

Southern Connecticut State University  
**FACULTY SENATE**

APPROVED MINUTES OF MARCH 6, 2024

<https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings>

The 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Faculty Senate AY 2023-2024 was held on March 6, 2024, at 12:11 p.m. via Zoom.

Attendance

FIRST	LAST	DEPARTMENT	TERM ENDS (SPRING)	ATTENDANCE	TOTAL
Lisa	Haylon	Accounting	2025		10/12
Valerie	Andrushko	Anthropology	2026		10/12
Melanie	Uribe	Art & Design	2024		12/12
Jillian	Rispoli	Athletics	2026		8/10
Nicholas	Edgington	Biology	2026		11/12
Kate	Toskin	Business Information Systems	2025		12/12
Jeff	Webb	Chemistry & Biochemistry	2026		11/12
Shawneen	Buckley	Communication Disorders	2024		11/12
Melanie	Savelli	Communication, Media & Screen Studies	2025		11/12
Shafaeat	Hossain	Computer Science	2025		11/12
Matthew	Ouimet	Counseling	2024		10/12
Laurie	Bonjo	Counseling & School Psychology	2026		10/12
Beena	Achhpal	Curriculum & Learning	2024		9/10
Maria	Diamantis	Curriculum & Learning	2024		11/12
Jennifer	Cooper Boemmels	Earth Science	2025		1/1
Jia	Yu	Economics	2024		10/12
Peter	Madonia	Educational Leadership & Policy Studies	2026		8/12
Paul	Petrie	English	2026		12/12
Mike	Shea	English	2024		12/12
Matthew	Miller	Environment, Geography, & Marine Sciences	2025		1/1
Sandip	Dutta	Finance & Real Estate	2025	*	4/12
Amanda	Strong	Healthcare Systems & Innovation	2025		11/12
Robert	Knipe	Health & Movement Sciences	2025		4/4
Daniel	Swartz	Health & Movement Sciences	2025		4/4
Christine	Petto	History	2026		12/12
Troy	Rondinone	History	2026		12/12
Yan	Liu	Information & Library Sciences	2024		8/12
Cindy	Simoneau	Journalism	2024		12/12
Elizabeth	Wilkinson	Library Services	2026		11/12
Amy	Jansen	Library Services	2025		11/12
Alison	Wall	Management & International Business	2025		12/12
Melvin	Prince	Marketing	2023	*	9/12

Sebastian	Perumbilly	Marriage & Family Therapy	2025		11/12
Klay	Kruczek	Mathematics	2025		12/12
Owen	Biesel	Mathematics	2025		12/12
Jonathan	Irving	Music	2026		9/11
Deborah	Morrill	School of Nursing	2026		12/12
Andrea	Adimando	School of Nursing	2024		11/12
Virginia	Metaxas	Part-Time Faculty (HIS)	2026		11/12
Garbielle	Ferrell	Part-Time Faculty (JRN)	2025		8/8
Michael	Sormrude	Part-Time Faculty (BIO)	2024		12/12
Michele	Delucia	Part-Time Faculty (PSY)	2024		11/12
Rex	Gilliland	Philosophy	2026		12/12
Elliott	Horch	Physics	2024		12/12
Jonathan	O'Hara	Political Science	2025	*	2/12
Kate	Marsland	Psychology	2025		8/12
Chris	Budnick	Psychology	2024	*	9/12
John	Nwangwu	Public Health	2024		12/12
Deron	Grabel	Recreation, Tourism, & Sport Management	2026		8/12
Isabel	Logan	Social Work	2026		9/11
Stephen	Monroe Tomczak	Social Work	2025		9/12
Gregory	Adams	Sociology	2026		12/12
Joan	Weir	Special Education	2024		9/10
Douglas	Macur	Theatre	2024	*	11/12
Tricia	Lin	Women's & Gender Studies	2025		12/12
Luke	Eilderts	World Languages & Literatures	2026		12/12
Natalie	Startling	SCSU Faculty Senate President	2024		12/12
Dwayne	Smith	SCSU President			11/12
Barbara	Cook	Chair, Graduate Council			11/12
Meghan	Barboza	Chair, Undergraduate Curriculum Form		*	10/12
Joseph	Merly	SGA			4/4

**GUESTS**

Daisy Torres-Baez  
Marilu Rochefort  
Tracy Tyree  
Trevor Brolliar  
Trudy Milburn

The following senators are empowered by the Faculty Senate to represent the Faculty Senate and thereby represent the faculty body in their role and contributions to the respective committee/group in which shared governance of business is being conducted with a duty to report back to the Faculty Senate minimally once per semester (additional reports determined by the respective representative or upon request by the Faculty Senate). It is recommended representatives also seek the Faculty Senate’s support and endorsement for matters determined by the respective representative or upon request by the Faculty Senate.

Early College Experience	Christine Broadbridge (fall 2022) Michele DeLucia (spring 2023)
Faculty Development Advisory Committee (FDAC)	Klay Kruczek
Undergraduate Curriculum Forum (UCF) liaison	Cindy Simoneau
University Library Committee (ULC)	Amy Jansen 1 Representative Unfilled
Working Group for Governing Bodies & Documents (Work complete)	Paul Petrie (Rules rep) Jeffrey Webb (Rules rep) Michael Shea (senator, non-Rules member, rep)
Strategic Action Plan Subcommittees <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advancing Social Justice</li> <li>• Maintaining Academic Excellence</li> <li>• Engaging our Community</li> </ul>	Miriah Kelly Kenneth McGill Michael Sormrude
DEI Advisory Council	Laurie Bonjo
Chief of Police Search Committee	Isabel Logan
Dean of the College of Education Search Committee	Laurie Bonjo

March 6, 2024

Faculty Senate President Natalie Starling called the 12<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Faculty Senate to order at 12:11 p.m. via Zoom.

- I. Announcements
  - A. D. Torres-Baez shared two announcements: The Division of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion has been working with Academic Affairs to get feedback from current and past chairs around training for leadership with an equitable lens. This message was also distributed via email. The second announcement was about the Division's Employee Inclusion and Wellbeing survey, also distributed by email. The survey closes March 22.
  - B. T. Lin shared information on the upcoming WGS Conference. Information can be found by visiting the website: <https://inside.southernct.edu/womens-and-gender-studies/conferences/2024>.
  - C. B. Cook shared the ongoing efforts
  - D. L. Eilderts shared information on the upcoming film in the ongoing French Film Series "Blurring Boundaries." Information can be found on the website: <https://sites.google.com/view/southernct-french/>.
  - E. B. Cook reminded the body about the upcoming Faculty Research Tapas event on March 19 from 4:30-6:30 in room 102 of the School of Business building.
- II. Minutes of the previous meeting held on February 21, 2024, were accepted as distributed. <https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings>
- III. Faculty Senate President's Report <https://inside.southernct.edu/faculty-senate/meetings>
  - A. N. Starling highlighted information in the report regarding concerns raised by M. Barboza and the UCF about the Writing Center and Coordinator.
- K. Marsland shared historical information about the Writing Center and Coordinator and offered follow-up.
- IV. Reports of the Faculty Senate Standing Committees
  - A. Reports received.
  - B. Academic Policy (M. Uribe): Updates on the bookstore program, detailing the initial meeting with Barnes and Noble representatives. She emphasized that it operates as an opt-out system, with students required to opt out if they don't wish to be charged \$18.75 per credit, varying based on credit load. Departments and courses cannot opt out; it's all-in or nothing. The university has the option to create its own website for clarity, and there will be a set timeline for students to opt in or out. Students can pick up materials at the bookstore or pay a shipping fee for delivery. All digital materials will be exclusively delivered through Blackboard. Concerns were raised about notifications for updates on bookstore materials, which Melanie agreed to address. M. Diamantis highlighted two points: only students can opt out, not anyone else, and textbooks are rentals with an option to purchase at the end of the semester. T. Lin mentioned student frustrations and questioned the possibility of opting out, to which it was clarified that this policy applies only to undergraduate students. Further questions included the use of financial aid for rental fees and the process for students needing only one book. B. Cook requested clear documentation for faculty once

discussions are finalized. M. Uribe confirmed plans to address these concerns in the coming weeks.

- C. Elections (K. Kruczek): Self-nominations for All-University elections closes March 22 at noon.
- D. Finance (C. Simoneau): Updates on the monthly report from J. Chabra regarding travel funds, noting that \$3,000 per faculty and \$1,500 per adjunct faculty is being spent this year. A clarification was made about the delay in accessing the first \$83,000 from a special travel fund, which J. Chabra aims to resolve by the next month. This is crucial as the \$83,000 line item does not roll over each year. The AUP funding for travel, however, is a rollover and cumulative fund. The plan is to negotiate a new MoU with the administration to potentially increase the contractual amounts based on the surplus. C. Simoneau mentioned the need for clarity on travel funds by April to bring a decision to the faculty senate and the union. The administration supports using available funds, aiming for an accessible and affordable plan for all faculty. Updates will be provided as the spring progresses.
- E. Personnel (M. Shea): Updates on the recent meeting with M. Sinclair from the personnel committee, discussing ways to improve advising at the individual faculty level. They debated whether to reward good advising or hold all faculty to a standard of excellence, recognizing the challenge of implementing this in the Promotion and Tenure (P&T) process. The concern was that placing advising metrics in the P&T process might disproportionately affect pre-tenure faculty. The committee aims to reward good advising but is considering the financial implications and whether the administration would support it. This issue remains under discussion, with a focus on clarifying the role of advising within faculty responsibilities and possibly revising the P&T process accordingly. During the discussion, concerns were raised about the subjective nature of assessing advising quality, the need for departmental equity in advising practices, and the potential for professional development in this area. The committee plans to continue exploring these complex issues.
- F. Rules (P. Petrie & J. Webb): Committee reviewed and made minor revisions to the Department Chair and Termination Hearing Committee documents. Continuing discussions include the Senate's representation on the University Tech committee. The committee also addressed the role of special appointment faculty in the selection of department chairs. Their main focus has been on substantial revisions to the Sabbatical Leave document, which have been discussed over the past three meetings. They anticipate bringing these revisions to the Senate floor in the upcoming meetings.
- G. Student Policy (A. Strong): The committee has been gathering information for two charges: one regarding hybrid courses and their designation in banner notes, and the other regarding enrollment, retention, and persistence. They plan to invite one to two individuals to the next meeting after spring break for further discussion on enrollment matters. At present, they have not reached any resolution-worthy findings, but they continue to work on these topics.

#### V. Special Committees

- A. UCF: Report received.
- B. Graduate Council (B. Cook): Highlighted two key points in her report, urging attention to revisions in the graduate catalog, particularly regarding changes in course numbering for master's, six-year certificates, and doctoral programs. A. Carroll is collaborating to ensure a smooth transition for affected programs, with

plans to communicate these changes to department chairs soon. Additionally, she noted that J. Wharton and J. Irwin responded to inquiries about the graduate commencement change, providing written responses shared with the committee for further clarification. Members are encouraged to reach out to J. Wharton and J. Irwin for any additional questions on the matter.

C. FASP: Report received.

VI. Unfinished Business

A. Proposed Statement on the Value of Service at the University:

- i. M. Shea presented a draft statement from the Personnel Policy Committee regarding the importance of service in faculty roles. Stemming from concerns about faculty involvement in committees and encouragement for service, the draft aims to emphasize the significance of service in faculty responsibilities. The statement clarifies that while the weightings for promotion, tenure, and renewal are already defined in the contract—teaching (primary load activity) weighted at ten, creative activity at five, and service at four—the intention is to reinforce the value of service as an integral part of faculty contributions. This draft is open for discussion and feedback, with the goal of eventually voting on it to represent the faculty's stance on the importance of service. Members are encouraged to share the draft with their departments for input. B. Cook added context, citing past challenges in faculty involvement and the evolving emphasis on service within the university. The purpose is not to mandate increased service activities but to recognize and value service contributions within the broader context of faculty roles at Southern. The Senate is tasked with bringing the statement back to their constituencies for further discussion and input, aiming for a final vote to endorse the statement as a reflection of the faculty's position.

VII. New Business

A. M. Uribe (APC) **moved to approve** the Resolution Regarding Syllabus Statement: Use of AI in courses.

B. After discussion, the body moved to a vote.

i. Vote tally

- 1. Yes ..... 44
- 2. No..... 1

i. The resolution was **approved**.

C. M. Shea **moved the following** regarding the Faculty Referenda regarding UCF approved changes to the LEP and revisions to the Faculty Senate Constitution.

- i. Informational Forum for LEP changes to be held Friday 3/22/2024 from 1:00pm-2:00pm, with a virtual option for attendees, and the FS Elections Committee Chair serving as the forum moderator.
- ii. Referendum opens for electronic voting on Friday, 3/22/2024 at 2:00pm and closes on Friday, 4/5/024 at 4:00pm.
- iii. The motion was **Seconded**.

1. M. Shea **moved to amend** the motion by striking and inserting the following:

Informational Forum for LEP changes to be held Friday 3/22/2024 from 1:00pm-~~2:00pm~~ 3:00p.m., with a virtual option for attendees,

and the FS Elections Committee Chair serving as the forum moderator.

Referendum opens for electronic voting on Friday, 3/22/2024 at ~~2:00pm~~ 3:00pm and closes on Friday, 4/5/024 at 4:00pm.

- 2. N. Starling asked if there were any objections to this amendment. Hearing none, the amendment **was adopted**.

- iv. After discussion, the body moved to a vote.

- 1. Vote tally

- a. Yes ..... 43

- b. No ..... 2

- i. The motion was **approved**.

- D. On behalf of the Executive Committee, N. Starling **moved to approve** the Resolution Regarding the Upcoming Presidential Search at Southern Connecticut State University.

- i. P. Petrie **moved to add** the following to the “Whereas”:

- ii. Whereas, Closed searches prioritize the hypothetical needs and preferences of a relatively small number of presidential applicants over the demonstrated needs and interests of the entire university community, comprising thousands of faculty, staff, and students who have a legitimate and compelling interest in meeting and engaging with their potential future leader;

- iii. N. Starling asked if there were any objections to approving the amendment as presented. Hearing none, the amendment was **adopted**.

- iv. After discussion, the body moved to a vote.

- 1. Vote tally

- a. Yes ..... 36

- b. No ..... 1

- i. The resolution was **approved**.

VIII. Adjournment

- A. M. Diamantis **moved to adjourn. Seconded.**

- i. The meeting adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

---

L. Eilderts  
Secretary

**SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY**

**FACULTY SENATE**

Resolution Regarding Syllabus Statement: Use of AI in courses

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

WHEREAS, The SCSU Faculty Senate is the official representative body of the Academic Faculty;

WHEREAS, The Faculty at SCSU have a deep commitment to the intellectual development and success of our students;

WHEREAS, SCSU is committed to fostering academic excellence, innovation, and the integration of emerging technologies in the educational process;

WHEREAS, Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools have the potential to enhance teaching methodologies, learning experiences, and research capabilities;

WHEREAS, The responsible and ethical use of AI tools aligns with SCSU's mission to prepare students for the challenges of the modern world; and

WHEREAS, SCSU Faculty address concerns related to academic integrity and plagiarism; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the SCSU Faculty Senate endorses the following statements for faculty's consideration in the incorporation of AI tools into their syllabi:

**1. Students May NOT Use AI Tools**

In this course, students are not permitted to use AI tools to complete assignments, tests, or any form of coursework submission. This policy is in place to ensure that students engage directly with the material and develop their critical thinking, analytical, problem-solving, and writing skills without reliance on external AI assistance. Violations of this policy, including any form of plagiarism or presenting AI-generated content as one's own work, will be considered academic misconduct and dealt with according to the university's academic integrity guidelines.

**2. Yes, Students May Use AI Tools**

In this course, students are permitted to use AI tools to assist with their coursework, including research, drafting, and problem-solving. However, it is crucial that students critically evaluate the information and outputs generated by AI tools, ensuring accuracy and relevance. All submissions must be accompanied by a statement detailing the extent of AI assistance received. Students are reminded to adhere to academic integrity policies when



using these tools, ensuring that all work is properly cited and that AI-generated content is not presented as their original work.

**3. Students Are Fully Encouraged to Use AI Tools**

Students are encouraged to use AI tools to enhance their learning experience in this course. These tools can assist in brainstorming, researching, and exploring complex concepts. AI tools should be used as an opportunity to engage critically with technology, fostering a deeper understanding of the course material. All submissions must be accompanied by a statement detailing the extent to which AI tools were utilized in their assignments. Students are reminded to adhere to academic integrity policies when using these tools, including correctly citing sources and ensuring that AI-generated content is not presented as their original work; and

*Resolved*, That The SCSU Faculty Senate encourages the administration to provide support and resources for faculty training and development in the use of AI tools, and to facilitate interdisciplinary collaboration in the exploration of innovative applications of AI in teaching and research.

# SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY FACULTY SENATE

## Resolution for Information

### Resolution Regarding the Upcoming Presidential Search at Southern Connecticut State University

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

Whereas, The Faculty Senate is the official governing body for shared governance;

Whereas, The Faculty Senate recognizes its role within the Connecticut State University (CSU) system in representing SCSU faculty as one of four members that constitute the CSUs (Central Connecticut State University (CCSU), Eastern Connecticut State University (ECSU), SCSU, and Western Connecticut State University (WCSU));

Whereas, The Faculty Senate recognizes such a role includes a shared responsibility to strive toward collective awareness of and support for the efforts of the other CSU institutions to further academic excellence and engage in shared governance;

Whereas, The Faculty Senate has historically expressed support for other institutions within the CSU system ([Resolution F-2017-05: Motion to Endorse the CCSU Faculty Senate Response to Students First Planning Team Reports](#); [Resolution S-2017-10: Resolution Regarding the CSCU “Students First” Initiative: An Affirmation of Our Commitment to Shared Governance](#); [Resolution F-2022-04: Support for Social Sciences at Western Connecticut State University and Motion to Endorse CCSU Senate Response to Western Connecticut State University](#); [Resolution F-2023-05: Support for Presidential Search Concerns at Eastern Connecticut State University \(ECSU\) and Central Connecticut State University \(CCSU\)](#));

Whereas, The SCSU, ECSU and CCSU Senates passed resolutions in AY 23-24 (see attached/below) regarding changes to the presidential search process which include the faculty’s opposition to “overly broad restrictions” in a new and additional Nondisclosure Agreement (NDA), and to forgoing public campus visits and public forums for finalists;

Whereas, Because CSUs are public institutions, it is to be expected that the structure of CSU presidential searches honor transparency and fair opportunity for stakeholder input;

Whereas, Consultancy firms that assist with presidential searches acknowledge the advantages of open searches (Crawford, R. (2024). [Open, Closed, or Hybrid? Confidentiality and the Presidential Search](#). The Chronicle for Higher Education);

Whereas, Closed searches prioritize the hypothetical needs and preferences of a relatively small number of presidential applicants over the demonstrated needs and interests of the entire university community, comprising thousands of faculty, staff, and students who have a legitimate and compelling interest in meeting and engaging with their potential future leader;

Whereas, The [AAUP Statement on Presidential Searches](#) dated 11/3/2015 (attached/below) specifies that

*“AAUP policy statements make clear that such decisions to forgo public campus visits and public forums by finalists violate longstanding principles of shared governance. Shared governance helps ensure that universities and colleges serve the public interest...Faculty members should demand that their institutions observe established norms of shared governance by involving faculty representatives in all stages of the search process and by providing the entire faculty and other members of the campus community the opportunity to meet with search finalists in public on campus.”;*

Whereas, Shared governance and faculty participation in the planning for future presidential searches can be ensured only if communication occurs within the dates all faculty are under contract;

Whereas, The practices followed by the Board of Regents (BOR) in the most recent SCSU presidential search, a search conducted by the Regents Search Committee (RSC) working in concert with the University Advisory Committee (UAC), for example, found a candidate well-matched to the SCSU community;

Whereas, The SCSU Faculty Senate is making this request in the spirit of shared governance, in the form of this proactive attempt to work with administration and the BOR for the shared benefit of a positive outcome and for effective decision-making that includes stakeholder representation;

Whereas, SCSU will be undergoing a presidential search in the very near future; now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That:*

1. All planning and communication to the SCSU faculty regarding the upcoming presidential search at SCSU, including the final plans for the process and formation of the UAC, occur within the dates all faculty are under contract as outlined in the Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA);
2. The upcoming presidential search at SCSU be conducted by a UAC, who review the credentials and interview candidates, and make hiring recommendations to the CSCU Chancellor, with more than half of the committee being SCSU faculty and administrative faculty members selected by their peers or by faculty representative bodies;
3. The upcoming presidential search at SCSU have, at a minimum, the following representatives as full members of the UAC:
  - a. At least one (1) Faculty Senate representative elected by the Faculty Senate;
  - b. At least one (1) SCSU-AAUP faculty representative, selected by SCSU-AAUP;
  - c. At least two (2) faculty representatives from the faculty at-large, elected by the faculty or a faculty representative body;
  - d. At least one (1) SCSU representative from the Faculty Advisory Committee (FAC), selected by FAC;
  - e. At least one (1) SCSU Student Government Association (SGA) representative, selected by the SGA; and

- f. At least one (1) SCSU administrative faculty member.
- 4. No member of the UAC be required to sign a confidentiality agreement beyond that which is a past practice and that which honors the confidentiality of the identity of presidential candidates, exclusive of the identities of finalist(s) after the formal announcements of public campus visit(s);
- 5. The upcoming presidential search at SCSU include the public availability of the finalist's/finalists' curriculum vitae prior to the public campus visit(s);
- 6. The UAC establish criteria for the selection of the president, and that such criteria shall include that applicants must hold an earned terminal degree in their field, and have multiple years of higher education experience, including experience as a high-ranking administrator in an institution of higher education.

**Eastern Connecticut State University Senate Resolution SR 23/24 – 04  
Senate Resolution on Campus Visits for Presidential Searches**

WHEREAS Chancellor Cheng notified the ECSU Community on 9/12/23 that he was launching the presidential search process;

WHEREAS the ECSU Community was notified in the CSCU System Office document “Process for the Appointment of a CSCU University President” that no presidential candidate would visit the ECSU campus;

WHEREAS past CSCU policy regarding presidential searches has required finalists to visit CSU campuses to meet faculty, staff, and students **prior** to being offered the position;

WHEREAS this past CSCU policy regarding presidential searches and campus visits has only helped, and not hindered, the search process;

WHEREAS some candidates might be wary of accepting an offer from an institution that they never have visited;

WHEREAS appointing a campus president that the majority of faculty, staff, and students have never met undermines confidence in that candidate, as well as the system office and board which approved such a process;

WHEREAS this new structure of CSCU presidential searches lacks transparency and ECSU is a public institution that requires transparency;

BE IT RESOLVED that all finalists in the ECSU Presidential Search should visit the ECSU campus to meet faculty, staff and students **prior** to being offered the position.



---

William Lugo, Senate President October 31, 2023

## **(CCSU) RESOLUTION ON PRESIDENTIAL SEARCHES**

WHEREAS, each of the colleges and universities that comprise CSCU is headed by a president;

WHEREAS, it is crucial for the future of each university that it be headed by a highly qualified, competent, and experienced academic;

WHEREAS, the decisions made by the president of each university have an impact on the lives and careers of hundreds of dedicated teaching and administrative faculty members, and thousands of students;

WHEREAS, it is essential for a successful president to foster positive relationships with the teaching faculty, administrative faculty, and students of the institution;

WHEREAS, teaching and administrative faculty members who have dedicated decades of their lives to the education of our students are in the best position to assess the qualifications of applicants to the position of a university president;

WHEREAS, a presidential candidate who does not visit the university campus as part of the hiring process will have extremely limited opportunities to interact with teaching faculty, administrative faculty, and students as part of that process;

WHEREAS, a qualified presidential candidate who does not have the opportunity to visit campus as part of the search process might be reluctant to accept the position;

BE IT RESOLVED, that the CCSU Faculty Senate demands that all presidential searches in CSCU must be national searches conducted consistently with principles of equity and inclusion;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the CCSU Faculty Senate demands that such presidential searches should be conducted by a single search committee, who reviews the credentials and interviews candidates, and makes hiring recommendations to the CSCU Chancellor, with more than half of the search committee being members of the teaching and administrative faculty of the institution whose president is being hired, elected by their peers or by faculty representative bodies;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED; that the CCSU Faculty Senate asserts that presidential search committees must establish criteria for the selection of the president, and that such criteria must include that applicants must hold an earned terminal degree in their field, and have many years of higher education experience, including at least some years as a high-ranking administrator in an institution of higher education;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the CCSU Faculty Senate demands that searches for university presidents be conducted according to [principles espoused in the AAUP Statement on Presidential Searches](#), and in particular, that presidential searches must include a campus visit for every finalist.

## No Confidence Resolution in CSCU Chancellor Terrence Cheng

*Authoritarian Management and the disregard for shared governance and transparency*

*Whereas* Chancellor Cheng has ignored traditional shared governance protocols.

- The CSCU system office created an academic planning review process with zero faculty input for all CSCU campuses, which had unrealistic goals and timelines, produced a largely unusable product, and ultimately wasted thousands of hours of faculty and staff time across the system;
- Interim campus presidents are now appointed without a search or input from faculty & staff.
- An ECSU presidential search committee was formed with no representation from ECSU (a change occurred only after [significant pressure from the ECSU senate](#))
- New CSCU presidential search policies remove all decision-making authority from campuses.

*Whereas* the CSCU system office continues to create and hire new positions at high salaries, without the necessary searches and procedures to carry them out, in violation of shared governance and BOR past practices (while also simultaneously demanding significant budget cuts from CSCU institutions);

*Whereas* Chancellor Cheng refuses to work with CSCU institutions in good faith.

- on September 5, 2023 the ECSU University Senate [passed a resolution](#) expressing concerns about the Academic Planning Process and offered reasonable solutions to address their concerns but received no response.
- On September 19, 2023 the ECSU University Senate [passed a resolution](#) expressing concern about no representation on the ECSU presidential search committee, as well as who was chairing the search committee. Ultimately, we were given token representation that would be easily outvoted to whatever interests were expressed by the system office, and our concerns about the chair were ignored.
- On October 23, 2023 the ECSU University Senate president [sent an email](#) to the BOR expressing concern about the NDA he was asked to sign. There were ten overly broad restrictions on the NDA, and the Senate President asked for two of the restrictions to be removed so he could report back to the senate as to the status of the search. The Senate President was told the changes “cannot be accepted.”
- On October 31, 2023 the ECSU University Senate [passed a resolution](#) expressing concern about presidential candidate finalists not visiting campuses, as has always been past practice and in the interest of shared governance. Unfortunately, this past practice will not be continued.

*Whereas* CSCU is a public higher education entity required to be transparent both as a state agency AND as a [standard for NECHE accreditation](#), yet transparency is not a priority within the CSCU system office:

-Many CSCU administrators and members of presidential search committees are now required to sign [NDAs \(non-disclosure agreements\)](#) which limit both transparency and accountability- despite the fact that there are already confidentiality agreements in place for CSU faculty and staff that allow transparency and accountability to take place.

-Preventing faculty, staff and students from having public forums [to meet potential presidential candidates](#), despite all four CSU Senates passing resolutions and/or motions to endorse such forums ([CCSU](#), [ECSU](#), [SCSU](#), WCSU).

#### *Lack of financial accountability and due diligence*

*Whereas* the consolidation of the community colleges and the mismanagement of the merger has created financial and structural instability for the entire CSCU system, [fueling massive enrollment declines](#) at CT State, but [not other CSCU institutions or nearby community college systems](#);

*Whereas* Chancellor Cheng has consistently eroded the autonomy of CSCU institutions, including the ability of campus leaders to independently engage the services of outside contractors at their discretion;

*Whereas* Chancellor Cheng failed to secure adequate funding through the disastrous CSCU 2030 plan, which has led to [significant staff reductions, cuts in student services, and tuition increases throughout the CSCU system](#), while simultaneously ballooning the CSCU system office budget, yet unable to fully explain where all the money has gone.

*Whereas* there is a total lack of transparency with internal and external stakeholders by CSCU and CSCC as evidenced by the many [claims and lawsuits](#) citing abuses of power, mismanagement of taxpayer money, and acts of retaliation and discrimination.

*Resolved*, that the ECSU University Senate, as the representative body for faculty and staff of Eastern Connecticut State University, votes No Confidence in CSCU Chancellor Terrence Cheng.

*William Lugo*

William Lugo, Senate President  
January 30, 2024





November 3, 2015

## Statement on Presidential Searches

In recent months at a number of colleges and universities across the country controversy has emerged over decisions by governing boards to conduct searches for new presidents or chancellors in secret, abandoning the previously standard practice of inviting a select group of finalists to visit the campus and meet publicly with faculty and other members of the campus community. The rationale for such secrecy is that open meetings discourage applications from highly qualified candidates, although no evidence has ever been offered to suggest that this is in fact the case.

AAUP policy statements make clear that such decisions to forgo public campus visits and public forums by finalists violate longstanding principles of shared governance. Shared governance helps ensure that universities and colleges serve the public interest. Serving this interest is why we have public universities and colleges and why we grant special tax status to nonprofit private universities and colleges.

As the Academic Senate at Sonoma State University has declared, "Forgoing announcing finalists' names publicly and scheduling official campus visits for them would be behavior more characteristic of a private corporation than a public university. Doing so would also mean a less transparent search process and less confidence in the outcome on the part of the university community and public. .... Such visits give the university and public insight into finalists' knowledge of the campus and their ability to unify and lead the students, faculty, staff and administration. They also give finalists insight into the university community they aspire to lead."

Although governing boards have the legal responsibility for selection of a president, the process of selection is fundamental in determining which candidate has the most appropriate academic leadership and administrative skills needed to lead the institution. The 1966 [Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities](#), formulated jointly by the AAUP, the American Council on Education, and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges states:

Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president. The selection of a chief administrative officer should follow upon a cooperative search by the governing board and the faculty, taking into consideration the opinions of others who are appropriately interested. The president should be equally qualified to serve both as the executive officer of the governing board and as the chief academic officer of the institution and the faculty. The president's dual role requires an ability to interpret to board and faculty the educational views and concepts of institutional government of the other. The president

should have the confidence of the board and the faculty.

A 2013 report from the AAUP's Committee on College and University Governance entitled [Confidentiality and Faculty Representation in Academic Governance](#) declares:

Unless mandated to be open by state law, many such searches [for higher administrative officers] have an initial, confidential screening stage conducted by a search committee that includes faculty members. The next stage is normally one in which finalists are interviewed. At this point in the process, the names of finalists should be made public to the campus community so that the community at large, faculty committees, or at least selected faculty members have an opportunity to interview the finalists and forward their views to the search committee or to a consulting firm employed by the college or university.

The conclusion of the same document recommends:

Searches for presidents and other chief academic officers should have an open phase that allows individual faculty members as well as faculty bodies to review the credentials of finalists, ask questions, and share opinions before a final decision is made.

Finally, the AAUP website provides a [Presidential Search Committee Checklist](#) to guide institutions in the application of these policies. This emphasizes that

open visits are crucial in the success of the search process because they permit members of the campus community to participate in providing impressions, as well as to contribute to the candidate's understanding of the culture of the institution. In this final phase of the selection process, open visits present vitally important opportunities for both the campus community and the candidate to determine each other's suitability. This final step is extraordinarily useful to the search committee in making its final recommendation to the board.

The AAUP thus calls upon colleges and universities to resist calls for closed, secretive searches and reaffirm their commitment to transparency and active faculty engagement in the hiring of higher administrative officers. Faculty members should demand that their institutions observe established norms of shared governance by involving faculty representatives in all stages of the search process and by providing the entire faculty and other members of the campus community the opportunity to meet with search finalists in public on campus.

Rudy Fichtenbaum, AAUP President

Henry Reichman, Chair, Committee A on Academic Freedom and Tenure Michael

DeCesare, Chair, Committee on College and University Governance