virtue of the position that I'm in given the ways under which people got elected through the community colleges and feel obliged both to be representative of -- of CSU as well as, in some ways, speaking for the Faculty Advisory Committee.

At the same time that the elections that took place at CSU were from the teaching faculty as opposed to -- and I -- I really don't want to speak to the election process that took place in the community colleges but it was sort of quite different process by the ways under which that happened, the committee is relatively -- is not relatively small -- it is small listed as -- as seven voting members on that committee.

I think that most of the concerns or the issues that this Committee is expected to address will be matters related to curriculum but I think that the teaching faculty are more able address.

I also think that the administrative faculty are under different kinds of administrative lines and -- and subject to different types of oversight than is true of the teaching faculty which makes their responsibility and their role somewhat different.

I have no objection if this Committee decides to include teaching faculty on the committee though if you were to do so I would appreciate the -- I would most like to see it simply adder -- added on to the existing size of the committee and that have the election process take place separately so that administrative and teaching faculty do not get on that committee through the same election process.

So for instance if you want to add one administrative faculty or non-teaching faculty per unit, sort of increasing us from seven to nine, seems like a -- a compromise.

SENATOR BYE: Actually that's very helpful and you did that very well. Thank you.

Other questions from Committee members?
Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER: Thank you for testifying today and my question is similar to Senator Bye's but in my experience we have others in the university, and by others I mean say the librarian, the head librarian for the university, there's always been a debate whether they are faculty or whether they are staff.

And they run usually a very large institution within the university. Sometimes they teach but oftentimes not because they end up being other because they have to administer that. And then I also -- now I'm thinking of the university as

well. We have campus police which are an entity unto themselves, they're here today for another reason, and we have say the head of food service. And I don't necessarily think of them as administration.

Do you have thoughts on those individuals and how they might participate if they so decided that -- because they're certainly are integral part of the university making them run and tick? Do you thoughts on that?

STEPHEN ADAIR: I wasn't expecting that question. And I think -- and I think that library is -- is a little bit different in the sense that many of the people in the library may be classified as faculty or may be classified as non-teaching faculty but there are certainly other staff positions that are there as well.

It -- it does seem to me that the mission of the Faculty Advisory Committee would be sort of specifically related to sort of educational issues and it seems to me that having representatives on there from campus police or students -- or -- not student services but -- well student services but -- or food services would -- would drastically change the sort of focus and ability to be able to generate sort of significant contributions out of the Faculty Advisory Committee.

REP. SAWYER: If we looked at your description of non-teaching faculty, not administration but non-teaching faculty, so you're saying that you don't think that they would add a depth to this (inaudible).

STEPHEN ADAIR: No -- no not -- no -- I -- there -- the prospective non-teaching faculty I think is -- they're situated differently in terms of how

it is that they report to administrators, for instance, the ways under which their, you know, their role as practitioners and professionals is structured differently I think than the teaching faculty.

Many I think have unique perspectives on things. I mean in thinking of the sort of current issues there are people that are in -- doing articulation agreements. There are people who do academic counseling. There are different kinds of advisors, right. I mean the -- those people may, in fact, offer interesting contributions.

REP. SAWYER: Let -- let me ask you a question then. Maybe it's my misinterpretation but on line 4 it says that there shall be a faculty advisory board for the Board of Regents of Higher Education to assist and perform -- the board performing its statutory functions.

And in this case we're talking about teaching faculty would be the change into the language that the members would be teaching faculty. So you don't think that some of these non-teaching faculty members fit into this advisory board? Do you see this advisory board only as teaching faculty?

STEPHEN ADAIR: I -- I would have no objection if the Committee elected to keep it only as teaching faculty. If the Committee --

REP. SAWYER: Oh politically correct, hold on.

STEPHEN ADAIR: -- if the Committee wanted to include teaching faculty then I would suggest that you make that a separate item to be included. So for instance if -- if there are to be three teaching faculties say from the community

colleges and three from CSU, then the -- the legislation would need to be I would suggest specifically changed to include say one person among the teaching faculty and one person for -- from CSU and one from the community colleges.

REP. SAWYER: From non-teaching faculty?

STEPHEN ADAIR: Yes.

REP. SAWYER: Thank you for your thoughts.

SENATOR BYE: Thank you, Dr. Adair. I'm sure you weren't expecting this many questions but we really appreciate your -- your perspective and I think that the reason we added this Faculty Advisory Committee is that when we talk to folks on campuses they said presidents come and go, you know, a lot of people come and go but we're here for many, many years for the most part and we have a lot to add and we have an important perspective.

And I think we can hear from the answers to the questions how complicated the landscape is on -- on campuses.

So thank you for your testimony and feel free to contact us if you have other thoughts because we hit you with a bunch of questions that are -- you'll keep processing probably. So thank you very much.

STEPHEN ADAIR: Thank you.

SENATOR BYE: Next is Father Jeffrey Von Arx, am I saying that -- from Fairfield University.

Good morning, Father.

FATHER JEFFREY von ARX: Good morning, Senator, how

SB 28

So I -- I appreciate your testimony.

Representative Sawyer do you have any questions or are you good?

And thank you for coming.

DOMINIC YOIA: Thank you very much.

SENATOR BYE: And I appreciate your patience.

DOMINIC YOIA: Thank you.

SENATOR BYE: Next on the list is Barbara Richards.
Welcome Barbara.

BARBARA RICHARDS: Thank you. Good afternoon those of you remaining and thank you.

SENATOR BYE: Good afternoon and just know, you know, as you -- it -- it doesn't look like there are a lot of people here but in fact, you know, we did all receive your correspondence and have raised this bill to address your concerns and I know it's --

BARBARA RICHARDS: Oh -- oh that's nice to know.

SENATOR BYE: -- very important to my co-chair, Representative Willis. Oh yes.

BARBARA RICHARDS: Yes I know it is too and -- and I have been corresponding with her so thank you very much.

SENATOR BYE: Thank you very much for coming.

BARBARA RICHARDS: Okay. I'm a professor of sociology at Housatonic Community College, a former member of the standing advisory committee

SB42

to the Board of Governors for Higher Education and an alternate member of the Faculty Advisory Committee of the Board of Regents. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify. I'm here about Bill No. 42.

I believe that the key word in the bill is unitary. It is important to know how the current community college representatives to the Faculty Advisory Committee were selected. The system office, that is the former system office, asked the academic deans to conduct democratic elections on each campus. Some deans asked the chairs of the senates or councils to run the elections and others held elections at meetings of the faculty.

The first stage of the elections was completed on each campus resulting in 12 nominees for three positions as representatives to the FAC plus an unspecified number of alternates.

At this point in the process three unions met with the new vice president for human resources of the Board of Regents. The unions proposed that they should name the community college members of the FAC. Their proposal was accepted and the unions then made their selections. All of the community college representatives and alternates currently serving on the Faculty Advisory Committee were names by these three unions.

I am a strong supporter of unions, have been for years, but -- but I see their mission as distinct from that of a Faculty Advisory Committee that has input on matters such as mission statements or policies on transfer and articulation. Unions have a duty to prioritize the welfare of their members, while the Advisory Committee should focus on the needs of the

students and of the state.

On another part of the bill, the insertion of the word teaching before the word faculty that's getting a lot of attention here. I would like to suggest that the Faculty Advisory Committee be enlarged to include one representative per campus from the community colleges and three representatives per campus from the CSUs. This would result in more effective communication by the FAC with all parts of the new combined system.

And with directions and a -- with direct elections and a larger committee, the teaching faculty, I believe, would be strongly represented on the resulting body and it would not be necessary to insert the word faculty. It would be useful for the committee to have the input of some non-teaching representatives as well.

Finally a question. If the bill passes, would the intent be for the existing Faculty Advisory Committee to serve out its two-year term or for the Faculty Senates to hold new elections soon after the statute takes effect?

Thank you very much and I'd be very happy to answer any questions. I'm the first community college person to speak here.

SENATOR BYE: Well thank you and I really want to thank you for your advocacy because what you pointed out to us as you were corresponding was that we were not nearly as clear as we could have been with the legislation around how this would go.

BARBARA RICHARDS: Well I think -- I think that the -
- the problem is it's so complicated on the

campuses about some places we have college senates, faculty senates. We have councils -- academic councils and, to some extent, you can't specify all that.

SENATOR BYE: Right.

BARBARA RICHARDS: You need to leave it up to us that -- I think it -- the generic term is governance bodies.

SENATOR BYE: What's that?

BARBARA RICHARDS: When we report to NEAG, the report on our governance structures and things like councils and senates. And then of course we're quite different from the CSUs. I -- I think that on -- on our campus -- I was just talking with the CSU people, one of the unions there, and it's their belief that if they held just the direct election that was of everyone, they probably would not elect non-fac -- non-teaching faculty.

I think we would because we tend to work together pretty well across the lines. We're small and we're kind of egalitarian and respect each other and -- and respected individuals would be elected from each campus.

SENATOR BYE: Right, right, okay. And another thing we're really going after is a uniform process.

BARBARA RICHARDS: Oh yes please.

SENATOR BYE: I think that's important to this Committee and we've already heard legislation that way. One thing I have concerns about, but maybe you can quell my concerns, is -- you know I've been on a lot of governing bodies and boards and they're really -- they really can get

too big to be effective.

And so if we had one representative per campus from the community college and one representative per campus from the CSU, I think we're up to 16 and then there's been recommendations today to --

BARBARA RICHARDS: To go to 25.

SENATOR BYE: -- to also have members of SUOAF which I think we're going to hear more about, the faculty -- the administrative faculty members and make sure they're represented. So, you know, I guess my question is what size do you think is a good size for a -- a board -- or too big?

BARBARA RICHARDS: Well I -- I think the -- the problem that we had -- we had one meeting so far and we are involving alternates. We have a lot of alternates the way it works.

SENATOR BYE: Apparently, I hear they've got a lot of alternates.

BARBARA RICHARDS: We -- we probably don't need that many alternates and you -- you could decide to specify that but we immediately wanted to get in touch with everyone, all the employees and especially faculty, about the transfer and articulation proposal which is happening right now.

So we sent out an email and then we looked around the room and we didn't have people from most of the campuses and the community colleges to get in touch with people. So I said I'll take Gateway and I'm now getting some results from Gateway but not many because they don't know me. I can't chat with them. It's very

useful to have a person --

SENATOR BYE: I think that's an excellent point.

BARBARA RICHARDS: -- and I think the presidents have a council of 17. The students I believe have one from each community college campus but we only have three and then whatever number of alternates for 12 campuses. It -- it would also take care -- I know some of the small campuses are concerned that they might not have a voice and, if we had 12, they certainly would have a voice.

SENATOR BYE: Okay well we'll certainly take that into account. You make a good point. The Presidents Council is 17.

BARBARA RICHARDS: Yeah.

SENATOR BYE: So other questions? Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER: It's an interesting dichotomy when you don't have branch -- fiel -- contacts out in these other institutions. Could you envision, trying to think outside the box, of a -- then a subcommittee of which -- if each campus represent -- each campus voted in someone to the Faculty Advisory Committee? No I'm sorry -- if you had a limited number that belonged to the Faculty Advisory Committee and they could be elected from a subcommittee that would contain one from each so there was a dialogue body that was representative of each campus and then --

BARBARA RICHARDS: (Inaudible)

REP. SAWYER: -- from that group people would be elected to be a member of the Faculty Advisory Committee? I don't know, I'm trying to find a

way because the articulation is -- is going to make or break the success of this for some institutions. Some will be successful, others it could absolutely be -- be an absolute abysmal failure because there's no connectivity.

BARBARA RICHARDS: Um it's possible. I mean one of things I'm trying to do now is -- I don't know exactly why but we haven't really been in much touch with each other across campuses except for the Early Childhood people are -- I think some (inaudible) are but -- and I'm trying to find out who's the head of each senate and who's in their senate so that I'll be able to send you that information just -- and so that we'll all know. I'll send it -- I'm -- I'm sending it out also to -- the people I find out I will also send them the information so that they know.

I -- I know I asked our -- our senate head do you know any of the other ones and she said no.

REP. SAWYER: And that's because you have a passion to do this.

BARBARA RICHARDS: So we need to be in touch more.

REP. SAWYER: You have a passion to do this and you're digging into it which is wonderful but someone else with a -- perhaps a --

BARBARA RICHARDS: I just -- right now the only thing we have that pulls us together is the Faculty Advisory Committee and so that's why I think of having the 12 there. It might be possible to have another group with 12 out of which came the Faculty Advisory. But I don't know, I'm not -- I find the -- the somewhat larger groups kind of work pretty well. You have people that volunteer for subcommittees and -- and do a lot of work that needs to be -- and there's a lot of

work that needs to be done.

The responses we got on this transfer and articulation are extensive and detailed and complicated, so, you know --

REP. SAWYER: Thank you.

BARBARA RICHARDS: Okay.

SENATOR BYE: Thank you so much for your testimony and for your patience today.

BARBARA RICHARDS: Thank you. I'm -- I'm glad you were actually getting that correspondence (inaudible).

SENATOR BYE: Oh yes we were -- we were and we were -
- we were discussing it even as it was going on
--

BARBARA RICHARDS: Right.

SENATOR BYE: -- as we got word that things were challenging, so thank you.

BARBARA RICHARDS: Okay. Well I'll be around if you have any further questions in the future.

SENATOR BYE: Super.

James Larmonaco?

JAMES LOMONACO: Good afternoon, Senator Bye, Representative Sawyer.

SENATOR BYE: Good afternoon.

JAMES LOMONACO: Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I'm here to talk about Senate Bill 42. What I do is represent the 700 or so

professional employees of the Connecticut State University, the people that provide direct services to students in such areas as admissions, financial aid, career counseling, academic advisement, academic support services. We also do things like design, do the -- the initial programs for the buildings and facilities that the University uses for its academic and -- and other purposes.

So the problem that we have with Senate Bill 42 is that the language says that -- that -- well we have some agreement and some disagreement. Where the language says teaching faculty we disagree and I think the -- the language ought to change to allow administrative faculty to participate as well.

The -- you Senator Bye earlier today mentioned the complexity of higher education. It's financing. It's the -- the reorganization and the entire process. You're absolutely right.

Representative Willis spoke to the problem with silos and unfortunately this bill creates a silo because it excludes from formal representation about 40 percent of intellectual capital that the University has to provide services to students.

We're deeply involved in design of all sorts of programs and we care for students outside of the classroom.

So I think the work the Advisory Board's going to have will exceed -- far exceed that -- that Professor Adair, my friend Stephen, spoke about earlier where he thought it was going to be mostly curricular in nature. I don't -- I don't see that.

If you listen to the testimony taken by this Committee over the last several weeks, the Committee members, the witnesses spoke about admissions, problem with fun -- funding, problems with financial aid, all of the things that -- that my members can have a very valuable and useful affect on in terms of advising the Board of Regents.

Now we think the Board ought to -- the language ought to -- ought to change in this way is that for CSU, and my colleagues from the community colleges behind me will speak to their -- their issues and perhaps their solutions, but for CSU you have said you want a uniform -- well through the whole process -- you want a uniform process. We can provide that through the faculty senates at Southern and the administrative senate at Southern and the university senates at the other three campuses.

So the -- the way to elect them at CSU is -- is doable. The only point I would make is that we would ask in the legislation if it's necessary that they have two members from the teaching faculty and one member from the administrative faculty. And by -- and the reason I ask for that is because, without that stipulation, none of us would be elected simply by the preponderance of votes that belong to the teaching faculty.

But unfortunately I think it would be a mistake if our -- if our members weren't represented. We do have some language in our collective bargaining agreement that speaks to our right to participate in shared governance and I can't imagine why the Board of Regents would want to exclude an enormous amount of expertise that they already pay for.

Thank you.

SENATOR BYE: Thank you, James, that was actually very compelling and -- and I think we have heard about the complexity today. We've been talking about that. And so what you're asking for is sort of a carve out that we make sure that people from the administrative faculty are involved -- are a part of this governance process with the Board of Regents.

JAMES LOMONACO: Yes I am.

SENATOR BYE: Okay. It seems like a reasonable request and I think you do have a different perspective. We want to be sure the teaching faculty are represented but --

JAMES LOMONACO: Absolutely.

SENATOR BYE: -- I think you make a case about why we would want to be sure that administrative faculty are included as well so thank you for coming today.

It looks like my co-chair has a question.

REP. WILLIS: I have -- I have a question. I like what you said about financial aid and that advice being shared. I mean the intent was teaching faculty, that's what we want, teaching faculty ensure that so many of the issues that we are concerned about and feel that the Board of Trustees -- Board of Regents should be looking at is primarily teaching.

How many -- what's the number again on the Board -- the Advisory Board, nine?

SENATOR BYE: I think it's seven.

REP. WILLIS: Seven. Is there -- I would be not inclined to open and roll up to -- completely up to staff representation. I would like us to pick out categories. I think financial aid -- maybe a financial aid person on -- on there and that's -- we'll leave it at that. I can't -- I think if you can make a compelling argument for somebody else who's going to be on that Board but right now my focus, you know, the intention was teaching, though I could certainly buy into financial aid. I found the rest would be questionable at best.

So thank you. If you could just give us a list that would be great.

JAMES LOMONACO: Okay, okay, although I'd add academic support services to that because they are -- we have some nationally known folks who could provide those sorts of programs that would achieve some of the remediation or the concerns you had about courses that were not usable later on so -- but I will provide that.

REP. WILLIS: I just don't want administrators. I want -- I want -- we don't want administrators. We want people who are involved in teaching and we want to see people -- I think you made a very compelling case for a financial aid person but I'm not sold on anybody else, so thank you.

JAMES LOMONACO: Well as long as we recom -- recognize that we provide direct services to students.

Okay, thank you.

SENATOR BYE: Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER: Could I just ask one more question before you go?

JAMES LOMONACO: I'm sorry, pardon me, my mistake.

REP. SAWYER: No, no mine. I didn't speak fast enough. You heard the other dialogue that I had and so my question to you is we have the other - - others that make sure that the campus runs, I think that you were talking about, and so my question to you is, you know, we have the issue of librarians. They are an integral part of every campus and they -- depending on which campus it is they fall into different categories, whether they are considered faculty or staff. Sometimes they have some teaching component and obviously I think we can all agree that libraries and their function has a big part of the educational component.

Do you -- where do you see them falling into this particular Advisory Committee?

JAMES LOMONACO: Well librarians at the Connecticut State University are members of the AAUP and so -- I mean certainly I think that, across the board, you have -- you have value and use and -- and knowledge that's -- that's necessary to do an effective job in -- in providing teaching services to students.

I mean it's sort of a soup to nuts process. I have no problem with -- with including them. The AAUP would have to elect one I guess if elections are the -- are the approach we want to take but I certainly don't have any problem.

REP. SAWYER: You know one of the concerns I have is the -- now the discussions going -- that we'll be able to go across campus lines from campus to campus.

JAMES LOMONACO: Right.

REP. SAWYER: And I -- I'm a touch afraid that there won't be good communications between the campuses and so my question was you -- to you was -- I mentioned before could you envision a -- a large committee with every campus having at least one, perhaps two members, and so let's say 36 members just -- or 40 members of a large subcommittee and then from that subcommittee people could be elected then to the Faculty Advisory Committee?

JAMES LOMONACO: Yes because a great deal of the work that would go into advising the Board shouldn't come from a single individual but should come through subcommittee work where you develop the -- the response to the questions that are asked by the Board in terms of what -- what do you think about this. (Inaudible).

REP. SAWYER: And then we'd be pretty sure that the -- the information that would get back to each institution.

JAMES LOMONACO: Yes, yes as long as the Committee is representative of all the institutions. Of course, yes I do.

REP. SAWYER: Thank you for your input.

JAMES LOMONACO: Oh you're welcome. Thank you.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you.

Jay Hyland from Connecticut Police -- um there's actually two people here, Connecticut Fire -- three?

A VOICE: Yes (inaudible).

REP. WILLIS: Do -- do you want to come up together?

STEVE COHEN: It's a pleasure, Chair Willis and other members of the Committee. Appreciate your time this afternoon. I am Steve Cohen. I'm president of the Congress of Connecticut Community Colleges. To my right is Bob Fernandez who is the political director of the Congress and he is also the director of financial aid at Quinebaug Valley Community College and I think you're familiar with him as well.

Just by way of quick introduction, the Congress of Connecticut Community Colleges, otherwise known as the 4C's, represents the professional staff and faculty of all 12 of our community colleges in Connecticut and our bargaining unit includes 800 full-time and 2,000 part-time teaching faculty and 800 full-time and 400 part-time professional administrators, counselors, librarians.

I'm here to talk to you very briefly about Senate Bill 42, An Act Concerning the Selection Process for Members of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents for Higher Education and the language of concern is in Section 1 which proposes limiting representation to teaching faculty.

Our professional staff members in the 4C's are creative and are professional and they have something to offer. And in fact two weeks ago when the Committee was entertaining testimony concerning Bill 5030, I testified as part of a virtual conga line of teaching faculty so I have something to say about that bill. But it was the gentleman to my right, Bob Fernandez, in his capacity as director of financial aid, who brought forth the issue of the changes in Pell grant language and the timelines for Pell grants

being limited now to six years.

That's the -- an example of the kind of expertise that our non-teaching professionals bring to the floor and all we ask is that those folks be allowed to be represented if they are selected and elected to serve. And that's the big concern for our membership and that's what we ask.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you.

STEVE COHEN: If I can respond to any questions I'd be happy to.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you. Thank you, Steve.

STEVE COHEN: Got it under three minutes.

REP. WILLIS: Wow that's not bad. You can tell you come here frequently.

STEVE COHEN: Um it's getting to be a habit.

REP. WILLIS: Well always (inaudible) to see you.

STEVE COHEN: Thank you. Appreciate the time.

Dennis Bogusky.

DENNIS BOGUSKY: Good afternoon, Representative Willis, members of the Committee.

I'm Dennis Bogusky. I'm the president of the Federation of Technical College Teachers, the other professional union at the community technical colleges. I'm one of the people that was instrumental in architecting the election that is one of the -- of the Board of Regents Advisory Committee so I'm here to speak to Senate Bill 42.

We have some concerns. I came here thinking that my only concern was the folks that were excluded from the committee, professional staff members, the librarians, the counselors, the people that do direct services for students.

And some of the testimony I've heard here today seems to amplify that. I -- I one believe in inclusion and not exclusion. And that leads me to my second point of how we got to the election and you heard things here today that suggested that there wasn't and there isn't great communication between the 12 institutions.

So how could, in a very short period of time, representatives become elected that were known to all 12 of those institutions? And I've heard some things from you, as a Committee, saying maybe we need to expand the population to a larger committee and then shrink down to a voting committee and have them elected.

And they're all very good ideas. But one of the things that we did when we heard that we had three people is we got together as the unions and we gave you nine people. We gave you three reps and we gave you two alternates for each of those reps. In fact one of those reps is the current co-chair -- the temporary co-chair. That's from my group.

That's an individual from Three Rivers Community College. He's the chair of the nuclear engineering department. He was the chair of the standing committee for the board of governors so he's had some experience in this.

We also, as I said, we also gave you some other people. Why? To expand the field, to -- to give some inclusion here and what I'd like to

ask from you as a Committee is to consider all of the things that you've heard here today.

I don't think I have a prescription for success but we want to see success with this committee. We want to see this committee do something and have an integral role -- a very important role in the direction -- perhaps in the direction of academics and the things that involve students - - student success in the bigger system here, the system of a state university with community colleges and four year institutions.

And maybe that committee needs to be a larger committee. Maybe it needs to be a larger committee. Maybe it should be, as I think Barbara Richards suggested here, a representative from each of the campuses and then let them figure out how to do the voting, but why exclude.

And then the second thing is a uniform process of election that does assure for fair election and participation. Going back to the history, the standing committee -- standing advisory committee to the Board of Governors had carve outs. It -- it gave -- it gave a representative to the technical college faculty. It gave a representative to the community college folks. It carved those things out.

And again, not to try to control anything but to try to get some participation and to move things forward, this is what we arrived at. We divided up the -- the reps and the -- and the alternates so there's three from each of the unions, that's the AFSCME professional group, that's the AFT group which is mine, and that's the 4C's group.

So I would urge you to reconsider the bill as it's written taking into consideration the kind

of things that you've heard here today, key things, inclusion and then a process that's uniform but yes a process that's going to work.

Thank you very much.

REP. WILLIS: Thank you.

Questions or comments? No?

Thank you very much.

DENNIS BOGUSKY: I get off easy, huh?

REP. WILLIS: You do.

If you want to submit comments in -- oh you -- you will do that, okay. Thank you.

I guess -- is anyone out there who would -- who did not sign up and would like to testify?

A VOICE: (Inaudible).

REP. WILLIS: That's all right. Anyone out in the audience who would like to testify and not sign up? Third time, anyone who would like to testify and hasn't signed up is -- is free to come forward.

Hearing none, I move that this meeting be closed.

Thank you.

February 28, 2012 - Testimony on Bill #42 at the Public Hearing of the Committee on Higher Education and Employment Advancement

Good afternoon Senator Bye, Representative Willis, and members of the Committee. My name is Barbara Richards. I am a Professor of Sociology at Housatonic Community College, a former member of the Standing Advisory Committee to the Board of Governors for Higher Education, and an alternate member of the Faculty Advisory Committee of the Board of Regents. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify before you today. I am here to speak in support of Bill #42.

I believe that the most important part of the bill is the word "unitary". It is important to know how the current community college representatives to the Faculty Advisory Committee were chosen. The system office asked the Academic Deans to conduct democratic elections on each campus. Some Deans asked the Chairs of the Senates or Councils to run the elections, while others held elections at meetings of the faculty.

The first stage of the elections was completed on each campus, resulting in twelve nominees for three positions as representatives to the FAC, plus an unspecified number of alternates.

At this point in the process three unions met with the new Vice-President for Human Resources of the Board of Regents. The unions proposed that they should name the community college members of the FAC. Their proposal was accepted and the unions then made their selections. All of the community college representatives and alternates currently serving on the FAC were named by these three unions.

I am a strong supporter of unions but I see their mission as distinct from that of a Faculty Advisory Committee that has input on matters such as mission statements or policies on transfer and articulation. Unions have a duty to prioritize the welfare of their members, while the FAC should focus on the needs of the students and of the state.

On another part of the bill, the insertion of the word "teaching" before the word "faculty": I would like to suggest that the FAC be enlarged to include one representative per campus from the community colleges and three representatives per campus from the CSUs. This would result in more effective communication by the FAC with all parts of the new combined system. With direct elections and a larger committee the teaching faculty would be strongly represented on the FAC and it would not be necessary to insert the word "faculty". It would be useful for the committee to have the input of some non-teaching representatives as well.

Finally, a question: If the bill passes, would the intent be for the existing FAC to serve out its two-year term or for the Faculty Senates to hold new elections soon after the statute takes effect?

Thank you very much. I would be happy to answer any questions.



STATE UNIVERSITY ORGANIZATION
OF ADMINISTRATIVE FACULTY
185 Main Street • Suite 208 • New Britain, CT 06051
tel: 860-465-5104

To: Members of the Higher Education and Employment Advancement
Committee

From: James LoMonaco, President, State University Organization of
Administrative Faculty

Date: February 28, 2012

Senator Bye, Representative Willis and members of the Higher Education Advancement Committee, thank you for the opportunity to Testify before the Committee regarding Senate Bill 42. My name is James LoMonaco and I serve as President of the State University Organization of Administrative Faculty the organization that represents the 710 professional staff members of the Connecticut State University.

Our testimony today is intended to point out a significant omission in Senate Bill 42 with regard to the composition of the Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents. If this legislation were to be enacted the result would be the exclusion insofar as formal representation to the BOR is concerned of the professional employees at CSU, The Connecticut community Colleges and Charter Oak College. These employees provide direct service to students in many that are essential to students as well as to the provision of services by the various campuses. It is our view that the collective wisdom of all stakeholders' is of great value to the Regents as they chart the course for the next step in public higher education in Connecticut.

Senate Bill 42 would limit Advisory Board membership exclusively to Teaching Faculty and provide no opportunity for formal input to the Regents by the approximately 1200 Administrative Faculty of the 3 units of the BOR. In testimony heard by this committee in the last several week's issues of admissions, financial aid, course availability, academic support services and cost to students were raised, both through testimony and through questions and comments made by the committee. Each of these areas are those that the Administrative Faculty have a great deal of knowledge regarding and, in fact, actually are responsible to oversee these services provided to students. While I expect the teaching faculty would be most uncomfortable with us advising on activities within the classroom with which we have limited expertise we are equally uncomfortable with faculty advising in areas in which they have little expertise.

The reorganization of public higher education in is a complex and challenging undertaking that will take a number of years to complete successfully. We believe that the Regents need all input available in the decision making process as issues mentioned above are addressed as we all move forward. To that end

it is suggested that if legislation is necessary that the text be revised to read "two members of the Teaching Faculty and one member of the Administrative Faculty" to be elected to represent CSU. Similar language could be used for the Community Colleges. This language would replace the exclusionary language that "teaching" faculty creates in section (a) of SB42 and would ensure that the Regents have the benefit of receiving advice formally from all faculties on the campuses. Elections for this membership could be made by combined faculty Senates (CCSU, ECSU and WCSU) and the Administrative Faculty Senate and the Teaching Faculty Senate at Southern to achieve the uniformity of process that the authors of the bill seek. A similar process could be employed by the Community Colleges as well Charter Oak State College.

In order to make sure that the process of reorganization goes well for students as well as the State of Connecticut generally it is imperative that we bring all of our intellectual resources to bear on the issues that face Connecticut. The professional staff that provide students with direct services in academic, student service and administrative support areas should be a resource that the Board of Regents uses effectively in overseeing this enterprise.

Thank you.



**Congress of Connecticut
Community Colleges**
907 Wethersfield Avenue
Hartford, CT 06114

phone: 860-296-5172
fax: 860-296-6219
e-mail: info@the4cs.org
web: www.the4cs.org

President
Steve Cohen

*Vice President
Faculty*
Lorraine Li

*Vice President
ACL's*
Maureen Chalmers

*Vice President
Part-timers*
Robyn Brooks

Professional Affairs
Cindy Meo

Organizational Affairs
Bryan Bonina

Diversity
William Foster

Secretary
Steve Krevisky

Comptroller
Tony Scott

February 28, 2012 Public Hearing

**Testimony Concerning SB 42 --AN ACT CONCERNING THE
SELECTION PROCESS FOR MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY
ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS FOR
HIGHER EDUCATION**

Members of the Higher Ed & Employment Advancement
Committee:

My name is Steve Cohen, and I am President of the Congress of
Connecticut Community Colleges.

The Congress of Connecticut Community Colleges, the 4C's,
represents the faculty and professional staff at Connecticut's
twelve Community Colleges. Our bargaining unit includes 800
full-time and 2,000 part-time teaching faculty, as well as 800
full-time and 400 part-time professional administrators,
counselors, and librarians.

Our members are concerned about Senate Bill 42, An Act
Concerning the Selection Process for members of the Faculty
Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents for Higher
Education.

Section 1 (a) proposes to limit representation to *teaching*
faculty. The current and the previous faculty advisory
committees did not exclude any professional staff member
from being a representative or alternate. 4C's professional
staff members are involved on a daily basis with students and
faculty and have the expertise to offer creative ideas to the
Advisory Committee. They may offer a different perspective
than teaching faculty, but their input is no less valuable. I
urge you to allow them to serve on this important advisory
body.

I would be happy to answer any questions.



February 28, 2012

Senator Bye, Representative Willis, and Members of the Higher Education Committee:

As a long-time instructor at Charter Oak State College (COSC) and in my current position as COSC Dean of Faculty, I am writing to you to please reconsider the current language in Senate Bill 42, An Act Concerning the Selection Process for Members of the Faculty Advisory Committee to the Board of Regents for Higher Education. In particular, I request that you allow Charter Oak's Academic Council (the equivalent of a Faculty Senate at COSC) to elect its teaching faculty representative and alternate to the Board of Regents Faculty Advisory Committee. The members of this body (which I chair) followed this procedure last year and duly elected a representative that we have confidence will represent the interests of our faculty. This process was selected because many of Charter Oak's teaching faculty members live outside of Connecticut and therefore would have difficulty attending a centralized meeting. The advisory committee representative will attend all of the Academic Council meetings in order to be informed of our academic issues, and to share with us information from the BORFAC meetings. The faculty representative will also be a member of the Distance Learning Teaching Committee, since COSC's internal curriculum is offered as distance learning courses. The Academic Council voted to have the Chair of the Academic Council (Dean of the Faculty) as the alternate.

As a long-time instructor at Charter Oak State College, I have been impressed by the ability of the institution to adapt to the needs of non-traditional students. In order to do this, the organization has benefited from thinking outside of the box and realizing that adopting a "one-size-fits-all" methodology is simply not in the best interest of students or faculty. In this spirit I would ask you to reword SB42 in recognition of Charter Oak State College's unique and important position in Connecticut public higher education.

Kristine Larsen, Ph.D.
286 Francis St.
New Britain, CT 06053

H – 1129

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2012**

**VOL.55
PART 7
2096 – 2446**

djp/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

175
April 19, 2012

concurrence with the Senate.

Total number voting	147
Necessary for adoption	74
Those voting Yea	147
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	4

DEPUTY SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ:

The Bill is passed in concurrence with the Senate.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 316.

THE CLERK:

On Page 20, Calendar 316, substitute for Senate Bill Number 42, AN ACT CONCERNING THE SELECTION PROCESS FOR MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE BOARD OF REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION. Favorable report on the Committee of Higher Education and Employment and Advancement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ:

Representative Willis of the 64th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. WILLIS (64th):

Thank you. So nice to see you again. It's been such a long time.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ:

djp/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

176
April 19, 2012

It has. It's nice to see you also, madam.

REP. WILLIS (64th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ:

Question is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill.

Representative Willis, you do have the floor, madam.

REP. WILLIS (64th):

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. This Bill concerns the composition of the faculty advisory committee to the Board of Regents for Higher Education and it ensures a selection process that is both fair and open. It increases the number of faculty members to three and it adds a member of the faculty that provides a direct student services. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ:

Thank you very much, madam.

Will you remark further on the Bill before us?

Representative LeGeyt of the 17th, you have the floor. It's nice to see you again, sir.

REP. LeGEYT (17th):

djp/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

177
April 19, 2012

Mr. Speaker, the pleasure is coming right back at you. I rise in complete support of this Bill and urge my colleagues to support it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ:

Thank you very much, sir.

Will you remark further on the Bill before us?

Will you remark further on the Bill before us?

If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. All members to the chamber, please. The House of Representatives is taking a roll call vote. All members to the chamber. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Please check the board to ensure that your vote has been properly cast. If all the members have voted the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

The Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 42 in concurrence with the Senate.

djp/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

178
April 19, 2012

Total number voting	146
Necessary for adoption	74
Those voting Yea	146
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	5

DEPUTY SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ:

The Bill is passed in concurrence with the
Senate.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 324.

THE CLERK:

On Page 21, Calendar 324, Senate Bill Number 191,
AN ACT MAKING TECHNICAL REVISIONS TO STATUTES
CONCERNING THE HOUSING COMMITTEE. Favorable report on
the Committee of Housing.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ:

Representative Wright of the great City of
Bristol, you have the floor, sir.

REP. WRIGHT (77th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of
the joint committee's favorable report and for passage
of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ:

Question is on acceptance of the joint
committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill.

S - 638

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2012**

**VOL. 55
PART 3
617 - 941**

rgd/md/gbr
SENATE

4
April 11, 2012

Moving now, Madam President, to the favorable reports on our calendar, beginning on calendar page 5, Calendar 53, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 20, Madam President, would move to place this item on our consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Calendar 56 is marked go. Calendar 57, Senate Bill Number 105, Madam President, move to place this item on our consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, moving to calendar page 6, Calendar 64 marked go. Calendar 65 marked go. And at the bottom of that page, Madam President, Calendar 75, Senate Bill Number 200, Madam President, would move to place that item on our consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Moving to calendar page 7, Calendar 80, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 42, Madam President, move to place that item on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

rgd/md/gbr
'SENATE

97
April 11, 2012

THE CLERK:

Page 1, Calendar 214, Senate Resolution Number 11; also page 1, Calendar 215, Senate Resolution Number 12; page 2, Calendar 216, Senate Joint Resolution Number 24; page 2, Calendar 217, Senate Joint Resolution Number 25.

Also on page 2, Calendar 244, House Joint Resolution Number 71; page 2, Calendar 245, House Joint Resolution Number 72; page 3, Calendar 246, House Joint Resolution Number 73; Calendar 247, House Joint Resolution 74; Calendar 248, House Joint Resolution Number 75; and Calendar 249, House Joint Resolution Number 76.

On page 4, House Joint Number -- Calendar 250, House Joint 77; Calendar 251, Senate Joint Resolution Number 26; also on page 4, Calendar 252, Senate Joint Resolution Number 27; on page 5, Senate Bill Number 53 -- I'm sorry, Calendar 53, Senate Bill Number 20; Calendar 56, Senate Bill 71; Calendar 57, Senate Bill 105.

On page 6, Calendar 75, Senate Bill 200; page 7, Calendar 80, Senate Bill Number 42; on page 9, Calendar 105, Senate Bill 252; on page 10, Calendar 111, Senate Bill 328; on 13, Calendar 164, Senate Bill Number 205; and on page 13, Calendar 168, Senate Bill 106.

On page 14, Calendar 181, Senate Bill 98; and Calendar 186, Senate Bill 191.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, I think that's Senate Bill 88.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 88, stand corrected.

Also Calendar 186, Senate Bill 191; on page 15, Calendar 198, Senate Bill Number 28; on page 17, Calendar 212, Senate Bill 241; and Calendar 213, Senate Bill 139.

On page 18, Calendar 227, Senate Bill 99.

THE CHAIR:

At this time, please, the machine will be open and please

rgd/md/gbr
SENATE

98
April 11, 2012

call for a roll call vote.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll
call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? If all members have voted, the
machine will be locked. And Mr. Clerk, will you call the
tally?

THE CLERK:

Total Number voting	36	
Necessary for adoption	19	
Those voting Yea		36
Those voting Nay		0
Those absent and not voting	0	

THE CHAIR:

The consent calendar has been adopted.

Senator Gerratano -- Gerratana, sorry.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Thank you, Madam President.

Just for a journal notation. I missed, not this vote, but
the previous vote on the legislation. I was out of the
Chamber on legislative business, but I would have voted
affirmative.

THE CHAIR:

It will be noted.

SENATOR GERRATANA:

Thank you, madam.

THE CHAIR: