

Central Connecticut State University

UNIVERSITY SENATE ACTION

Senate Motion Number FS 24.25.001R

TO: President Zulma Toro

FROM: President of the University Senate

1. The attached motion of the University Senate, dealing with:

UPBC Resolution

is presented to you for your consideration.

2. This resolution was adopted by the University Senate on 11/25/2024.

3. After considering this motion, please indicate your action on this form, and return it together with the original copy to the President of the University Senate.

4. Under the By-Laws of the University Senate, Section 3.7, the following schedule of action is to be observed.

a) By 12/2/2024, Senate resolution reported to the President of the University. (Within five school days of the session in which they are adopted).

b) By 12/16/2024, the President of the University to return the resolution to the President of the Senate. (Within ten school days of its receipt).

11/26/2024

Date



Stephen Adair, President, University Senate

ENDORSEMENT:

TO: President of the University Senate

FROM: President Zulma Toro

1. Motion Approved :
2. Motion Disapproved: *(Explanatory statement must be appended, see page 2).*
3. Action "is deferred":
4. Resolution Noted:
5. Other: _____

(If desired, comments may be appended, see page 2)

Date

President Zulma Toro

Central Connecticut State University

UNIVERSITY SENATE ACTION

Comments (*required if motion is disapproved, optional otherwise*):

**Central Connecticut State University
University Planning and Budget Committee**

RESOLUTION

Concerning

**UPBC Planning Statement for 2025 and Beyond
November 2024**

Whereas the “University Planning and Budget Committee (UPBC) advises the President, within the context of the University's mission, through the Senate, on the long-term goals, strategic planning process and budgetary priorities of the University;” and

Whereas the UPBC “provides a forum for the discussion of planning and budgetary issues so that recommendations reflect the concerns of the entire campus community;” and

Whereas the UPBC expects that CCSU’s President and Executive Administration will engage in appropriate *joint* planning with us and will maintain a collegial approach to governance; and

Whereas the UPBC embraces and champions two guiding principles that are reflected in CCSU’s Strategic Plan: 1) Meaningful Shared Governance and 2) a Commitment to High Quality Education and Student Success; and

Whereas the CCSU Administration has not followed the Integrated Planning Process as described in the Integrated Planning Council flowcharts and documents; and

Whereas the CCSU Administration has not provided adequate budgetary information, which includes detailed University budget line-item allocations and expenditures and explanations for denied budget requests; and

Whereas the CCSU Administration often fails to release final reports from Presidential Task Forces (PTF) contributing to a lack of transparency and meaningful shared governance; now, therefore, be it

Resolved that the CCSU Administration provide to the UPBC detailed university budget and expenditures data and detailed staffing data (faculty reassigned time, refilling or creation of positions across campus, numbers of interim positions) in order for the UPBC to fulfill its responsibility to annually review division budgets and to make informed recommendations concerning a) increases to base budgets, b) one-time requests, c) capital equipment requests, d) position requests, and e) cost saving and investment opportunities; and be it further

Resolved that the CCSU Administration provide to the UPBC a complete list of all annual budget requests received by each Division Head, organized by those recommended and those not recommended for funding by the Division Head, with a brief explanation for each denied request; and be it further

Resolved that the CCSU Administration resume following the Integrated Planning Pathway as developed by the Integrated Planning Council and which established a transparent and integrated process for reviewing and evaluating proposals from all campus constituencies for programs, projects and initiatives which are not exclusively under the purview of the Faculty Senate; and be it further

Resolved the President work with the UPBC, Faculty Senate, Curriculum Committee, CCSU-AAUP, and CCSU-SUOAF to reconceive the duties of the IPC to ensure for meaningful shared governance; and be it further

Resolved that the President work with Faculty Senate, CCSU-AAUP, and CCSU-SUOAF to determine who will serve on PTF's, so we can ensure the needs and expertise of faculty and staff are reflected in PTF membership, and that all Presidential Task Forces use a uniform final report structure, to be shared with the Faculty Senate.

We look forward to working closely with faculty, staff, and our administrative partners to deliver the highest quality educational experience possible at CCSU.

UPBC Planning Statement for 2025 and Beyond

November 2024

According to our Charter, the “University Planning and Budget Committee advises the Central President, within the context of the University's mission, through the Senate, on the long-term goals, strategic planning process and budgetary priorities of the University. It provides a forum for the discussion of planning and budgetary issues so that recommendations reflect the concerns of the entire campus community.” In sum, the UPBC expects to actively participate in the review of planning and budgetary requests, with significant input from the campus community. However, in recent years, the UPBC has not been able to meaningfully engage in university-wide planning and budgetary advisement.

Further, we have been functioning in both a system and university defined by crisis and scarcity. Although our CCSU enrollments have been steadily increasing in recent years, our campus reserves have nearly doubled to \$[90,164,696](#) ([CSU Annual Comprehensive Financial Report 2023](#)), and CCSU has yet another year of record surpluses (\$7,000,000 for the last academic year), faculty and staff are repeatedly told by CCSU and CCSU leaders that we are experiencing a fiscal crisis and that investment is not an option. Instead, faculty and staff are instructed to do more with less (e.g. stagnant department budgets, fewer faculty and clerical) and to innovate with increasingly fewer supportive resources.

It is within this larger context that the Committee outlines below our guiding principles and a path forward to meaningful engagement with CCSU’s President and Executive Administration. If we are to live up to CCSU’s full potential and move toward meaningful engagement, both faculty and the administration must embrace and champion two guiding principles: 1) Meaningful Shared Governance and 2) a Commitment to High Quality Education and Student Success.

Guiding Principles

1) Commitment to Meaningful Shared Governance

We are guided by the principle that faculty and the administration are equals in governance, and both must agree that shared governance in principle and in practice means that faculty have real authority over decision-making.

As such, we expect that CCSU’s President and Executive Administration will present/discuss with the appropriate shared governance committees *in advance* of a significant program or policy change (i.e. the Faculty Senate, CCSU-AAUP, the Council of Chairs, and the UPBC). In so doing, faculty have the right to expect that the administration will be transparent in sharing what are the measurable expected outcomes of a program or policy change and all data that are used to justify those changes.

For the UPBC to meaningfully engage with the administration, our committee must have the time, the mechanisms, and the data for us to actively develop positions that reflect faculty, staff, and student interests. The job of the UPBC is not to mirror the positions of the administration; it is to articulate and argue for the interests of faculty, staff and students foremost. Only then can we join efforts with the administration to do the best that we can for CCSU. We expect CCSU's President and Executive Administration will engage in appropriate *joint* planning with us and will maintain a collegial approach to governance. The hierarchical nature of the different offices of the administration has no bearing on the work that this committee does. Instead, the committee's work focuses on our commitment to high quality education and student success and through negotiation with the administration, we will achieve these goals.

Concerns

- **Budget Review Process** – According to [AAUP's Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities \(1966, 1990\)](#), "The framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility, should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community." To that end, AAUP insists that effective planning requires key budgetary knowledge and information:

The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short- and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections.

In recent years, it has become clear to members of UPBC that the Committee's Charter, as previously written, made it difficult for the UPBC to prioritize recommendations for university budget requests. The role of the UPBC was narrowly focused on reviewing and recommending requests for 1) increases to base budgets, 2) one-time requests, 3) capital equipment requests, and 4) position requests. Items 1-4 were filtered through unit heads within each division and subsequently evaluated and vetted by division heads, who then presented their final requests to the UPBC for review. UPBC subsequently forwarded their recommendations to the Integrated Planning Council (IPC), which made the final determination regarding investment and spending. This process lacked transparency and did not provide the UPBC with necessary information to make informed recommendations.

Ideally, all requests within these 4 categories should be presented to the UPBC with explanations for why division heads support, or do not support, funding of the listed items. Further, information regarding current spending levels needs to be provided.

Last year, UPBC revised its Charter, clarifying its duties to complete “an annual review of divisional budgets.” These amendments were approved by the Faculty Senate in Spring of 2024. With the detailed, current budget information that we expect the administration will provide, UPBC expects that its role at CCSU will be more in line with the guidelines outlined in AAUP’s *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*, so that more meaningful shared governance can take place.

We expect that administrators will provide detailed university budget and expenditures data and detailed staffing data (faculty reassigned time, refilling or creation of positions across campus, numbers of interim positions) so that UPBC can fulfill its responsibility to annually review division budgets and to make informed recommendations concerning a) increases to base budgets, b) one-time requests, c) capital equipment requests, d) position requests, and e) cost saving opportunities. In addition, we expect a complete list of all annual budget requests received by each Division Head, organized by those recommended and those not recommended for funding by the division head, with a brief explanation for each denied request.

- **Integrated Planning Pathway (IPP)** - The [Integrated Planning Pathway](#) was developed by the Integrated Planning Council and adopted 10/16/2017. The IPP established a transparent and integrated process for reviewing and evaluating proposals from all campus constituencies for programs, projects and initiatives which are not exclusively under the purview of the Faculty Senate. The Integrated Planning Pathway specifies that proposals be submitted to the UPBC through the Integrated Planning Portal and then routed to FPC and ITC, if relevant, after which the FPC and ITC report back to the UPBC with recommendations. The proposal is then reviewed by the UPBC and CFO who then determine if the proposal is viable and should be recommended to the IPC or if the proposal should be returned to the authors. This also involves planning for new or renovated facilities, which are both matters of planning and budget. For example, a comprehensive presentation, with justification and budget estimates, for the newly opened AI corridor was never presented to the UPBC. Nor has UPBC been involved in the planning of the Central CT Workforce & Innovation Hub cited in CCSU’s FY 2024 Spending Plan submitted to the BOR on June 12, 2024. This again demonstrates a lack of transparency as well as a failure to embrace the principles of shared governance.

We expect that per the agreed upon Integrated Planning Pathway, the UPBC should receive all submitted requests and initiate the review process.

- **Integrated Planning Council (IPC)** – The IPC was formed on August 27, 2017 with the intention of promoting “greater transparency with respect to strategic decisions.” According to the Council’s [charge](#),

The Integrated Planning Council (IPC) serves as the centralized planning, budgeting, and review committee at Central Connecticut State University. It advises the President on issues that affect the entire University, draw upon significant resources, and require input from across the institution. To that end, it

reviews recommendations and proposals brought forward by Executive Committee members, as well as the University Planning and Budget Committee (UPBC) and Faculty Senate.

According to the charge, the Council is to be composed of the following eleven individuals: University President; Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs; Chief Administrative Officer; Chief Financial Officer; Vice President for Student Affairs; Vice President for Institutional Advancement; Chief Diversity Officer; Faculty Senate President; University Planning & Budget Committee - AAUP representative; University Planning & Budget Committee - SUOAF representative, Student Government Association President. Due to recent changes to administrative titles and oversight, the names of these positions have changed as has the membership of the Council. The current Council consists of [13 members](#) (9 management confidential members, 3 AAUP members, and 1 SUOAF member).

The current budgetary process requires that individuals across campus complete budgetary requests and submit those requests to their division heads. Division heads then review those requests and put forth their final division requests to the UPBC for review. After UPBC reviews those budgetary requests, UPBC submits those requests to IPC. As described above, the IPC consists of the President and many of the same division heads who previously put forth their budgetary requests to UPBC. Ultimately, IPC issues a final decision regarding UPBC's recommendations.

Although faculty and staff are a part of the IPC, they have very little real power given the high number of division heads serving on the Council. Certainly, faculty appreciate being a part of the IPC, but their role does not fulfill the ideals of shared governance in any meaningful way and division heads ultimately maintain complete power to override any recommendations issued by UPBC.

We expect that the President work with UPBC, Faculty Senate, Curriculum Committee, CCSU-AAUP, and CCSU-SUOAF to reconceive the duties of the IPC to ensure for meaningful shared governance.

- **Presidential Task Forces (PTF)** – There exist a number of PTF's that have been convened to address many diverse issues affecting students, faculty, and staff on our campus. However, it is unclear how many of these PTF's currently exist, who is serving on these task forces, and what their respective charges are. It is unclear how people are selected to serve on these PTF's and the official charges of these PTF's have not always been made public in advance of the PTF's formation which violates some of the fundamental tenets of shared governance. Finally, faculty who serve on these PTF's ought to be recognized for their service, and so clarity regarding their charges, functions, actions, and outcomes, ought to be provided to the general University community.

Given the very important role that these PTF's serve at our University, we expect that all Presidential Task Forces use a uniform final report structure, to be shared with the Faculty Senate which includes the following:

1. the official charge to the PTF,
2. the membership of the PTF,
3. background as to why the task force was formed,
4. description of how data were gathered,
5. clear presentation of the evidence gathered,
6. summary of findings;

Finally, to ensure the basic tenets of shared governance are being honored, we expect that the President work with Faculty Senate, CCSU-AAUP, and CCSU-SUOAF to determine who will serve on PTF's, so we can ensure the needs and expertise of faculty and staff are reflected in PTF membership.

- **Reassigned & Release Time** – Faculty are provided with reassigned or release time to engage in leadership activities (e.g. Department Chair, Faculty Senate, Curriculum Chair, AAUP) as well as research, curriculum development, faculty development, and instructional enhancement. Reassigned and release time is a clear metric of meaningful shared governance, demonstrating the University's commitment to providing faculty with the time necessary to fully engage in campus functions outside the classroom that contribute to ensuring high quality education and student success.

We expect that CCSU demonstrate its commitment to both shared governance and student success by having Faculty Senate and CSU-AAUP working together with CCSU Administrators to evaluate and explore the adequacy of the number of reassigned and release time hours provided to faculty, so that faculty can substantively address the concerns outlined in the following section that are negatively impacting students access to high quality education.

2) **Commitment to High Quality Education and Student Success**

We are guided in our decision-making by our fundamental commitment to creating and supporting high quality educational experiences and to our students' academic and social success. When reviewing planning and budgetary requests, we explore how they address various components of the [Strategic Plan 2030](#), with a particular focus on how they affect educational quality in the classroom and student success at our University. In recent years, we've witnessed trends that are changing what students, faculty, and staff are experiencing in our classrooms and offices. We outline below several concerns that will most certainly influence our decision-making and that we are requesting CCSU's Administrators address.

Concerns

- **Academic & Social Needs** – Not only at CCSU, but across the nation, universities have seen a significant rise in students requiring Accessibility Services, Student Wellness Services, and Learning Center Services as a result of increased levels of anxiety and other social needs, as

well as increased academic and tutoring needs in the wake of the COVID-19 pandemic ([Leviniovitz 2024](#)). As a result of these challenges, faculty are devoting many additional hours to addressing these needs both inside and outside of the classroom thereby increasing their workload ([Galef 2024](#)).

We request that CCSU’s Administrators work with UPBC, Faculty Senate, and CCSU-AAUP to increase budgetary support at the departmental level so departments can develop programming based on faculty’s expertise and that provides supports unique to each Department’s student populations (e.g. localized labs and tutoring opportunities, departmental social and academic events, dynamic programming that emerges from students’ interests and needs). As academic Department budgets have dwindled and as expenses that in the past were handled by other offices (e.g. Human Resources – business cards; Copying, Marketing) are increasingly expected to be covered by Departments, there exist very limited resources for Departments to provide such supports that improve students’ connection to their home Departments.

We also expect that CCSU’s Administrators work with UPBC, Faculty Senate and CCSU-AAUP so enough faculty can be hired to ensure faculty have smaller class sizes and more one-one-one time with students, so that faculty can better address these increasingly diverse accessibility accommodations and wellness needs within our student population.

- **Decreasing Number of Faculty & Clerical Support** – Faculty and our clerical staff are the face of our University, yet their numbers as compared to other divisions are decreasing. As the table below reveals, between FY2018 and FY2023 CCSU experienced significant increases in all employee categories, particularly in Management Confidential and Administrative positions, and saw significant decreases in faculty and clerical positions. Admittedly, some of the increases in the Management Confidential category is a result of some clerical moving to that category given the level of confidentiality necessary to perform their duties. Nonetheless, these numbers make it very clear that there are distressing employment trends that are not aligned with our two guiding principles.

<u>Employee Category</u>	<u>FY 2018</u>	<u>FY2023</u>	<u>Total Difference</u>
Faculty	436	396	-40
Clerical	90	59	-31
Management Confidential	34	51	+17
Administrators	205	228	+23
Protective Services	18	19	+1
Library	12	13	+1
Counselors	3	5	+2
Maintenance	83	88	+5

Rather than hire additional faculty and clerical, faculty are increasingly asked to raise their course caps and clerical are increasingly asked to simultaneously serve two departments.

We expect that CCSU's Administrators carefully analyze these employment trends and work with UPBC, Faculty Senate and UPBC to make changes that serve our students, ensuring educational quality is not compromised and that improved student retention and success are the outcomes.

- **Increasing Use of Generative AI & Other Technologies** – The research and pedagogical challenges and opportunities for faculty as a result of emerging generative AI technologies are well documented ([Alonso 2024](#); [Cusak 2024](#); [Dutton 2024](#)). One thing is clear—these emerging technologies will fundamentally transform higher education, and it is also quite clear that most higher education institutions are not prepared for these changes and challenges ([McMurtie 2024](#); [Perlmutter 2024](#)). Certainly, it is exciting that CCSU has a Virtual Reality Lab, a new AI Minor, and new AI Corridor and that President's AI Task Force organized CCSU's first AI conference. However, the vast majority of faculty at CCSU have not yet participated in these events and have not yet adjusted their pedagogy to address these technological changes. Further our University must address the ethical dimensions as well as the very real costs, both fiscal and environmental, associated with AI ([Crawford 2024](#); [Luccioni, Jernite, Strubell 2024](#); [Perlmutter 2024](#)). Most startling is the lack of information and research regarding the use of generative AI technologies in our classrooms and in the context of online learning.

We expect that the CCSU's Administrators seriously work with UPBC, Faculty Senate, and CCSU-AAUP to address the challenges and opportunities that faculty and staff are immediately facing as a result of students' increasing use of generative AI technologies. Increased reassigned time for curricular and pedagogical development, smaller course sizes so faculty can revise their pedagogical approaches, and more opportunities for professional development are all necessary investments as we sort a way forward in these unprecedented times.