

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 905

HE 003 872

TITLE Excerpts from the Findings and Recommendations of Eight Resource Groups. A Report to the Management/Policy Group of the Commission for Higher Education.

INSTITUTION Connecticut Commission for Higher Education, Hartford.

PUB DATE Feb 73

NOTE 71p.; Document no. 8

AVAILABLE FROM Master Plan Staff Associates, P.O. Box 1320, Hartford, Connecticut 06101 (no price quoted)

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29

DESCRIPTORS *Educational Planning; *Higher Education; *Management Information Systems; *Master Plans; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

This document presents findings and recommendations prepared by 8 resource groups for consideration by the Commission for Higher Education as it develops a master plan for higher education in the state of Connecticut. The resource groups are categorized under the areas of (1) goals, (2) enrollment, (3) facilities, (4) programs, (5) improvement of opportunity, (6) transfer, (7) equal opportunity, and (8) finance. In addition to a summary of the findings of the resource groups, an outline of activities for the development of the master plan is included as well as a proposal for a management information system in the state. (HS)

ED 074905

**EXCERPTS
FROM THE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
OF EIGHT RESOURCE GROUPS**

**A REPORT TO THE MANAGEMENT/POLICY GROUP
OF THE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION**

- I. GOALS**
- II. ENROLLMENT**
- III. FACILITIES**
- IV. PROGRAMS**
- V. IMPROVEMENT OF OPPORTUNITY**
- VI. TRANSFER**
- VII. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY**
- VIII. FINANCE**

- Note: 1) The excerpts which follow are the work of Resource Groups.
2) The reader is reminded that the recommendations are made to the CHE and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the CHE.
3) Extensive documentation and supportive information are contained in the full reports.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE00 3872

*Additional copies of this report
may be obtained from:*

MASTER PLAN STAFF ASSOCIATES
P. O. Box 1320
Hartford, Connecticut 06101

*Document #8
February 1973*

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

EXCERPTS OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND
RECOMMENDATIONS OF EIGHT RESOURCE GROUPS

a report to the Management/Policy Group
of the Commission for Higher Education

February 1973



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

P.O. Box 1320

HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06101

AREA CODE 203 566-3913

February, 1973

To the Reader:

The 1972 General Assembly passed Public Act 194 which directed the Commission for Higher Education to develop a Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut by January 1974. In response, the Commission determined a structure designed to insure broadly based participation in the development of the plan. An overview of that structure is contained in the following document.

One of the most important elements of the Master Plan structure is the eight Resource Groups. Since September 1972, these groups, made up of over two hundred persons, have addressed themselves to major topics for the Master Plan. The full reports of these eight groups are available through the Commission for Higher Education, institutions of higher education, and public libraries.

This report, which has been prepared to give a generalized indication of the findings and recommendations of the eight Resource Group reports, may be considered an index to the full reports. The reader is encouraged to consult the full reports.

The Commission for Higher Education is most grateful to the many individuals who gave freely of their time and energies serving on Resource Groups. The excellent groundwork they have provided in their reports will facilitate the deliberations of additional groups and individuals as the process of Master Plan development continues.

MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Donald H. McGannon, Chairman, New Canaan
James J. Dutton, Jr., Norwich
Henry F. Fagan, Stratford
Miss Anne M. Hogan, Putnam
Miss Helen M. Hogan, Cheshire
Robert J. Jeffries, Westport
Mrs. Norma A. Jorgensen, Newington
Miss Margaret Kiely, Bridgeport
Mrs. Bernice Niejadlik, Danielson
Mrs. Irene Novak, Westport
John R. Reitemeyer, Barkhamsted
William J. Sanders, ex officio, West Hartford

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Gordon W. Tasker, Chairman, Hartford
Merlin D. Bishop, West Hartford
Mrs. Eugene D. Jones, Wilton
Mrs. Albert N. Jorgensen, Jr., Newington
Walter B. Kozloski, Farmington
Mrs. Conrad J. Kronholm, Jr., Hartford
John M. Lupton, Wallingford
John T. Macdonald, Hartford
Joseph R. McCormick, Wethersfield
The Honorable Thomas J. Meskill, Hartford
Carl W. Nielsen, Hartford
William J. Sanders, Hartford
Charles Stroh, Hartford
Robert F. Taylor, Hartford
W. DeHomer Waller, New Haven

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR STATE COLLEGES

Mrs. Bernice C. Niejadlik, Chairman, Danielson
Frank Cammarano, New Haven
James E. Dyer, Danbury
Richard Gurney, Lakeville
Francis W. Hogan, Torrington
Ernest A. Johnson, Hamden
Miss Laura Johnson, Hartford
Ramon M. Martinez, Middletown
Marcus R. McCraven, New Haven
James F. McNally, Hartford
John F. Robinson, West Hartford
Alvin B. Woods, Bloomfield

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR REGIONAL COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Henry F. Fagan, Chairman, Stratford
Roger B. Bagley, Manchester
Robert P. Giannini, Bridgeport
Mrs. Elizabeth Joyner, Winsted
Paul Mali, Groton
Mrs. Dorothy C. McNulty, West Hartford
Marcos Ocasio, New Haven
Vincent J. Scamporino, Middletown
Mrs. Beryl Strout, Wallingford
W. Lonsdale Taylor, Woodstock Valley
Mrs. Marjorie Terrell, West Hartford
Max R. Traurig, Waterbury

BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR STATE TECHNICAL COLLEGES

William Horowitz, Chairman, New Haven
Thomas G. Carruthers, Vernon
Mrs. Virginia D. Christian, Norwich
Mrs. Betty Lou Dorin, Berlin
G. Eugene Goundrey, Middletown
Mrs. Jane Dargan Humphries, West Hartford
Miss Margaret Kiely, Bridgeport
Nicholas A. Longo, Putnam
John E. Toffolon, Riverton

MANAGEMENT/POLICY GROUP

Henry E. Fagan, Chairman
Board of Trustees Regional Community Colleges
Mrs. Bernice C. Niejadlik, Chairman
Board of Trustees State Colleges
William Horowitz, Chairman
Board of Trustees State Technical Colleges
Gordon W. Tasker, Chairman
Board of Trustees University of Connecticut
Donald H. McGannon, Chairman
Commission for Higher Education
Robert A. Kidera, President
Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges

Executive and General Assembly Liaison

Representative Howard M. Klebanoff
Stuart Smith, Office of the Governor
Senator Ruth O. Truex

REVIEW AND EVALUATION GROUP

Samuel M. Brownell
Consultant on Urban Education, Yale University
John J. Driscoll, President
Connecticut State Labor Council, AFL-CIO
The Reverend Edwin R. Edmonds
Dixwell Avenue Congregational Church, New Haven
Theodore F. Hogan, Jr., Chairman
State Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities, New Haven
Arthur Howe, Lyme
Carmine R. Lavieri
Secretary, Connecticut Bar Association, Winsted
Ms. Laura M. Pope, Executive Director
Connecticut Association of Boards of Education, Inc., Hartford
Dennen Reilley, West Hartford Public Schools, West Hartford
Mabel Murphy Smythe, Phelps-Stokes Fund, New York
Arthur L. Woods, President
Connecticut Business and Industry Association, Inc., Hartford
Adolf G. Carlson, Commissioner
Department of Finance and Control
Ruben Figueroa, Commissioner
Department of Community Affairs
Mrs. Gloria Schaffer, Secretary of State

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM PROJECT TEAM

Dorothy Goodwin, The University of Connecticut
Cletus Clow, State Colleges
Kenneth Summerer, Regional Community Colleges
Joseph Karpowich, State Technical Colleges
Francis Degnan, Commission for Higher Education

George Hall, IBM
Charles Lounsbury, IBM
Roger Kalar, IBM

COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION STAFF

Warren G. Hill, Chancellor
Louis Rabineau, Vice Chancellor; Director, Program Planning
Francis J. Degnan, Director, Research and Publications
R. Kent Fielding, Associate in Higher Education
Mary Ellen Stanwick, Special Assistant
Linwood Robinson, Special Consultant
Josephine Cauley, typist

MASTER PLAN STAFF ASSOCIATES

David Basch, Board of Trustees for State Colleges
Brian H. Burke, University of Connecticut
Joseph Dunn, Central Connecticut State College
W. Lewis Hyde, Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges
Stanley Macklow, Norwalk State Technical College
Bernard Shea, Board of Trustees of Regional Community Colleges
Sally Morgan, University of Connecticut

C O N T E N T S

	page
A. Introduction	1
B. Process of the Master Plan	3
I. Groups Involved in the Master Plan	3
II. An Outline of Activities for the Development of the Master Plan	5
C. Resource Groups: Membership and Excerpts of Findings and Recommendations	
I. <u>Goals</u> Thomas F. Malone, Chairman	7
II. <u>Enrollment</u> Dorothy Schrader, Chairman	15
III. <u>Facilities</u> Robert Mutrux, Chairman	19
IV. <u>Programs</u> Harold See, Chairman	29
V. <u>Improvement of Opportunity</u> The Rev. W. C. McInnes, S. J., Chairman	41
VI. <u>Transfer</u> Edgar F. Beckham, Chairman	47
VII. <u>Equal Opportunity</u> Joseph Downey, Chairman	53
VIII. <u>Finance</u> Edwin L. Caldwell, Chairman	59
D. Proposal for a Management Information System	67

INTRODUCTION

The following excerpts of findings and recommendations have been prepared by eight Resource Groups for consideration by the Commission for Higher Education as it develops a Master Plan for higher education in Connecticut. To insure clear understanding of this report of excerpts, a number of points should be emphasized:

- The findings and recommendations are the considered judgment of the individual Resource Groups. They do not represent an opinion or position of the Commission for Higher Education or any other group such as the Management/Policy or Review and Evaluation Group.
- The Resource Group reports, as a whole, are position papers for consideration in the development of the Master Plan. They should not be construed as constituting a first draft of the Master Plan. Subsequent to further discussion and comment, the recommendations made in these papers may be retained, revised, or deleted in the Master Plan.
- The findings and recommendations are in summary form. Extensive supportive information and documentation are contained in the full reports.
- While the findings and recommendations appear in a single document, they are the work of eight distinct and autonomous groups.

Thus, for example, the recommendations of various groups may conflict. The reconciliation of conflicting recommendations will be considered in the process of developing a draft Master Plan.

- The development of a Master Plan is a dynamic process requiring continuing input from many sources. Although the Resource Group reports provide an important source of judgments about the elements of the plan, additional reaction, comment, and thought is required before an initial draft of the Master Plan can be completed.
- Copies of the full reports of the Resource Groups will be distributed to the board of trustees of the constituent units of the public system of higher education for their use and for dissemination to each of the institutions of higher education in the system, the Review and Evaluation Group and other interested groups and individuals. Copies will be made available to the public through public libraries around the state. Any group or individual who is interested in commenting on the Resource Group reports is invited to do so. Meetings will be arranged where requested, within the limits of available staff time, to discuss the findings and recommendations made in the reports.
- All questions and comments concerning these reports should be addressed to Master Plan Staff Associates, c/o The Commission for Higher Education, P. O. Box 1320, Hartford, Connecticut 06101.

PROCESS OF THE MASTER PLAN

Groups Involved in the Master Plan

- I. Commission for Higher Education: The State's coordinating agency for higher education was requested by the General Assembly (P.A. 194, 1972) to develop, in cooperation with the boards of trustees of the constituent units of the public system, a Master Plan for Higher Education in Connecticut. The plan is to be completed and submitted to the General Assembly by January, 1974.

- II. Management/Policy Group: A steering committee for the Master Plan process; membership consists of the chairmen of the boards of trustees for the constituent units, and the president of the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges. Liaison representation from the Governor's office and from the General Assembly are also represented.

- III. Resource Groups: These groups are charged with developing position papers on specific topics for utilization in the development of a Master Plan. Membership is proportionately balanced between the higher education community and non-academics to insure that a broad spectrum of viewpoints be represented in group deliberations.

- IV. Review and Evaluation Group: A group invited to review, evaluate, and make comments on the Resource Group reports and successive drafts of the Master Plan. Ten members represent a wide spectrum of the state's business and public interest activity and three ex-officio members are from state government.

- V. Master Plan Staff Associates: Each of the constituent units of the public system and the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges have provided staff support for the Master Plan project. The staff associates serve a dual function: (1) each staff associate provides staff assistance to a Resource Group and, subsequently, (2) the staff associates will, in collaboration with the Commission staff, prepare the draft of the Master Plan.
- VI. Constituent Unit Boards of Trustees, including Faculty, Students and Administration: All boards of trustees of the higher education system are asked to review carefully the Resource Group reports and the Master Plan drafts to follow. It is expected that each institution will encourage the fullest possible discussion among faculty, students, and administrators.
- VII. The Public: In addition to the higher education constituencies noted above, a vital input to the Master Plan is the participation of all who are interested, including: individuals in industry, labor, minorities, professionals -- in short, all organizations and individuals interested in higher education. Comments are invited at any stage of the development of the Master Plan. However, for consideration for the initial draft of the Master Plan, comments must be received by April 1973 and in the final draft of the Master Plan by September 1973.

AN OUTLINE OF ACTIVITIES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MASTER PLAN

Activity

1. CHE requests staff assistance from constituent units 6/72
2. CHE appoints Management/Policy Group
3. Management/Policy Group:
 - a. Identifies elements of Master Plan
 - b. Develops queries to be addressed
 - c. Appoints Resource Groups
4. CHE holds Colloquium Orientation meeting
5. CHE appoints Review and Evaluation Group
6. CHE approves interim report for transmittal to Governor and General Assembly 12/72
7. Resource Groups complete and transmit papers to Management/Policy Group
8. Management/Policy Group distributes Resource Group reports to Constituent units, Review and Evaluation Group, and other interested groups and individuals
9. Comments on Resource Group reports are submitted by Review and Evaluation Group, constituent units, and other interested individuals and groups
10. Initial Draft of Master Plan is prepared and distributed to constituent units and Review and Evaluation Group
11. Initial reactions are received and Draft of Master Plan is amended
12. CHE sponsors public presentation of amended Draft on final Draft Master Plan and solicits comments from all groups and individuals who are interested
13. Comments reviewed and evaluated and final draft prepared
14. Management/Policy Group receives final comments on final Draft of Master Plan from constituent units and Review and Evaluation Group, reports to CHE
15. CHE approves final draft of Master Plan and transmits it to the Governor and General Assembly 12/73

I. GOALS: Goals for the System of Higher Education; Role and Scope of Constituent Units; Number and Location of Institutional Units

Chairman: Dr. Thomas F. Malone, Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Connecticut

Staff Associate: Dr. W. Lewis Executive Director
Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges

Mrs. Katherine BOURN
Andover

Miss Elaine BOURRET
President, Student Council
Greater Hartford Community College
Hartford

Mr. Walter BRAHM
State Librarian
Hartford

Dr. William F. BRAZZIEL
Professor of Higher Education
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mrs. Oliver BUTTERWORTH
West Hartford

Mrs. Fred CAZEL
Storrs

Mr. F. J. CHIARENZA
Dean, School of Arts & Sciences
University of Hartford
West Hartford

Mr. John CLEARY
Hartford Times
Hartford

Mr. Paul COLLINS, Principal
Weaver High School
Hartford

Mr. Milton DEVANE
Attorney
New Haven

Mr. Frank DONOVAN
Manager of Public Affairs
General Electric
Bridgeport

Mr. Warren DOYLE
Student
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Donald B. ENGLE
Librarian
Yale University
New Haven

Mr. Wayne ENGLISH
President, Student Council
Hartford State Technical College
Hartford

Mr. Alfred FITT
Special Assistant to the President
Yale University
New Haven

Mrs. Yakira FRANK
Stamford

Mr. Zoltan FEUERMAN, Director
United Aircraft Training Center
Hartford

Mrs. Lucy T. HAMMER
Branford

Miss Martha HANF
West Hartford

Mr. John A. HEALEY
Instructor in Physics
University of Connecticut
Waterbury Branch
Waterbury

Mr. Curtis E. JENNINGS
Assistant Professor of History
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

Mr. Bryce JOSE
Assistant Vice President for
Personnel Relations
Southern New England Telephone Company
New Haven

Mr. Lothar KAHN
Professor of Modern Languages
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

Mr. Anthony KELLER
Executive Director
Commission on the Arts
Hartford

Mrs. John G. LEE
Farmington

Mr. Stanley LEVEN
Attorney
Hartford

Mr. Phillip LIGUORI, President
Briarwood
Southington

Mr. John McDONALD
Librarian
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Dr. Thurston E. MANNING, President
University of Bridgeport
Bridgeport

Sister Mary Claire MARKHAM
Professor of Chemistry
Saint Joseph College
West Hartford

Mrs. Theodore H. MEYER
Easton

Mr. Marshall MONTGOMERY
New Canaan

Mr. Paul NACKIN
Stamford

Mr. William OLSEN
Headmaster
The Hotchkiss School
Lakeville

Mr. Sherwood PROTHERO
Norwalk

Mr. Elliott RESSLER
Cheshire

Dr. Robert N. RUE, President
Mohegan Community College
Norwich

Mr. Leo SCHNEIDERMAN
Professor of Psychology
Eastern Connecticut State College
Willimantic

Dr. Roderick M. SCOTT
Danbury

Mrs. Albert SIMS
Riverside

Mr. Wesley SLATE
Student
Eastern Connecticut State College
Willimantic

Dr. Sheila TOBIAS
Associate Provost
Wesleyan University
Middletown

Mr. Robert VOGEL
Executive Director
Greater Hartford Consortium
Hartford

Miss Annie WARREN
Hartford

Dr. Charles R. WEBB, President
Eastern Connecticut State College
Willimantic

Mr. Donald R. WELTER, President
Thames Valley Technical College
Norwich

Observer: Dr. T. Edward HOLLANDER
Deputy Commissioner for
Higher and Professional
Education
New York State Education
Department
Albany, New York

1. GOALS: Goals for the System of Higher Education; Role and Scope of Constituent Units; Number and Location of Institutional Units

EXCERPTS OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS

1. New knowledge acquired mainly over the past hundred years has placed in society's hands the power to transform the world in ways that were not even dreamt of as the Twentieth Century dawned. The pace of change generated by knowledge yet to be acquired will accelerate rather than slow down in the years ahead.
2. In the "knowledge society" into which we are entering, to keep pace with our sister states in economic well-being, Connecticut must cultivate assiduously excellence, diversity, and balance in the quality of its human resources. Thirty thousand new jobs must be generated each year during the 1970's if we are to accommodate our growing labor force and achieve full employment by 1980. A powerful influence in attaining this desirable goal will be the degree to which our post-secondary system of higher education fulfills its basic function of providing the individual fulfillment -- intellectual, social, cultural, and economic -- which undergirds the strength and stability of our society.
3. The present array of educational institutions in Connecticut has the potential capability of responding to these needs, but a Herculean effort will be required over several years, involving intensive rethinking of fundamental goals, the role and scope of each constituent unit, and the number and location of units. Generalized goal setting must give way to specific identification of student-oriented, academic objectives towards which institutional progress can be measured by the institutions

themselves. As we move from an era when growth was the prime objective into one in which there is lessened stress on buildings and facilities and increased emphasis on improving the quality of present programs and exercising discriminating judgment in innovation and the addition of new programs, much more attention must be paid to the academic interaction of the several constituent units -- public and private.

4. If indications of disenchantment with higher education, as manifest in public attitudes and declining percentages of students seeking it, are to be reversed in the interests of developing Connecticut's human resources, orchestration of the entire system -- public and private -- will be required. Coordination of finance and administration in the public sector is provided by the Commission for Higher Education. What is now needed is a "central nervous system" capable of sensitively assessing societal values and needs and individual human preferences, and relating and linking them to the diverse array of existing or potential institutional capabilities. Imaginative institution coordination will be required to insure sensitivity, preserve institutional autonomy, and avoid bureaucratic rigidities. This orchestration cannot be superimposed from above, but must arise from creative and unselfish thinking from within the educational institutions themselves.
5. Given an increasingly rapid rate in the accumulation of knowledge, the obsolescence of skills, the changing role of women in society, and value preferences of youth, augmented provision is needed for intermittent education during an individual's entire lifetime. More effective coupling of secondary education and higher education will be needed. Particular attention should be paid to special programs that would update skills in advanced science, technology and the career professions.

6. A significant development in the interaction of the public and private sectors is a new state program providing about \$1,000,000 this year to independent colleges for scholarships for Connecticut students. This has helped preserve our independent institutions, and has given students a wider choice of opportunities. The cost to the state for each student helped is less than it would have cost to educate him in the public system, and no new facilities are needed, since many independent colleges have excess capacity.

There is also legislation authorizing the Commission for Higher Education to contract for facilities, services, or programs with independent colleges, though no such contracts have been approved.

7. A milestone that holds portent for the medium distant future is the Education Amendments of 1972 which authorize very significant new federal programs in aid of higher education, particularly the Basic Opportunity Grants which will "entitle" every young person in the nation to an award of up to \$1400 per year towards his college expenses, depending on need. Also authorized are direct grants to institutions, support for libraries, loans to students, and many other things. The federal Budget for Fiscal Year 1974 will indicate the extent to which these new programs will be funded. In our judgment, there will be little additional money compared with last year, and we will be wise to plan our system without expecting very much federal help in the next five years beyond that already being received.

8. Other specific findings are as follows:

- + Changing demand for some types of training, particularly teacher training, will require substantial changes in the curriculum of many institutions, particularly the State

- Colleges, in the next few years. The need for teachers will not rise again for many years, if ever.
- + The present separation of the Technical Colleges from the Community Colleges unnecessarily isolates the students from each other, restricts the career choices of students at both types of college, and has allowed the existence of different calendars so that transfer or cross registration is difficult.
 - + Enrollment trends are down in Technical Colleges and up in Community Colleges.
 - + Proprietary Institutions are forbidden to grant degrees in Connecticut, though allowed to in some other states. An unnecessary injustice is being done to some students in Connecticut relative to students in other states.
 - + With full utilization of private and public institutions there will be no geographic region of the state lacking access to higher education.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. We recommend that the planning process now under way be intensified and linked intimately to the institutions of higher education by the establishment of an Academic Council for four-year institutions, and one for two-year institutions. The Councils would embrace all public, private, and proprietary institutions and would have as their principal functions:
 - + Assessing societal change and needs and the appropriate response in curricular innovation including program introduction, consolidation, coordination and termination.
 - + Fostering the kind of intellectual leadership and experimentation that would make our system of higher education

a magnet that would attract scholars from all over the world while supporting, through research and graduate study, our state's leadership in business and industry.

+ Assisting mobility of students among the several levels of higher education and assuring effective linkage with secondary education.

We have considered locating this activity in the Commission for Higher Education, but believe that these functions are best performed by a council that reports directly to the governing boards of the institutions without adding to the administrative overburden. Each council would be staffed by rotating an individual on a leave of absence from one of the participating institutions, supported by a secretary. Provision for experimentation should be provided by a direct state appropriation that should be about one percent of the public support for higher education. The administrative and financial coordination performed by CHE would continue as before.

2. We recommend that a new Board of Trustees be established for the Technical Colleges to help them respond to the challenges of changing society and to encourage more effective cooperation with the community colleges. The new Board should have representation from community colleges, from industry, and from labor and should be instructed to bring the Community and the Technical Colleges closer together.
3. We recommend that the University of Connecticut Health Center remain as a unit of the University but with the administrative flexibility that would be afforded by having it administered as a non-profit corporation supported by the State and operated by the Board of Trustees. The question of a separate Board of Trustees for the Health Center has been considered and we conclude that this would be a retrogressive step

in medical education.

4. We recommend that none of the branches of the University should be authorized to become a four-year institution, but extension services and selected graduate offerings for adults should be encouraged.
5. We recommend that more comprehensive accreditation be made available to properly qualified proprietary schools or to programs within schools so that they can grant degrees. This should be achieved by reference to an accrediting body such as The New England Association of Schools and Colleges or The Commission for Higher Education. Until such accreditation is established, credit by examination should be available to facilitate mobility.
6. We recommend a proper balance between attention to career preparation and attention to the traditional arts and sciences education which preserves and enriches our cultural tradition.
7. We recommend that specific numerical enrollment goals should be established for minority-group students in the different parts of the system.
8. We recommend that no new public institutions of higher education should be established in the next five years.

II. ENROLLMENT: Distribution of Enrollment Among Constituent Units

Chairman: Dr. Dorothy Schrader, Chairman, Mathematics Department
Southern Connecticut State College

Staff Associate: Stanley Macklow, Assistant Professor of Physics
Norwalk State Technical College

Mr. Tom BOWLER
Student
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

Dr. John CAREY
Instructor in History
Tunxis Community College
Farmington

Mr. Johnie M. FLOYD
Assistant Director of Admissions
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

Mrs. Patricia HENDEL
Office of Continuing Education
Connecticut College
New London

Mr. Frank KELLY
Director of Admissions
Waterbury State Technical College
Waterbury

Mrs. Susan LINCOLN
Dean of Students
South Central Community College
New Haven

Mr. Joseph PALKER
Torrington Company
Torrington

Mrs. Frederick REIMERS
First Vice President, National
School Board Association
Branford

Mr. Gerard RUCCI
Connecticut State Employment Service
Hartford

Mrs. Alexander F. SMITH
Mathematics Department
Middlesex Community College
Middletown

Ms. Gwendolyn SPEAKS
Student
Waterbury State Technical College
Waterbury

Ms. Helaine STARR
Student
Waterbury State Technical College
Watertown

Mr. John W. VLANDIS
Director of Admissions
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Truman WARNER
Professor of Social Sciences
Western Connecticut State College
Danbury

Mr. David WEILL
Southwestern Conn. Library System
Fairfield

II. Enrollment: Distribution of Enrollment Among Constituent Units

EXCERPTS OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Higher education is currently in a state of uncertainty in regard to its most important element - students. Enrollments have risen generally over the past decade but the past two years have shown a smaller increase than was predicted. Until 1971 the projections made by the Commission for Higher Education were accurate to 1% or better. These projections failed in 1971 and 1972, which indicates that fewer high school graduates are starting college and the number of already enrolled students returning is smaller than expected. At this time there are no reliable figures on which to base a long-range projection of enrollment. It seems likely, however, that enrollment is at a peak. Birth rate figures would lead one to expect a decrease in enrollment GROWTH in 1975 and an actual decline in total enrollment by 1980. However, the apparent alteration in the rate of college-going this year means that 1975 will probably become a year of decline in enrollment and 1980 a year of sharp decline. These projections refer only to the traditional student. A serious effort to increase other enrollments (part-time, non-credit and community-service) would obviously alter the picture.

Historically, post-secondary education in Connecticut has served a limited group of Connecticut residents. The typical student of the past was in his late teens, single, dependent on his parents for support. He attended classes full time, lived on or near campus, and completed his degree in four years. The post-secondary institutions were structured to serve him.

This committee feels that public post-secondary institutions should serve the entire community and not merely one sector of it. Each member

Findings and Recommendations (cont.)

of the community should have the opportunity to receive the post-secondary education which he needs and desires. The Enrollment Resource Group did not feel that a mere commentary on existing facts was sufficient. Since enrollment figures are influenced by many factors, the following modifications of the education system are recommended:

1. At least lower-division education be tuition free.
2. The open admissions policy at the community colleges be made operative by adequate funding.
3. Off-campus courses offered by state colleges and the University be substantially increased.
4. Courses to serve community needs be instituted or increased at all state post-secondary institutions.
5. Graduate, summer, and extension courses be funded by the state.
6. A central clearinghouse to process applications for the various admissions offices be established.

The following problems have generated the above recommendations:

1. Tuition and fees bar many students from post-secondary education.
2. Enrollment of non-white, lower economic level, and other minority students does not represent the population of the state.
3. There is insufficient opportunity for those who wish to continue their education on a part-time basis.
4. Most of Connecticut's people do not consider the colleges and university as their institutions.
5. The per-credit cost of graduate, summer, and extension courses is much higher than it is for full-time undergraduate courses.
6. While it is known that the enrollment of traditional students is decreasing in the state, precise enrollment figures cannot be cited because there is no central source of compatible data.

III. FACILITIES: Utilization of Existing Facilities and Needs for
New Facilities

Chairman: Robert Mutrux, Architect on Board of Directors,
Fletcher-Thompson, Inc., Bridgeport

Staff Associate: David Basch, Director of Planning and Development
Board of Trustees for State Colleges

Mr. Stan GABY
Associate Professor of Physics
Mohegan Community College
Norwich

Miss Eileen PATTON
Student
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Paul GOINES
Sales Representative
Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.
West Hartford

Mr. Thomas RAIMONDI, President
Hartford State Technical College
Hartford

Mr. Frank GOMES
Business Administrator
Post Junior College
Waterbury

Mr. Douglas REID
Bridgeport Public Library
Bridgeport

Mr. Carrol HUGHES
Assistant Commissioner
Public Information in Education
Dept. of Environmental Protection
Hartford

Mr. James ROBERTSON
Executive Vice President
Quinnipiac College
Hamden

Mr. David LaBAU
Architect, Golden, Thornton,
LaBau, Inc.
West Hartford

Mr. John ROHRBACK
Vice President for Financial Affairs
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Wallace LEE
Assistant Professor of Mathematics
Western Connecticut State College
Danbury

Mrs. Vincent TIROLA
Westport

Dr. Frederick W. LOWE, Jr.
President
Manchester Community College
Manchester

Mr. Reginald W. WASHINGTON
Student
Eastern Connecticut State College
Willimantic

Mr. Robert MEYERS
Career Training Institute
Wethersfield

Miss Peggy WILSON
Assistant Professor of Education
Eastern Connecticut State College
Willimantic

Mr. Ben T. WINN
Assistant Professor of Biology
South Central Community College
New Haven

III. Facilities: Utilization of Existing Facilities and Needs for New Facilities

EXCERPTS OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1) THE CONSTRUCTION BACKLOG

Finding: It is clear that the State is struggling with building commitments to a range of institutions, commitments it finds exceedingly difficult to finance. It is also clear that the State is looking for sound guidance on just how to treat with this backlog.

Recommendation: It is recommended that the Governor give clear and immediate guidance as to the availability of capital funds for each of the constituent units of higher education, based on an evaluation of the facility priority recommendations made by these units this past year. Further, it is recommended that the Commission for Higher Education in collaboration with the Boards of Trustees of the constituent units establish a pattern for capital construction that: (a) lengthens out the program of development of the Community College System; (b) insists on a slower plan of facilities development for the University, State, and Technical Colleges; and (c) defers commitment to new programs that require new facilities.

2) THE FACILITIES PROCESS

Finding: There exists no authoritative advisory body in higher education with the staff, the expertise, and the responsibility to devise standardized procedures of facilities programming, to gather sufficient data on the quantity and quality of facilities, to advise on the priorities of facilities needs based upon constituent unit plans, and to seek out and illuminate State fiscal plans in the facilities area.

2) FACILITIES PROCESS (Cont.)

Recommendation: Establish within the context of the Commission for Higher Education a Central Facilities Group within the offices of the Commission with an appropriately-structured Advisory Committee of its own to carry out the above functions and to encourage within the constituent units a continuing planning process and the exploration of opportunities for developing joint-use facilities (See later recommendation).

Finding: There is pending legislation to transfer the responsibilities of the Commission on Aid to Higher Education to the CHE and to reserve a role for members of the Commission on Aid as advisory to the CHE on facilities. The Commission on Aid is a knowledgeable body, familiar with Federal programs that benefit higher education and familiar with facility needs at both public and private institutions. This expertise would be valuable within a facilities process. The staff and members of the Commission on Aid could thus comprise in part the makeup of the proposed Central Facilities Group.

Recommendation: Proposed legislation to transfer the responsibilities of the Commission on Aid to Higher Education to the CHE should be supported, reserving a role for the members of the Commission on Aid, who could usefully be asked to serve as an advisory body to the CHE on facilities need. It is further recommended that members of this advisory body be composed of representatives of both private and public institutions as well as others with competency in evaluating facilities requirements and that these members be appointed by the Commission for Higher Education.

*

Finding: The present process of facility planning is inadequate in staff and resources at the campus and the constituent unit Board of

2) FACILITIES PROCESS (Cont.)

Trustees level to carry out proper planning activities to yield timely and relevant data on facility needs. The inputs from such decentralized planning activities are vital to proper consideration of need and priorities by a Central Facilities Group.

Recommendation: Facilities planning should be a decentralized activity carried out at the level of the campus and constituent unit Board of Trustees and that funds for operations and staff for a continuing Planning capability be a part of the budget requests of each constituent unit.

*

Finding: The Department of Public Works has for years been bearing most of the criticism for the failure to deliver facilities efficiently and economically. We find this criticism exaggerated; the fault belongs to all of the agencies that have had a hand in meeting construction requirements--from the constituent units to the Commission for Higher Education; from the State Administration to members of the General Assembly.

Recommendation: The Department of Public Works should be strengthened with a Deputy Commissioner and appropriate staff specifically charged with responsibility for higher education facilities and cooperation with the Central Facilities Group.

3) FACILITY UTILIZATION AND STANDARDS:

Finding: Our Resource Group soon determined that traditional classroom and laboratory utilization studies, while they do have their appropriate use and value, by and large are an imperfect means of establishing the degree of efficiency and adequacy with which institutions use their facilities. At best these data relate to a fraction of

facilities on campus and treat them within a limited context. Thus the conclusions of the recent Etherington Report on classroom utilization at public institutions of higher education have been found to be in serious error and misleading.

Recommendation: It is recommended that: (a) utilization data from both public and private institutions continue to be gathered; (b) that the Central Facilities Group within the CHE be charged with responsibility for insuring its accuracy and relevance; (c) that this same group recommend to the State appropriate standards of utilization; and (d) that the CHE improve its own comprehension of the meaning of utilization data and its appropriate context so that it is in a stronger position to relieve some of the misguided public apprehension over existing conditions.

*

Finding: Connecticut maintains stringent space requirements for elementary and secondary schools, but it has not established adequate standards of space or a clear notion of the scale of facilities appropriate to the individual constituent units of higher education.

Recommendation: Pending the development of facility space standards of its own, the State should adopt the standards developed by the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education, feeling that these standards are probably the most thoughtfully designed in the nation today.

4) COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING

Finding: The present processes of institutional planning at the campus level are generally sporadic and uneven. Most important of all, though many of the planners have been talented, they have not had access to

realistic fiscal parameters against which to do the planning. These inadequacies have restricted opportunities to take into account changing needs and purposes as they relate to students, other institutions, and to higher education as a system with their consequences in the quantity and quality of facilities. Such plans are vital for the functioning of an adequate facilities process.

Recommendation: Continuing and adequate procedures of comprehensive planning including periodic development of academic and physical plans should be established for each separate institution of public higher education.

5) PRIVATE AND REGIONAL RESOURCES

Finding: The Resource Group was impressed greatly with the availability of educational resource in the private sector, particularly, within an often-neglected sector, that of the proprietary schools. Taking advantage of such resources may reduce the burden of facility needs in public higher education.

Recommendation: Wherever feasible and desirable in the development of higher education in the State, and in the planning of individual institutions due account shall be taken of the resources of the private and proprietary sectors of higher education to make use of the possibilities of joint use and sharing of facilities through contract programs.

*

Finding: There are substantial resources in public and private higher education as well as in non-higher education institutions which are located within educational regions as defined by the CHE and which may usefully augment one another to the benefit of the region and the State.

Recommendation: Data on facilities and academic resources should be compiled by regions to be used in the planning process so that they may lead to the optimum utilization of resources, and in the optimum development of higher education within a region.

6) AUXILIARY FUND FACILITIES

Finding: One of the profound problems facing the constituent units relates to the funding of non-academic facilities, including student union buildings, parking areas, and dormitories. Construction costs have simply outdistanced the ability of students on many campuses in Connecticut to finance these much-needed facilities. A further burden is imposed by the limited 20 year bonding term that does not spread out the cost of facilities to the generations of students who will use them.

Recommendation: The newly-imposed tuition payments should be segregated to provide a Self-Liquidating Facilities Fund with which to finance such non-academic facilities across the State and the term under which bonds are sold for these projects be lengthened from the present 20 years to 30 years.

7) ARCHITECT SELECTION

Finding: The present system of the selection of architects and engineers by the Department of Public Works fails to lead to the optimum choices of professionals that would lead to the establishment of the relationship of confidence and rapport between the user agency and professionals needed for the proper design and programming of facilities.

Recommendation: The president of an institution shall have a significant voice in the selection of all professionals engaged in the planning, programming, and design of campus facilities.

8) FACILITIES DELIVERY

Finding: Due to factors beyond its control the Public Works Department has not operated in an efficient manner in the production of facilities for higher education. We believe that there is great opportunity: (a) to speed the process of design and construction through a streamlining of procedures; (b) to develop increased use of the private sector through leaseback and other contractual arrangements; and (c) to save substantial money through elimination of unnecessary delays occasioned by the present process.

Recommendation: The organization and operations of the Department of Public Works should be reviewed to the end that it may make optimum use of methods and approaches to improve its effectiveness in facilities delivery in terms of speed, quality, and economy.

9) ENVIRONMENTAL AND ESTHETIC CONSIDERATIONS

Finding: It requires no great breadth of observation nor depth of perception to realize that the relation between the physical symbol for higher education and the world around it has not achieved the high standard that the State deserves. The exterior appearance of facilities, on the whole, is spartan at best; in the layout and design of facilities, the environment has more often than not been either neglected or totally ignored.

Recommendation: Every effort should be made to achieve the highest level of quality in these vital areas. Respect for environmental factors in site planning, energy conservation, and the preservation of natural resources is of prime importance in a field which, by definition, is a major influence in the shaping of the world we live in and hope to enjoy.

Furthermore, we are dealing in an area whose visual impact is evident

well in advance of its functional effect. It is essential, therefore, that creations resulting from the Master Plan, in every case, be a distinct credit to the institution that inspired it, the State that hosts it, and the taxpayer who supports it.

In particular, funds should not only be budgeted but reserved, first, for planning which will result in an agreeable natural setting, and second, for interiors in which stimulating works of creative art may be displayed and appreciated.

IV. PROGRAMS: Distribution, Revision, and Termination

Chairman: Dr. Harold See, Benton Professor of International and Higher Education, University of Bridgeport

Staff Associate: Dr. Joseph Dunn, Director of Institutional Research
Central Connecticut State College

Dr. Frederick ADAMS
Dean, School of Allied Health
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Miss Claire M. BERG
Assistant Professor of Biology
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mrs. Kay V. BERGIN
Associate Professor of Business
Mattatuck Community College
Waterbury

Sister Helen BONIN
Academic Dean
Annhurst College
Woodstock

Mr. Robert J. BRUNELL, President
Conn. State Fed. of Teachers AFL-CIO
Hartford

Mr. Thomas P. CONNORS
Office of Public Administration
Manchester Community College
Manchester

Mrs. Nancie FELT
Assistant Professor of Mathematics
Norwalk State Technical College
Norwalk

Ms. Eloise HARRIS
Community Renewal Team
Hartford

Mr. Chandier HOWARD
Student
Housatonic Community College
Stratford

Mr. Stanley S. KATZ
Dean, School of Allied Health
and Natural Science
Quinnipiac College
Hamden

Mr. Nathan B. LERNER
Associate Professor of Chemistry
Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven

Mr. Ralph LIGHTFOOT
Senior Staff Engineer
Sikorsky Aircraft
Stratford

Mr. Edward J. LISTON, President
Housatonic Community College
Bridgeport

Mr. Robert E. LORISH
Chairman, Department of Government
Connecticut College
New London

Rabbi Jerome MALINO
Danbury

Mr. Walter MARCUS
Attorney
Rocky Hill

Dr. Peter W. McFADDEN
Dean, School of Engineering
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Joseph MURPHY
Associate Commissioner of Education
and Director of Vocational Education
State Department of Education
Hartford

Miss Shelley NAMER
Student
University of Bridgeport

Miss Barbara SCHUTT
Norwich

Mr. William L. WALLACE
Senior Vice President, Olin
Stamford

Miss Marie WHITE
Associate Dean of Student Affairs
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

Mr. Howard ZETTLER
Assistant Professor of English
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

IV. Programs: Distribution, Revision, and Termination

EXCERPTS OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings:

1. Inclusion of the proprietary schools and hospital schools with the institutions of higher education in a statewide system for coordination of post-secondary educational programs under the aegis of the Commission for Higher Education is in the best interests of the citizens of Connecticut.

Presently, there are 138 post-secondary institutions in Connecticut available to serve the approximately 150,000 persons desiring such educational opportunities each year. For purposes of program coordination, some of these institutions possess sufficient similarities of level and type to be grouped into the seven "units" as follows: Proprietary Schools - 62; Hospital Schools - 32; Technical Colleges - 4; Community Colleges - 12; State Colleges - 4; State University - 1; Private Colleges and Universities - 23; for a total of 138.

Collectively, these institutions now possess the diversity necessary to meet the educational needs of Connecticut's citizens. The role of the Commission for Higher Education as both a catalytic agent and a clearinghouse would be to draw the best from this diverse group of established institutions into a system for the coordination of programs and to aid the development of a whole series of flexible relationships within education and with the larger community which do balance public interest with institutional autonomy. (See Section Two - Answers C, D, E, F, G, I, J, K, L; and Section Three)

Findings (cont.)

2. The process of actively involving over two hundred persons from a wide variety of backgrounds in the Master Plan effort is highly commendable and one that should be continued in some form. Effective program planning must be based on a continuing, much stronger effort to involve the broader interested community through general and special advisory committees, special studies, resource groups, and the like. Liaison should be actively cultivated in terms of geographic area, particular career fields, using employers, professional groups, etc. Only in this way can we hope to achieve reasonable relevance in this era of rapidly increasing change. This approach is needed in the interest of educational institutions, the students, the concerned business and government institutions, and the society as a whole. We are not doing nearly as well in this area as we need to. Hopefully, the relatively broad participation in this master planning effort will help us to make a start towards substantial improvement. (See Section Two - Answers D, 1; and Section Three)

3. Many educational institutions have found value in advisory groups of informed and interested lay people. Initially, these advisory groups were helpful in broadening the college experience and in fund raising. Recently, dedicated groups have demonstrated their value to the college by relating the needs of the public to the college, sometimes on a program-by-program basis. In some instances, the college needed assurance of the acceptance and value of a contemplated program. In other cases, the lay advisors recognized a fault or void in the educational program, and provided

Findings (cont.)

significant and constructive assistance in the initiation of a new program.

The development of such formal relationships would encourage and expedite the introduction of program ideas to the Commission for Higher Education by a variety of institutions, agencies, groups, or individuals outside the educational establishment and arrange for the careful consideration of such ideas as programs for review and possible "plug-in" to the system for the coordination of post-secondary educational programs. The much sought after balance between the needs of society and the needs of individual students would be much closer to reality. (See Section Two - Answers D and I)

4. Programs are defined as those organized educational activities which lead to some terminal objective, be it a certificate, diploma, or degree. Representatives from both the public and private sectors expressed dissatisfaction with the present method of program approval since there is no effective means through which to avoid unnecessary duplication of programs, and no rational link among the various levels and types of programs.

The most effective process of program review is one that considers not only the approval of new programs, but also the deletion, merger, revision, and shelving of existing programs; contains no unnecessary and cumbersome procedures; and expedites program change. It is a process which involves all public and private post-secondary institutions, utilizes common guidelines and procedures, and allows individual institutions to contribute signif-

Findings (cont.)

icantly to the statewide system for the coordination of post-secondary educational programs.

More complete institutional compliance with the statewide process of program review would overcome some of the shortcomings of the present method of program approval and benefit both the individual institutions and the state's efforts to meet the post-secondary educational needs of its citizens.

In recommending required compliance under appropriate circumstances, Resource Group IV (Programs) is aware of the intricate, historic, legal and educational issues involved in the relationships between public and private education, and, therefore, found that it would be advisable for the Commission for Higher Education to complete a study forthwith on the feasibility of such required compliance. (See Section Two - Answers A, B, C, D, E, F, J, and K)

5. Many levels and types of institutions do not feel adequately represented in the present method of program approval and wish to contribute directly to the proposed statewide system for the coordination of post-secondary educational programs. Such contributions could best be made through the newly constituted Academic Planning Committee which with operating funds and with direct in-put from all seven "units", could develop appropriate guidelines, hold open and regularly scheduled meetings, publish a newsletter, and hold hearings and/or appeals on program changes. A balance between centralized authority and institutional autonomy could be maintained in regard to program development and

Findings (cont.)

and help increase the efficiency of learning on a life-time basis. It is also felt that much more attention must be given to programs of continuing education, since the accelerating pace of change means that most people will require increasingly frequent updating and rereading of their educational background. (See Section Two - Answers B, C, D, F, L; and Section Three)

8. Master planning as a means of balancing the needs of people with the resources of the state to provide for those needs must never ignore the human element in its efforts to coordinate activities or to develop more efficient statewide utilization of resources.

This admonition is extremely important in the development of master plans for the process of program review, for the development of programs at the several levels and types of institutions, and for consideration of the relevant future of educational programs in Connecticut. Inertia in the change process often displayed by individuals and groups of individuals, is based, primarily, upon a sincere concern for the changes that might occur in the personal and professional status of persons involved in the programs as they presently exist.

Wide participation in the planning process, availability of accurate data about present and future program needs, decrease in professional positions through attrition rather than direct elimination, provision for the personal program interests of students, and opportunities for retraining or reassignment of professional personnel are all ways through which a concern for the human element can be implemented. (See Section Two - Answers F, G, I; and Section Three)

Findings (cont.)

9. This report does not wish to further the concept that the only means of providing improved educational opportunities for the citizens of Connecticut is by the mere allocation of more funds. However, it is felt adequate funds for the operation of the various committees and advisory bodies are essential to the successful completion of their responsibilities.

The establishment of the recommended statewide system for the coordination of post-secondary educational programs should result in some financial economies through the more effective use of all existing educational resources, through more utilization of innovative instructional techniques, and through more widespread employment of alternate approaches to education. Further funds might be saved by curtailing the building of new physical facilities except where detailed justification is present. In so doing, additional funds would then be available for program development through the various committees and advisory bodies, and for student and faculty assistance where appropriate. (See Section Two-Answers C, D, E, F, G, I, M, O; and Section Three)

Note: Section I of the final report of Resource Group IV (Programs) contains a full discussion of the salient findings associated with each recommendation. In addition, the sources provided in the parentheses refer to other parts of this final report in which further discussion of these topics can be found.

Recommendations

1. That the Commission for Higher Education be directed and authorized to plan and implement a statewide system for the coordination of post-secondary educational programs in Connecticut. (See Section Two - Answers C, D, E, F, G, I, J, K, L; and Section Three)
2. That the process of educational planning initiated in this Master Plan effort be continued by the Commission for Higher Education as part of its on-going, standard operating procedures. (See Section Two - Answers D, I; and Section Three)
3. That increased efforts be made by both the Commission for Higher Education and individual institutions to develop and maintain closer, deeper, and more formal relationships between "education" and the other elements of society. (See Section Two - Answers D and I)
4. That public and private post-secondary institutions be required to comply with the policies and procedures of a statewide process of program review if they wish to share in public funds for programs for which public funds are sought or offered. Such funds would not include individual student scholarships. (See Section Two - Answers A, B, C, D, E, F, J, and K)
5. That the present Sub-Committee on Coordination and Planning be replaced by a permanent Academic Planning Committee under the aegis of the Commission for Higher Education with advise and consent authority over the review of programs, and that this new committee be representative of all seven "units", faculty, students

Recommendations (cont.)

and the general public. (See Section Two - Answers F, J; and Section Three)

6. That separate advisory bodies be established in such general career fields as business, technology, and industry; teacher education; criminal administration and social services; health professions; and environmental studies; to work directly with the proposed Academic Planning Committee of the Commission for Higher Education in the coordination of educational programs in these fields. (See Section Two - Answers C, D, E, K, L, M; and Section Three)
7. That the Commission for Higher Education provide leadership in introducing the aspect of futures research and the methodology of futures-orientated planning and policy making into the development of educational programs in Connecticut. (See Section Two - Answers B, C, D, F, L; and Section Three)
8. That the implementation of the various recommendations contained within this report be based upon due consideration of their effects on the lives of people since education is an enterprise concerned primarily with people and not with products. (See Section Two - Answers F, G, I; and Section Three)
9. That adequate funding be provided to implement the recommendations offered in this report and that procedures for the public accountability of such funds be developed to assure their efficient and effective use. (See Section Two - Answers C, D, E, F, G, I, M, O, and Section Three)

Recommendations

1. That ~~the~~ Commission for Higher Education be directed and authorized to plan and implement a statewide system for the coordination of ~~post~~-secondary educational programs in Connecticut. (See Section Two - Answers C, D, E, F, G, I, J, K, L; and Section Three)
2. That the process of educational planning initiated in this Master Plan effort be continued by the Commission for Higher Education as part of its on-going, standard operating procedures. (See Section Two - Answers D, I; and Section Three)
3. That increased efforts be made by both the Commission for Higher Education and individual institutions to develop and maintain closer, deeper, and more formal relationships between "education" and the other elements of society. (See Section Two - Answers D and I)
4. That public and private ~~post~~-secondary institutions be required to comply with the policies and procedures of a statewide process of program review if they wish to share in public funds for programs for which public funds are sought or offered. Such funds would not include individual student scholarships. (See Section Two - Answers A, B, C, D, E, F, J, and K)
5. That the ~~present~~ Sub-Committee on Coordination and Planning be replaced by a permanent Academic Planning Committee under the aegis of the Commission for Higher Education with advise and consent authority over the review of programs, and that this new committee be representative of all seven "units", faculty, students

Recommendations (cont.)

and the general public. (See Section Two - Answers F, J; and Section Three)

6. That separate advisory bodies be established in such general career fields as business, technology, and industry; teacher education; criminal administration and social services; health professions; and environmental studies; to work directly with the proposed Academic Planning Committee of the Commission for Higher Education in the coordination of educational programs in these fields. (See Section Two - Answers C, D, E, K, L, M; and Section Three)
7. That the Commission for Higher Education provide leadership in introducing the aspect of futures research and the methodology of futures-orientated planning and policy making into the development of educational programs in Connecticut. (See Section Two - Answers B, C, D, F, L; and Section Three)
8. That the implementation of the various recommendations contained within this report be based upon due consideration of their effects on the lives of people since education is an enterprise concerned primarily with people and not with products. (See Section Two - Answers F, G, I; and Section Three)
9. That adequate funding be provided to implement the recommendations offered in this report and that procedures for the public accountability of such funds be developed to assure their efficient and effective use. (See Section Two - Answers C, D, E, F, G, I, M, O, and Section Three)

V. IMPROVEMENT OF OPPORTUNITY: Alternative Approaches for the Delivery of
Higher Education Services

Chairman: The Rev. W. C. McInnes, S. J., President
Fairfield University

Staff Associate: Dr. Bernard Shea, Director of Research, Projects & Publications
Board of Trustees for Regional Community Colleges

Mr. Robert ALLISON
Student
Manchester Community College
Manchester

Dr. Bernard BERNER
Chief Counseling Psychologist
Veterans Administration Hospital
West Haven

Mr. Arthur J. BRISSETTE
Director of Continuing Education
Sacred Heart University
Bridgeport

Mr. William BROWN, Executive Director
Urban League of Greater Hartford
Hartford

Mrs. Doris CASSIDAY
American Association of University
Women
Stamford

Dr. Joseph CHEPAITIS
Director of Academic Development
University of New Haven
West Haven

Mr. Bice CLEWOW
Editor, West Hartford News
West Hartford

Mr. F. Edward CRANZ
Professor of History
Connecticut College
New London

Dr. Harold DAVIS
Chairman, Administration and
Supervision Department
Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven

Mr. Kenneth E. DEREGO
Director, Extension Service
Waterbury State Technical College
Waterbury

Miss Linda E. DIAZ
Attorney
Hartford

Mr. Roy E. DIGNI, Personnel Assistant
State Personnel Department
State Office Building
Hartford

Mr. Ben DUBOIS
State Personnel Department
Hartford

Mr. James A. DORSEY
Director, Adult and Continuing
Education
State Department of Education
Hartford

The Honorable Lillian ERB
Judge of Probate
Groton

Mr. Jonathan F. FANTON
Special Assistant to the President
Yale University
New Haven

Mr. Douglas M. FELLOWS
Consultant, Educational Development
Program
University of Hartford
West Hartford

Dr. Robert H. FENN
Dean of Faculty
Manchester Community College
Manchester

John G. FREYMANN, M. D.
Director of Education
The Hartford Hospital
Hartford

Mr. Galvin G. GALL
Assistant Provost
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Miss Carolyn GILLESPIE
Student
Eastern Connecticut State College
Willimantic

Dr. Peter GOLDMARK, President
Goldmark Communications Corporation
Stamford

Mr. Edmund GUBBINS
Director of Education
Department of Correction
Hartford

Mr. Stanley HARASIMOWITZ
Chairman, Department of Electric
Technology
Thames Valley State Technical College
Norwich

Mr. Edward M. Harris, Jr.
Vice President, Secretary, and
General Counsel, Pitney Bowes Inc.
Stamford

Dr. Michael J. HERRICK
Assistant Professor of English
Housatonic Community College
Bridgeport

Mr. Felix IRIZARRY, Jr.
Student
University of Hartford
West Hartford

Mrs. Merryl JACKSON
West Haven

Dr. H. B. JESTIN
Academic Vice President
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

Mr. Frank L. JUSZLI, President
Norwalk State Technical College
Norwalk

Dr. Evelyn G. LEWIS
Consultant for Disadvantaged and
Handicapped Programs
State Department of Education
Hartford

Mr. Anthony L. MASSO
Connecticut State Labor Council,
AFL-CIO
Darien

Mr. Reinaldo MATOS
Assistant Director, New England
Program in Teacher Education
Hamden

Mr. Robert E. PATRICELLI
Vice President
Greater Hartford Process
Hartford

Mr. Michael PERILLO
Assistant Director, Evening Division
and Summer Session
Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven

Mrs. Carrie PERRY
Administrator, Ambulatory Health
Care
Hartford

Dr. Leon J. RICHELLE
Associate Dean of the Graduate School
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Earl SHEPHERD
The Everywhere School
Hartford

Mr. Arthur L. SINGER, Jr.
Alfred P. Sloan Foundation
New York, New York

Mr. Paul K. TAFF, President
Connecticut Public Television
Hartford

Dr. David WAX
New England Board of Higher Education
Wellesley, Massachusetts

V. Improvement of Opportunity: Alternate Approaches for the Delivery of Higher Education Services

EXCERPTS OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS:

1. Institutions and agencies inside and outside the system of traditionally organized and accredited higher education are in need of new formats in order to increase their ability to meet the needs of the state. It is possible to improve Connecticut's system of higher education in terms both of quality and of opportunities by establishing a program to award external degrees.
2. Although increasing efforts are being made to make traditional programs more flexible, thousands of Connecticut residents are still denied access to higher education services. Moreover, many residents are penalized by a lack of formal recognition of learning achieved outside the classroom. As a result of these deprivations, the state's manpower is underutilized, and for many individuals serious inequalities in economic opportunity persist.
3. On their own initiative, many colleges and universities within the state are developing programs for external degrees, credit by examination, and technology-supported teaching.
4. A substantial foundation of communications media is already available and is developing for technology-supported teaching.

Findings (cont.)

5. A program to award external degrees requires encouragement, status, and continuity. In order to provide effective educational services the functions of instruction and evaluation need not be conducted within a single organization.
6. Since economic factors play an important part in the development of educational programs, it is imperative that steps be taken to assure maximum benefits in relation to costs.
7. The development of alternatives to traditional modes of higher education requires appropriate new regulations by state licensing authorities.
8. The success of a new program of nontraditional educational services depends heavily upon its acceptance by traditional institutions and the general public.
9. Evaluation is necessary to monitor any nontraditional program.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. A comprehensive program for earning undergraduate degrees and college credit by nontraditional methods should be developed and coordinated on a state-wide basis including credit by examination, credit by transfer, credit for off-campus study, and credit for experience.

Recommendations (cont.)

2. Priority for new opportunities in higher education should go to persons currently denied access especially veterans, minorities, low-income groups, shift workers, housewives, the handicapped, the elderly, and those seeking additional career education. Immediate attention should be given to student guidance and public information to encourage the use of existing and new alternate methods of earning college credits and degrees.
3. The Commission for Higher Education should be a catalytic public agency to promote maximum participation of post-secondary institutions and community service organizations in the delivery of alternative modes of higher education services by encouraging contractual relationships and the award of degrees by new and nontraditional methods.
4. Immediate attention should go to expanding the utilization of existing and new systems for delivery of higher education services through radio, television, press, computer, and other technological resources. A continuing staff program of research and development should be an integral part of such activity.
5. A new constituent unit within the state system of higher education should be created. This unit with its own board of trustees should have authority (1) to award undergraduate degrees on the basis of examinations and transfer of credit, (2) to award credit for learning on the basis of demonstrated competency without regard to how it was achieved, and (3) to

Recommendations (cont.)

provide services necessary to implement its functions as a degree and credit granting agency.

6. Public funds should be made available to staff and implement a pilot program on an expandable basis in response to a continuing appraisal of need.
7. The Commission for Higher Education should issue regulations in accordance with Section 10-330a (b) of the 1971 supplement to the General Statutes of Connecticut. The recent Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions of Higher Education (FRACHE) report of guidelines for accreditation of nontraditional degree programs should be utilized in preparing said regulations.
8. The new unit established to promote programs of nontraditional study and/or to award external degrees and credit by examination should seek to obtain full accreditation from the New England Association of Schools and Colleges.
9. Steps should be taken to monitor the performance of non-traditional programs and to guarantee the adequacy and quality of services to minority and other target populations. Evaluation of programs should be vested in an advisory group made up of representatives from traditional higher education, representatives from the target populations (including participants in the program), and representatives from the public at large.

VI. TRANSFER: Transfer of Students Between Institutions and Programs

Chairman: Edgar F. Beckham, Dean of The College
Wesleyan University

Staff Associate: Brian H. Burke, Assistant to the Provost
University of Connecticut

Mr. Paul BEECHING
Associate Dean of Arts and
Sciences
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

Mrs. Shirley BELLUARDO
Associate Dean of Arts and
Sciences
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Miss Mary BRACKETT
Academic Dean
Norwalk Community College
Norwalk

Mr. Dominic BUONOCORE
Waterbury State Technical College
Waterbury

Dr. John R. BURTON
Chairman Business Administration
Department
Manchester Community College
Manchester

Mrs. Ann DICKENS
Assistant Director of Admissions
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Dr. Regina M. DUFFY, President
Northwestern Connecticut
Community College
Winsted

Ms. June GOODMAN
Danbury

Mr. Paul S. HINES
Chairman Chemistry Department
Western Connecticut State College
Danbury

Mr. Errol F. HOSEIN
Board Member, C.A.D. U.A.W.
Hartford

Mr. Thomas A. KELLY
Student
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Robert LOUGEE
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Charles MATHEWS
Student
Wesleyan University
Middletown

Mr. Thomas C. MAYERS
Director of Community Relations
Olin Corporation
Stamford

Mr. Juan RAMOS
Community Consultant Connecticut
Mental Health Center
New Haven

Mr. Harold SCHWEDE
West Redding

Ms. Jacqueline SULINSKI
Student
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

VI. Transfer: Transfer of Students Between Institutions and Programs

EXCERPTS OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Resource Group on Transfer decided that the most productive use of its time would be to devote its principal efforts to the problems of Community College transfers, and from the specific recommendations pertaining thereto, develop general guidelines to be used for all other transfer cases.

It is recommended:

Credit/Standing

1. When a graduate from a transfer curriculum of a Connecticut Regional Community College is admitted to a bachelor's degree granting public institution in Connecticut primarily on the basis of performance in the transfer curriculum, he should receive full credit at the receiving institution for all courses within the transfer curriculum of the sending institution for which a passing grade was assigned.
2. Recommendation 1 should be construed to include credits assigned within the transfer curriculum by the sending college for academic work taken at another institution.
3. All institutions should review their general education and course distribution requirements and assess their effect on transfer students.
4. Those institution-wide general education requirements which are taken predominantly by lower division students of the institution and which take the form of specific courses should be waived for Community College graduates of transfer programs.
5. When substantial changes are made or planned in baccalaureate programs, notice and explanation of such changes should be forwarded to institutions likely to be preparing students for entry into such programs.

6. To the extent feasible, the determination of satisfactory completion of prerequisite academic work should be made on the basis of a student's mastery of essential elements of the subject matter and not solely on the basis of the similarity of catalog course descriptions.

Admission

7. Every Connecticut resident who earns an associate degree in a transfer curriculum from a Connecticut Regional Community College should be guaranteed admission to one of the bachelor's degree programs at a Connecticut public institution.
8. Among all applicants to restricted curricula--those which, due to the need for laboratories, clinical affiliations, or other limiting factors, have an enrollment ceiling--priority should be given to qualified graduates of Connecticut Community Colleges over other transfer applicants.
9. Program planning at institutions which receive transfer students should include specific consideration of the number of students anticipated from the Regional Community Colleges.

Accommodation

10. The calendar of matriculation routines which begins with the submission of an application for admission should be reorganized in such a way as to insure that transfer students have an opportunity to register for courses and programs on an equal footing with other students and have equal access to such services and resources as counseling and advising, financial aid, and housing. Pending the completion of the calendar reorganization, resources and services such as enrollment spaces in courses and programs, and financial aid funds should be held in reserve in appropriate amounts for entering transfer students.

11. The terms of a transfer student's admission should be made as explicit and as comprehensive as possible and be communicated to the student as early as possible. The "admission contract" should state clearly the different categories of requirements which pertain to the program the student will enter and specify the extent to which the student has met the requirements in each category. It should also outline the services and resources (advising, counseling, course registration, financial aid, housing, and the like) which will be available to the students and indicate when and where they may be obtained.
12. Orientation programs which take into account the special needs of transfer students should be planned and implemented by all institutions which receive transfer students.
13. Budgets for student services should be increased to provide adequately for the needs of transfer students.
14. Institutional leadership should be exerted to raise academic advising to a higher order of importance, and to see that the number and preparedness of faculty assigned and the time allotted is sufficient for the registration needs of all students.

Recommendations for Implementation

15. The Commission for Higher Education should establish a Transfer Coordinating Committee with representation from Regional Community Colleges, State Colleges, the University of Connecticut, State Technical Colleges, and the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges. The Committee should be charged with the following responsibilities:
 - a. Submission of an annual report to the Commission on the movement of transfer students into and out of institutions of higher education in Connecticut.

- b. Regular monitoring of the transfer process and identification of transfer problems.
 - c. Recommendation to the Commission and to the appropriate institutions for changes in transfer policy and procedures.
 - d. Development, by the first biennial revision of the Master Plan of an agreement among institutions of higher education in Connecticut on the interpretation of standardized examinations such as CLEP.
 - e. Investigation of problems of articulation between proprietary schools and other post-secondary institutions.
16. Each institution of higher education in Connecticut should appoint a transfer liaison officer who will be responsible for monitoring the movement of transfer students into and out of the institution and for maintaining effective communication with the Transfer Coordinating Committee.
17. The Commission for Higher Education should appoint to its staff an officer to serve as "ombudsman" in individual transfer disputes.
18. The Commission for Higher Education, with the assistance of the Transfer Coordinating Committee, should prepare periodic estimates of the number of Community College transfer students likely to select each baccalaureate program offered at public four-year institutions.
19. The Commission for Higher Education should take the lead in stimulating and encouraging closer inter-institutional communication and cooperation within academic disciplines.

VII. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY: Special Needs of Minorities in Higher Education and Methods of Meeting Needs

Chairman: Joseph Downey, Director of Program Operations,
Community Progrsss, Inc., New Haven

Staff Associate: Linwood Robinson, Special Consultant,
Commission for Higher Education

Dr. Floyd BASS
Director, Center for Black Studies
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Francis COLEMAN
Special Assistant
Department of Children & Youth Services
Hartford

Dr. Arthur BANKS, President
Greater Hartford Community College
Hartford

Mr. Norman DAVIS
Professor, Biological Sciences Group
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Bradley BIGGS
Administrative Dean
Middlesex Community College
Middletown

Ms. Barbara DeBAPTISTE
Assistant to the President for
Minority Affairs
Mattatuck Community College
Waterbury

Mr. Raymond BLANKS
Shanti School
Hartford

Ms. Linda EDGERTON
Coordinator of Learning Resources
Mohegan Community College
Norwich

Mr. Carlton BOYD
Executive Director
Connecticut Talent Faculty Search
New Haven

Mr. Michael FRANCOEUR
R. M. Francoeur and Associates, Inc.
Hartford

Mr. Roy L. BROOKS
Student
Yale Law School
New Haven

Mr. Lewis A. FYLES
Hartford

Mr. Enrique BROWN
Student
Yale Divinity School
New Haven

Dr. George HARRIS
Assistant Superintendent of Schools
New Haven

Ms. Ernestine BROWN
Director, Upward Bound
Connecticut College
New London

Mr. Theodore HOGAN
Chairman, State Commission on Human
Rights and Opportunities
New Haven

Mr. Herbert COHEN
Attorney
Bridgeport

Mr. Myles HUBBARD
Bloomfield High School
Bloomfield

Mrs. Trudy JOHNSON
Department of Community Affairs
Hartford

Mr. Raymond LOPES
Deputy Commissioner
Department of Correction
Hartford

Mr. Albert MARTIN
Assistant Professor of Art
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

Mr. Pedro MELENDEZ
Student
South Central Community College
New Haven

Dr. Phillip POWELL
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Yale University
New Haven

Mr. Alfredo RIBOT
Board of Education
Bridgeport

Ms. Maria RIVERA
Assistant Professor
University of Hartford
West Hartford

Mrs. Jacqueline SCHAEFFER
Hartford

Ms. Mitzi SILVER
New Haven

Dr. John STINSON, Jr.
Newington

Mr. Francisco VELEZ
President, Latin American Society
Meriden

Mrs. Constance Terry WILDS
Director of Community Relations
Western Connecticut State College
Danbury

Ms. Barbara D. ZOW
Graduate Student
University of Connecticut
Storrs

VII. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY: Special Needs of Minorities in Higher Education and Methods of Meeting Needs

EXCERPTS OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following are the principal findings and recommendations of the Resource Group on Equal Opportunity. As such, they reflect neither the range of deliberations nor the scope of the report. The "Body and Commentary" section of the full report presents a broader perspective of the issues addressed by this group.

I. Finding:

Discernible percentage increases in minority enrollments occurred between 1970-1972 within independent institutions, community colleges and technical colleges. On the other hand, the percentage of minority enrollments in the University of Connecticut and in the four-year state colleges remained virtually constant.

The over-all percentage of full-time minority group students rose only 1% between 1970-1972.

Recommendation:

That institutions of higher education in Connecticut, with particular emphasis upon public colleges and the University of Connecticut, move resolutely to increase in significant numbers those students of minority groups.

II. Finding:

While institutions of higher education within Connecticut have witnessed an increase in the number of minority faculty and administrators, the percentage of these groups within the institutions remains disproportionate to their composition within the general population.

Recommendation:

That (1) each constituent unit, through its Board of Trustees working in conjunction with the CHE, establish goals and timetables, implementing an Affirmative Action Program to accelerate the recruitment, retention and promotion of minority faculty and staff; and (2) the CHE be charged with responsibility for receiving yearly reports from each constituent unit and for publicly announcing the efforts to increase minority faculty and staff in higher education in Connecticut.

III. Finding:

The credibility of the Commission for Higher Education is in question because there are no minorities on the regular professional staff of this central state agency for higher education.

Recommendation:

That (1) the CHE move deliberately on hiring, in a full-time and regular position, a minority person as an Associate in Higher Education to represent the concern of the Commission for minorities in higher education in Connecticut; and (2) as vacancies occur, minorities be given equal consideration for all available positions.

IV. Finding:

The Commission for Higher Education and the Board of Trustees of constituent units, in legitimate positions to make critically influential decisions and/or policies affecting the state and direction of higher education in Connecticut, are composed of insufficient numbers of minority representatives to be adequately responsive to minority group concerns.

Recommendation:

That CHE and the Board of Trustees of each constituent unit not only increase their minority representation but also establish on each governing body a Minority Affairs Committee (or Sub-Committee) to act on behalf of minorities and to publish a yearly report on the progress of each committee.

V. Finding:

The admissions policies and practices of a number of institutions of higher education continue to deny unduly or to restrict severely the educational opportunities of many minority students who encounter unnecessary barriers and unrealistic measures of their potential.

Recommendation:

That (1) the State Legislature and the Commission for Higher Education view all institutions of higher education in the state as a single resource committed to the common goal of meeting the post-secondary educational needs of the citizenry of Connecticut; and (2) the State of Connecticut guarantee some form of post-secondary education to each high

school graduate of this state; (3) admissions practices include measures of attitudinal and motivational considerations as well as grade point averages.

VI. Finding:

With sufficient financial and academic undergirding, supportive services can be effective not only for students who have educational or economic disadvantages but also for institutions which seek alternatives to traditional modes of higher education.

Recommendation:

That (1) the Commission for Higher Education and the State Legislature develop and implement a system which awards to institutions a tuition differential (reimbursement) for each student requiring supportive services for the first two years of his post-secondary educational career; and (2) the State Legislature, the Commission for Higher Education and the institutions themselves make full utilization of appropriate state and federal funds to develop cooperative arrangements which will enhance the supportive services already underway and provide for the creation of additional supportive service programs.

VIII. FINANCE: Fiscal Support and Resource Allocation

Chairman: Dr. Edwin L. Caldwell, Vice President and Economist
Connecticut Bank and Trust Company

Staff Associate: Brian H. Burke, Assistant to the Provost
University of Connecticut

Miss Brenda BEAN
Student
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Miss Eleanor GILL
Dean, School of Nursing
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Raymond R. BEAUREGARD
Senior Economist, Northeast
Utilities Service Company
Hartford

Mr. Ralph M. GOGLIA
Executive Assistant to Superintendent
of Schools
New Haven

Mr. Harry J. CUNHA
Associate Professor of
Business Administration
Middlesex Community College
Middletown

Dr. Lawrence HARRIS
Dean, School of Business
Quinnipiac College
Hamden

Mr. P. Jerome CUNNINGHAM
Director of Financial Aid
Wesleyan University
Middletown

Mr. Milton L. JACKSON
Comptroller, Opportunities
Industrialization, Inc.
New Haven

Mr. Ward S. CURRAN
Professor of Economics
Trinity College
Hartford

Dr. Algin B. KING
Dean, School of Business
Central Connecticut State College
New Britain

Mr. Fred J. DOOCY
Vice President, Public Affairs
Hartford National Bank
Hartford

Mr. James S. LLOYD
Student
Middlesex Community College
Middletown

Mr. G. Lowell FIELD
Professor of Political Science
University of Connecticut
Storrs

Mr. Paul PERREGAUX
Branch Manager, Connecticut Bank
and Trust Company
Mansfield

Mr. Kenneth W. FOGG, President
Waterbury State Technical College
Waterbury

Dr. Warren C. STOKER
Vice President
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
of Connecticut
Hartford

Mrs. Shirley FOSTER
Hartford

Mr. Thomas SULLIVAN
Director of Admissions
Thames Valley State Technical College
Norwich

Mr. Robert H. FRANKLIN
Executive Director
Connecticut Public Expenditure Council
Hartford

Ms. Thelma WATERMAN
Director of Community Affairs
Connecticut College
New London

Designate for Dr. A. W. WOODRUFF:
Mr. Edward L. FRIEDMAN
University of Hartford
West Hartford

VIII. FINANCE: Fiscal Support and Resource Allocation

EXCERPTS OF PRINCIPAL FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

**Denotes Recommendation

Operating Expenditures

1. Projections of total state spending and spending of the four constituent units of public higher education, excluding the University Health Center, reveal that over the planning period the continuation of current expenditures per student in dollars of constant purchasing power, plus the restoration of spending for such things as maintenance and support which have had to be deferred in recent years, can be accomplished with a portion of the state budget no larger than that in 1972-73.

Factors having the greatest potential of increasing budget needs are:

- ...Collective bargaining
- ...Increases in part-time student enrollment
- ...Initiation of programs with low student-staff ratios
- ...Student financial assistance

Factors having greatest potential to reduce budget needs are:

- ...Degree options which reduce the required amount of formalized and supervised learning
- ...Avoidance of program duplication, course proliferation and other arrangements which cause small classes where they are not required pedagogically

Tuition, Fees, and Other Revenue

2. The federal Higher Education Amendments of 1972 notwithstanding, the federal contribution to institutional budgets will on the average be a

Tuition, Fees, and Other Revenue (cont.)

constant or declining source of revenue in the early years of the planning period. The funding of those provisions in later years is conjectural.

- **3. It is recommended that the Chancellor of Higher Education keep the institutions of higher education in Connecticut continually apprised of possible future funding from federal sources.
4. Even though enrollments are declining at the primary and secondary level shifts of resources from these areas to higher education will not take place in the planning period.
 5. Tuition is a likely source of increased state and/or institutional revenue in the first planning period, and the increase it will provide to the state General Fund exceeds the potential cost of adequate, state-funded student financial assistance.
 6. The yearly expenses for full-time Connecticut residents to attend public institutions of higher education in Connecticut (from \$1600 at a Community College to more than \$2500 at the University) represents a considerable sacrifice for the average Connecticut student and his family, and include tuition and required fees at the State College and University level considerably higher than the median of similar institutions of other states.
 7. Using required student fees (not tuition) at the University of Connecticut for illustrative purposes: The fee increases approved for fall 1973 and spring 1975 could be avoided if current and anticipated institutional bond obligations were refinanced on thirty year amortization schedules rather than the current twenty year schedules; and a fee

Tuition, Fees, and Other Revenue (cont.)

reduction could be realized if the University could remit tuition for a number of its needy students rather than provide off-setting scholarships from existing fees.

**8. It is recommended:

- a. that tuition charges at public institutions be graduated according to level of instruction, i. e., lowest at the lower division and highest at the graduate level, and that such tuition policy be accompanied by a program of incentive grants, based upon family income, for Connecticut students in public and private institutions in the state, and that this program be financed from the state General Fund, and that this plan involve institutional administration of the grants.
- b. that any fundamental change in tuition charges be phased into over a three year period.

**9. It is recommended that the current State Scholarship Program be expanded to be able to provide a number of awards equaling 10% of the high school graduates of a given year.

**10. It is recommended that thirty year amortization of bonds financed by institutional fund sources be seriously considered by fiscal authorities.

Capital Budgets

11. The state pattern of capital spending is essentially unplanned, not coordinated with operating budget preparation, and bears little or no relationship with legislative authorization.

Capital Budgets (cont.)

12. While there are certain definite capital needs at many institutions, a general increase in capacity of the total higher education plant in Connecticut is not needed.
- **13. It is recommended that a time plan be settled upon in the current year to allow capital spending to proceed on a scheduled, continuous basis for those projects which are already planned and which the institutions can justify to the most essential for their particular purposes; and that lowest priority be given to those capital proposals whose principal effect is to make the system of higher education more extensive and whose existence must be justified on significant, overall, state-wide enrollment increases.

Budgetary Procedures and Expenditure Controls

14. The existing calendar for operating budget approval thwarts rather than promotes responsive, flexible, and efficient institutional decision making.
15. The current policies by the Department of Finance and Control of pre-audit controls of day-to-day institutional spending interfere with educational decisions and prevent the development of management competence at the institutional level.
16. In the light of the purely incremental budget regulations of recent years, the targets of the budget allocation formula of the Commission for Higher Education (the SCHLDE formula) have been reduced to mere post budget indices.
17. The SCHLDE budget technique is a very useful tool for allocating budget recommendations among units, but its current application is not suffi-

Budgetary Procedures and Expenditure Controls (cont.)

ciently sensitive to program cost differences.

- **18. It is recommended that public institutions of higher education be allowed to make employment commitments, without prior approval, for a portion of the new positions included in the Commission for Higher Education budget recommendations for the subsequent fiscal year so that they may participate in professional labor markets at optimal times of the year.
- **19. It is recommended that the Governor provide broad spending guidelines to the constituent units of public higher education, to be monitored and controlled by the boards of trustees and the administrative officers of each unit, and that existing pre-audit controls of daily institutional decisions be discontinued.
- **20. It is recommended that to improve budget planning, accountability, and to enhance mutual understanding of administrative decisions, the development of a management information system proceed as rapidly as possible, and that the resources needed for its development be provided as an appropriation to the Commission for Higher Education.
- **21. It is recommended that the procedures and formulas for allocation of funds among constituent units be modified to include program cost differences.

The Independent Institutions

- 22. Since there is neither significant overall enrollment expansion anticipated nor wide-spread excess capacity in the private college sector, and because of the existence of Special Act 53 and Public Act 140 of

The Independent Institutions (cont.)

the state statutes, no new public programs to channel students into the independent colleges need be devised.

- **23. It is recommended that pilot contracts under Public Act 140 be funded and commenced as soon as possible in order to create the flexibility and preparedness needed to utilize the resources of the independent institutions whenever the long run interests of state can be better served by so doing.

PROPOSAL FOR A MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

An important part of the Master Planning effort has been the work of a project team which has been developing a proposal for a management information system (MIS) for the system of higher education in Connecticut. Since June 1972, when the specific charge was assigned to it by the Commission for Higher Education, the team, with representation from each of the four constituent units and with donated services from the IBM Corporation, has met regularly and is now preparing a draft of the proposal.

The study will deal with the long term development of a defined network, the organizational structures to manage and control the operation of that network and a recommendation for an immediate first system implementation. Included will be the findings and conclusions of a comprehensive series of interviews with all college and central office administrators. The report is scheduled for presentation at the Commission for Higher Education meeting in March. Publication date for the final and approved report is scheduled for early May. Copies may be obtained from the following:

Dr. Francis J. Degnan
Director of Research
Commission for Higher Education
P. O. Box 1320
Hartford, Connecticut 06101