

"The Faculty Senate shall be the representative body of the faculty, deriving its authority from the faculty as per the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Its primary function shall be to serve as the agency by which the faculty can actively participate in the governance and policy-making decisions of the University on the basis of the principle of shared authority." (Faculty Senate Constitution, Section I).

President's Report to the Faculty Senate – September 26, 2018

1. President Ojakian will visit SCSU on **Friday, September 28 at 1-2:30 pm**. **The location is EN A 120** and the agenda will be to discuss updates from BOR and ways that us, the faculty, can assist in educating the new governor, legislators, and others on who we are, what we do and the importance of higher education. Please remind your colleagues in your department!
2. On Friday, September 14, the Faculty Senate sponsored the informational session about the Digital Professional Assessment Pilot. The session was attended by about 20 faculty attended, a dean, and Provost Prezant. Senators David Pettigrew and Walter Stutzman lead the presentation/discussion along with Karen Musmanno from IT.
3. On Monday, September 17, the FS Executive Committee met with the Provost to discuss the following items:
 - a. He confirmed that the Executive Director's position for Innovation, Research, and STEM was a newly created position and he appointed Dr. Christine Broadbridge to be the Executive Director.
 - b. The Intellectual property policy and procedural changes is being discussed and confirmed that the faculty committee still exists as the advisory body to the Provost. The members of the committee are appointed by the Provost.
 - c. The concern of the schedule of athletic games during the first week of classes will be discussed with the Athletic department, it was an unfortunate event this year.
 - d. The reduction of the Inquiry, Critical Thinking, and W classes will be monitored and discussed again.
 - e. The Academic Year Scheduling Task Force report needs to be presented to greater audience than just the Faculty Senate and the open discussion will take place on **Monday, October 1st at 12:15-1:45 pm in EN A 120**. Please remind your colleagues in your department to attend.
 - f. The BOR's proposed Academic Program/Low Completer Review Policy is circulating and the Provost confirmed that SCSU (or other universities) are autonomous right now in running the programs and if the enrollment and graduation numbers are low for three consecutive years, then the universities will consider review and or termination of the programs. The 2013/2014 report had proposed numbers and the projection numbers for the Universities were ok, but not for the Community Colleges. The Provost stated that we should not be concerned at this time.
4. On Tuesday, September 18th President Bertolino delivered his State of the University Address and if you missed it, you can listen to it on youtube:
<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UcTWuH8Rphh0H8K0Y-qQs7rQ>

After the presentation, there was an appreciation celebration for all faculty, staff, administrators, students, and other guests.

5. On Monday, September 24th, the 125th Kick-off Celebration took place outside Buley Library and the two banners were unveiled. Food, refreshments, desserts and free items were available to all who attended. Great start of the 125th celebration events, more to follow.
6. On Tuesday, September 25th, I was informed that Eastern and Central have approved a resolution pertaining the BOR's revised Academic Program/Low Completer Review Process. The two resolutions from our sister universities are attached. I also received phone calls about Southern's position on this policy, attached is the proposed SCSU Resolution for discussion/approval.

FALL 2018: September 26; October 10 and 24; November 7 and 28; and December 5.

SPRING 2019: January 23; February 6 and 20; March 6 and 27; April 10 and 24; and May 8.

**SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY SENATE
RESOLUTION Opposing the CT/BOR Policy on “Academic Program/Low
Completer Review Process”
September 26, 2018**

Whereas, Southern Connecticut State University (SCSU) exists for the primary purpose of furthering academic excellence; and

Whereas, SCSU promotes academic excellence through innovative teaching and learning experiences and a broad range of socially relevant programs that support its social justice mission; and

Whereas, academic excellence may be reflected in academically and socially relevant programs, regardless of enrollment profiles; and

Whereas, the value of programs offered at SCSU and the extent to which they provide educational opportunities for our students cannot be measured by graduation rates alone; and

Whereas, there are occasions when it is appropriate to review and discontinue programs; and

Whereas, there is a contractually mandated process for initiating a recommendation for program review and discontinuance (CBA Article 5.20); and

Whereas, the contractually mandated process specifies program review and discontinuance as a local (i.e., campus) matter; and

Whereas, according to the contractually mandated process, a recommendation for program discontinuance is to be investigated through a faculty-driven shared-governance approach; and

Whereas, the BOR is proposing a policy entitled “Academic Program/Low Completer Review Process” that ignores CBA Article 5.20; and

Whereas, the proposed BOR policy was created without any consultation with the contractually specific faculty governance bodies on the University campuses; and

Whereas, the contractually mandated faculty-driven shared-governance approach specifies a role for the University President, but not for the chief academic officer, for whom the proposed BOR policy on Academic Program/Low Completer Review Process creates a role, in conflict with the CBA; and

Whereas, the failure of the BOR to recognize in its proposed policy the role of the faculty governance bodies is a violation of the CBA entered into by the BOR; and

Whereas, failure to engage in shared governance and respect the shared authority of the faculty imperils accreditation; and

Whereas, the “trigger” numbers in the policy are not evidence-based thresholds for action; therefore be it

Resolved, That the proposed policy, entitled “Academic Program/Low Completer Review Process,” is unsupportable, as it is inconsistent with the CBA, which specifies program review as a campus-based, faculty-driven process; and further

Resolved, That any policy in which program review is triggered solely by the number of graduating students would undermine the mission of higher education and be a disservice to students.