

1-11-1979

## Minutes, January 12, 1979

Follow this and additional works at: [https://opencommons.uconn.edu/bot\\_agendas](https://opencommons.uconn.edu/bot_agendas)

---

### Recommended Citation

"Minutes, January 12, 1979" (1979). *Agendas and Minutes*. 334.  
[https://opencommons.uconn.edu/bot\\_agendas/334](https://opencommons.uconn.edu/bot_agendas/334)

*Dr. DiBiaggio*

MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

Held at the Merlin D. Bishop Center, Storrs                      January 12, 1979

The meeting was called to order at 11:30 a.m. by Chairman Gordon W. Tasker. Trustees present were Mesdames Briscoe, Jorgensen, and Kronholm, Messrs. Brown, Canzonetti, Catanese, Cunningham, D'Oliveira, Donen, Jacobs, Kleban, Krogh, Lowney, Rich, Shedd, Stroh, and Tasker.

Ms. Linda Hirschman, representing Governor Grasso, joined the meeting for the open session in the afternoon.

University staff present were: Acting President Gant, Vice Presidents Adams, DiBiaggio, and Wilson, and Acting Vice President Hanna.

Actions were by unanimous vote, except as otherwise noted.

1. On a motion by Mrs. Kronholm, seconded by Mrs. Jorgensen, THE BOARD VOTED to go into executive session for the purpose of considering matters of personnel and collective bargaining. The Chairman stated that since the matters to be considered will require staff information, the minutes should reflect that Acting President Gant, Vice Presidents Adams, DiBiaggio, and Wilson, and Acting Vice President Hanna, Messrs. Bailey, Buck, Kimball, and McGowan were in attendance. Members of the Board present at this time were: Mesdames Briscoe, Jorgensen, and Kronholm, Messrs. Brown, Canzonetti, Catanese, Cunningham, D'Oliveira, Donen, Jacobs, Kleban, Krogh, Lowney, Rich, Shedd, Stroh, and Tasker. While in executive session, the Board took the following actions:
  - (A) President Gant thanked the Board for the opportunity to be absent from the University for a short period of time which enabled him to participate in two gatherings in Europe.

- (B) President Gant reported that Dr. Robert Volle had asked to be relieved of his appointment as Vice President for Graduate Education and Research, which was to be effective January 1. In transmitting Dr. Volle's decision to the Board, President Gant expressed regret at losing the benefit of Dr. Volle's leadership in the vice presidency. The President stated that Dr. Volle would continue in teaching and research as Professor of Pharmacology and would also continue as Associate Dean for Preclinical Education in the School of Medicine.
- (C) President Gant commented briefly on the status of the search for the Vice President for Finance and Administration.
- (D) President Gant informed the Trustees that a review of Dean Elias' service as Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences had been carried out by Vice President Wilson. Dean Elias has been asked to continue to serve in that position.
- (E) The Trustees were reminded of the expectation that the Board's Collective Bargaining Committee would be reporting, at this meeting, on the matter of the petition received from Mr. Joseph Glasser, Assistant Professor in the School of Business Administration. Since University Counsel, Attorney McKenna, had to be in court today and could not be present at this meeting to advise the Trustees, the report by the Board's Collective Bargaining Committee will be presented at the next Board meeting.
- (F) Vice President Wilson reported briefly on the latest developments in the area of collective bargaining.
- (G) The Board reviewed the latest recommendations on personnel matters pertaining to appointments, leaves of absence, promotions, reassignments, resignations, and retirements with the understanding that the vote on these personnel matters would be taken in the open session part of the Board meeting.
- (H) While in limited executive session, Professor Katz, Chairman of the Presidential Search Advisory Committee, reported at length on the Committee's search for a new president. Chairman Tasker thanked Professor Katz for taking of his time to make this presentation to the full Board.

2. Chairman Tasker, declaring a recess for lunch at 1:05 p.m. reminded the Trustees that the meeting would be reconvened in open session. Mrs. Briscoe left the meeting at this time.
3. After reconvening the Board meeting, Chairman Tasker welcomed Ms. Linda Hirschman, Special Assistant for Policy and Program, to the Board meeting as the representative of Governor Grasso.
4. In response to three earlier requests for permission to address the Board, Mr. Tasker called upon the following individuals:
  - (1) Mr. Marty Krugman -- Mr. Krugman, speaking as an individual and as a graduate student at the University, voiced his objections to the construction of the new Co-op on the so-called Hawley Armory site. He criticized some aspects of the process by which the plans for the Co-op were developed and also urged that the remaining portion of the land surrounding the new building be landscaped for recreational use.

Mr. Tasker suggested to Mr. Krugman that the Co-op Board should have the benefit of his interest in the matter.

- (2) Dr. Lee Sheldon -- Dr. Sheldon, a postgraduate periodontist resident at the Health Center. A copy of his remarks entitled "Considerations Regarding Initiation of a Clinical Utilization Fee" is attached.
- (3) Ms. Arline Ward -- Ms. Ward, speaking as a member of the Student-Faculty Committee of the Stamford Branch MBA Program, in opposition to the proposed MBA fee, said that the group had suggested to Dean Patten that the budget be reduced by \$150,000 by (1) no longer subsidizing the undergraduate program at Stamford, (2) deferring the current library subsidies, and (3) not increasing the faculty by two positions. If these cost reductions were implemented, the fee increase would not be necessary this year. The group also feels that the fee increase is discriminatory, particularly against women and minorities seeking an education. Ms. Ward pointed out that the cost to the student for the MBA program offered at Storrs would approximate \$2,000, whereas, the cost to the student at Stamford would amount to \$4,800. Ms. Ward urged a rollback in the proposed fee increase to \$85 per credit hour.

Jan. 11, 1979

CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING INITIATION OF A CLINICAL UTILIZATION FEE

1. This proposed fee is a discriminatory policy. Due to semantics and arbitrary definitions, a group of residents have been reclassified as "postgraduate students", although functions and responsibilities have not been altered. This fee is being levied on endodontic, periodontic and orthodontic "postgraduate" students. Oral surgery, pedodontic and family practice residents are not being charged.

We do not feel that a usage fee should be levied on a group of dentists who utilize the clinic 50% of the time and not on a group that spends as much as 90% of their time in the clinic.

2. Endodontic, periodontic and orthodontic "postgraduate students" are not only clinicians, We also generate income for the university via other routes, ie. research grants for the university and time spent teaching the undergraduate students.
3. We have been informed by the administration that the clinical usage fee is to be redirected back into funds for financially deprived residents, however, the clinical usage fee is being levied on the most deprived residents to begin with.
4. We have been informed that the clinic has an overall bad collection rate of between 25 and 50%. It is the responsibility of the administration to effectively collect fees. Residents should not have to be penalized for the failure of the university to establish efficient collection procedures.
5. Historically, residents did not have stipends reduced or eliminated in the middle of their program, ie. someone accepted in a program received his stipend throughout. To start charging a fee to "postgrad" residents in the middle of their programs when there has been much confusion over the years regarding this policy is not consistent with past university policies.
6. We have been informed by the administration that the university has chosen to deemphasize certain specialty programs and that instituting this fee is one manifestation of this deemphasis. This information was given to us directly by the dental school administration. We wish to know if this is in fact university policy. If so, we feel it should be published in the official catalogue so that applicants might make a more intelligent decision concerning choice of specialty programs.
7. Historically, medical and dental residents were on equal par at this university, but whereas stipends for medical residents have been raised, stipends for dental residents have not only been taken away, but now some dental residents are being charged a clinical usage fee. This policy is a regressive one for postgraduate dental training in this institution.

5. While considering the approval of the minutes of the last Board meeting, Mr. Donen, referring to Item 6 on page 6624 called for a clarification to indicate that he said that the manner in which the Department of Education had raised their legislation resulted in a public awareness of what they were bringing forth to the legislature and that he, Mr. Donen, urged the University to act in a similar manner. On a motion by Mr. Cunningham, seconded by Mrs. Kronholm, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the amended minutes of the meeting of December 8, 1978.
6. President Gant, calling attention to the document, "Update on the Mandated Expansion of the Stamford Branch," asked Vice President Wilson to comment on the document. Vice President Wilson briefly describing the six parts of the report, noted that the report had been prepared in response to the Board's request for an update on the five-year plan for expanding the Stamford Branch into a four-year degree-granting institution.

Mr. Rich, stating that in his opinion the report fills the requirements of the Board's resolution of last October, moved that the Board accept the report and forward the updated five-year plan to the Board of Higher Education for implementation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cunningham.

During the discussion, Mr. Brown stressed that in addition to the submission of this document there should be a strong indication to BHE that the Board of Trustees wants to implement the mandate of the General Assembly; and further, that the University's Board of Trustees urges BHE to do the same.

Mr. Catanese offered as an amendment to Mr. Rich's motion that the recommendation of the administration be removed from the report in the presentation to BHE since the Legislature has already mandated a four-year curriculum at the Branch. Mr. Catanese's amendment was seconded by Mrs. Jorgensen. Following a vote on the proposed amendment, Chairman Tasker declared the amending motion was lost. Trustees Catanese and Jorgensen registered in favor of the amendment, Trustees Brown, Canzonetti, Cunningham, D'Oliveira, Donen, Jacobs, Krogh, Kronholm, Lowney, Rich, Shedd, and Stroh registered in opposition.

Since some concern was expressed that the Trustees did not have time in advance of this meeting to read the report, Mr. Brown suggested that it would be appropriate to defer action on this matter until the next meeting. Mr. Donen moved that the original motion be tabled until next month. Mr. Brown seconded the motion and THE BOARD VOTED to table the motion until next month. Trustees Brown, Canzonetti, Catanese, D'Oliveira, Donen, Jacobs, Kronholm, Shedd, and Stroh voted in favor of the motion. Trustees Cunningham, Jorgensen, Lowney, Krogh, and Rich registered in opposition.

7. The President reported that he had no legislative items to report to the Board at this time. He explained that several matters are being considered and that there will be some legislative proposals to be brought to the Board's attention at the next meeting.

At this time, President Gant also reported briefly on his recent discussions with the Board of Higher Education pertaining to the form in which BHE's budget request for the University may be submitted to the General Assembly. A further report on these budget-related matters will be presented at the Board meeting in February.

Following some discussion of the accumulating impact of deferred maintenance, Mr. Stroh requested a detailed statement of the University's real serious needs in terms of maintenance and the related costs, plus any other things that the President may want to certify as urgently needed without delay. The President agreed to prepare such a statement for the next meeting.

8. Mrs. Jorgensen, reporting on the latest meeting of the Board of Higher Education remarked as follows:

"The licensure of a Bachelor's degree program in Computer Science at the University of Bridgeport was approved, along with licensure of a Bachelor's degree program in Business Administration at Eastern Connecticut State College.

"The University's fee increase or the fee which was set for the Junior Year Abroad was approved. The use and occupancy agreements were approved and the leases also.

"One of the important things which has happened in the Board of Higher Education is that the Fiscal Budget Management Committee has now been combined with the Capital Projects Committee. The Capital Projects Committee originally started in the Board

as a subcommittee of the Fiscal and Budget Management Committee, but because the two things were overlapping in so many cases, the people who were in the Fiscal and Budget Committee are now also members of the Capital Projects Committee. I feel that this is a good solution to the problem because when you're dealing with money you have to know the whole scope of things and if you're not aware of what's going on in capital project planning throughout the system, you really are not able to make valid judgments.

"The Board enjoyed, and I was present and did enjoy it, a retreat in early December for all the board members. There were many valuable programs presented. I think we got a sort of insight as to what work is being done by staff of the Board of Higher Education in preparing for the drawing up of the plan which is to be presented to the General Assembly. There are still many unsolved questions, and I think you should be aware that one of them is the problems in southwestern Connecticut which includes our Stamford Branch. You probably have read, particularly in the New Haven Register and some of the other state newspapers, about the flack which has been going around concerning the appropriation and the planning for the new campus at Western. There is now approved, and I think the bids were to be in yesterday, a classroom building at Western Connecticut State College. Many people in southwestern Connecticut feel that all the institutions in that part of the state should be centralized in one area with perhaps some of these other institutions, some of them two-year, some of them four-year, being satellites of one major institution which would be a four-year degree-planning institution. This could be our Stamford Branch, it could be Western Connecticut State College, or it could be a new institution which would be set up. We don't know, but you should be aware that this may be a critical problem in the planning for this new reorganization structure of higher education within the State of Connecticut. I feel that other than dealing with the formerly proposed regents plan, which changes the governance of institutions, the major thrust of this plan is going to be -- where are these institutions going to be, what are they going to do, and how are they going to relate to each other."



9. In her report on the status of the University's ad hoc Committee on the Reorganization of Higher Education, Mrs. Jorgensen said, "We are going to have our first meeting on January 30 in Bishop Center at 4:00. Trustees who would like to attend will be more than welcome. I have invited two members of the Board of Higher Education staff to be with us to give us an insight into the planning and resource study which has been given to things like enrollment projections for the state, facilities which are available, number of square feet, number of students, all this kind of thing which will be background used by the Board in its determination of final plan that goes to the General Assembly. Some of the members of the University Committee are students, some are faculty, some are administrators, some are trustees. We would like as much input from the University community as possible."

Chairman Tasker asked Mr. Bailey to send out a reminder to all Trustees with respect to the location and date of this meeting.

At this time, Mr. Tasker also alerted the group to the possibility of holding an informal session at some time in the spring.

10. Mr. Jacobs, reporting as Chairman of the Budget and Finance Committee, noted that copies of the University's current Financial Report had been distributed by Mr. Hanna.

The Committee heard a report by Mr. D. Jacobs, Director of Food Service at the University of Pennsylvania, on the recently completed study of food service at the University of Connecticut. A written report will be made available within the next three weeks and the Board may expect further information on this matter.

The Budget and Finance Committee was informed that the Co-op Board of Directors at their meeting on December 12, 1978 decided that at this time the Co-op would not lease space to any commercial enterprise.

The Committee heard an update report on corporate replies to their adoption of Sullivan Principles. Mrs. Fischer stated that since the time of her report to the Trustees last month when it was indicated that five firms had not responded, two firms had responded. In response to University follow-up letters dated December 29, 1978 to the three remaining firms, two of these firms said that they had not received the University's initial inquiry. To date, only one company has not reported; the University has received twenty-six responses from the twenty-seven corporations. Fifteen of those companies

do business in South Africa. Eleven firms have endorsed the Sullivan Principles and four firms have written their own principles, in essence, based on the Sullivan Principles.

Mr. Jacobs reported that the Budget and Finance Committee had also received copies of a Study of Athletic Services and Present and Future Needs which was paid for by a grant from the Alumni Association. This Study will be discussed at a future date.

11. Mr. Jacobs reported that the Committee had reviewed all of the proposed contracts and agreements and recommended approval to the full Board. On Mr. Jacobs' motion, seconded by Mr. Cunningham, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the list of contracts and agreements and authorized the President, Vice Presidents, Associate Executive Director, and Assistant Vice Presidents to sign the necessary documents on behalf of the University. A copy of the approved list is attached to the file copy of the Board minutes.

Mr. Shedd asked to be recorded as not voting on #4, agreement with the State Board of Education.

12. Referring to the November action of the Board on fee modifications, Mr. Jacobs moved that the package of fee adjustments as proposed at that time be ratified and, in addition to those fee adjustments, that the two amendments that were approved at that time be included in the ratification. The motion was seconded by Dr. Lowney. At this point, Dean Patten was asked to speak to the off-campus MBA fee adjustment. The Dean said -- "If we are to have a quality program that is accredited at the national level by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, it is our opinion that the fee increase is necessary." Dean Patten added that the important aspects embodied in the proposal are the requisite number of full-time faculty, and the necessary amount of supporting materials. It is a self-supporting program, mandated as such, and it is the only nationally accredited graduate program in business in Connecticut.

In response to a question by Chairman Tasker, Dean Patten acknowledged that a part of the funds collected under that program are used to support the undergraduate program at Stamford. Dean Patten explained that two faculty members were hired with the anticipation that General Fund money would be forthcoming; it was not provided, and the faculty for both the undergraduate and graduate programs were necessarily funded from the 6.12 fees.

At this point, Mr. Stroh, expressing his concern with the offering of a program when it was not funded by the legislature, remarked that unless the funds were provided for a program, that program should not be offered.

As an amendment to the motion on the floor, Mrs. Jorgensen moved that the MBA fee of \$100 per credit hour per semester be changed to \$85. The motion to amend was seconded by Dr. Canzonetti. On the question of covering the costs of the program, Dean Patten said that for the present year it would take \$83 per credit to offer it on a break even basis, \$97.50 starting next year and \$102.50 the following year. In response to Mr. Shedd's concern that the high percentage of increase may be out of line with attempts to control inflation, Mr. Hanna explained that he was satisfied that the adjustments conformed to the spirit of wage and price guidelines. Mr. Hanna called attention to two of a series of recommendations that have been developed as a result of a dialogue between representatives of higher education associations and the Council on Wage and Price Stability:

- (1) If wage cost increases are constrained not to exceed those allowable under the wage standard, then tuition increases needed to prevent deficits, taking into account both operating and capital requirements, will not be considered out of compliance with the price standards.
- (2) COWPS recognizes that (1) higher education institutions are characterized as "budget balancers," and (2) tuition is not the functional equivalent of an industrial price because tuition, which is not intended to cover the full cost of college education, is often necessarily determined as a residual amount required to balance the budget if other sources of revenue fail to compensate for inflation.

Ms. Hirschman and Dr. Canzonetti left the meeting at this time.

After a lengthy discussion on the need to maintain quality and to act responsibly on these matters, Chairman Tasker called for the vote on Mrs. Jorgensen's amendment. Trustees Brown, Catanese, Cunningham, Donen, Jorgensen, Krogh, Shedd, and Stroh favored the amendment and Trustees D'Oliveira, Jacobs, Kleban, Kronholm, Lowney, Rich, and Tasker voted against the amendment. The Chairman declared that the motion to amend the MBA fee had carried.

Mrs. Kronholm left the meeting at this time.

At this time, Mr. Donen offered an amendment to the portion of Mr. Jacobs' original motion pertaining to the assessment of a \$1,200 fee for students enrolled in the two-year post-graduate dental certificate programs at the Health Center. Mr. Donen moved that this fee not apply to those students who have already begun the program. The motion to amend was

seconded by Mr. Catanese. After a brief discussion of the amendment, the Chairman, calling for the vote on Mr. Donen's motion to amend the clinical usage fee, declared the motion to amend was defeated. Trustees Catanese and Donen voted in favor of the proposed amendment, Trustees Brown, Cunningham, D'Oliveira, Jacobs, Jorgensen, Kleban, Krogh, Lowney, Rich, Shedd, Stroh, and Tasker voted against the amendment.

Mr. D'Oliveira, referring to the Board's approval of the \$85 fee for the MBA program at the branches, asked whether this would result in the program operating at a loss or whether there would be a cut in the quality of the present program which might result in the loss of accreditation of the MBA program. Dean Patten replied that at the end of the current academic year the fund would end with a positive balance of approximately \$48,000. With the \$85 fee in place during the next year, expenditures would exceed revenues by \$150,000; and, at the end of the year the fund would have a deficit of \$102,000. Since you can't have a deficit in these kinds of funds, the program would have to be cut back. This could probably be accomplished by not having any library purchases for next year, by not having two faculty needed to keep accreditation, and by terminating two others. A \$100 fee would keep the program in the black through the year 1980-81. At this point, Mr. Stroh moved that the Trustees reconsider their previous action to set the MBA fee at \$85. The motion to reconsider was seconded by Mr. D'Oliveira. Mr. Stroh explained that he had voted for the amendment previously because he understood that the \$85 fee was adequate and he now realizes that this was a misunderstanding. On the vote to reconsider the earlier action to amend the MBA fee, Trustees Brown, Cunningham, D'Oliveira, Jacobs, Kleban, Lowney, Rich, Stroh, and Tasker voted in favor of the action to reconsider. Trustees Catanese, Donen, Jorgensen, Krogh, and Shedd opposed the action. Chairman Tasker declared that the Board would now reconsider Mrs. Jorgensen's amendment that the MBA fee of \$100 per credit hour per semester be changed to \$85. During the discussion, Mr. Shedd reiterated his earlier remarks that he did not believe that, as a matter of practice or a matter of principle, the University should be funding an undergraduate General Fund program out of graduate student fees; and, that there ought to be another alternative to what had been suggested as a way of staying in the black on this program. The possibility of filling the two undergraduate faculty positions from General Fund monies, the possibility of putting a cap on enrollments, and the possibility of using the income from other 6.12 programs to support this 6.12 offering were also discussed.

After reminding the Trustees that they were voting once again on Mrs. Jorgensen's motion to change the MBA fee from \$100 to \$85 per credit hour, Chairman Tasker called for the vote on the motion. The motion was lost with Trustees Brown, Catanese, Donen, Jorgensen, Krogh, and Shedd favoring the motion and Trustees Cunningham, D'Oliveira, Jacobs, Kleban, Lowney, Rich, Stroh, and Tasker voting against the motion.

Upon returning to action on the original motion by Mr. Jacobs, THE BOARD VOTED to ratify the following student fees for 1979-80 as approved by the Board on November 10, 1978 and the two amendments that were also included in the Board action at that time:

University

- (1) The General University Fee be increased in the following amounts effective with the Fall Semester of 1979:
  - (a) Undergraduates and graduates attending the Storrs Campus - \$40.00 per semester (Total \$240.00 per semester).
  - (b) Undergraduates and graduates attending the branch campuses - \$20.00 per semester (Total \$130.00 per semester).
  - (c) Graduate students attending the School of Social Work - \$40.00 per semester (Total \$220.00 per semester).
  - (d) Out-of-State undergraduate students - \$50.00 per semester (Total \$325.00 per semester).
- (2) The Residence Halls Fee be increased by \$62.00 per semester (Total \$372.00/\$487.00 per semester), effective with the Fall Semester of 1979.
- (3) The Master's of Business Administration Fee be increased to \$100.00 per credit hour per semester effective with the Fall Semester of 1979.
- (4) The following elective or service fees will be effective with the Fall Semester of 1979 and subject to certain conditions as indicated:
  - (a) Application Fees at all locations and the MBA program be increased to \$20.00 per applicant.
  - (b) The Graduate Student Activity Fee be increased from \$7.00 to \$12.00 per year.
  - (c) The Greater Hartford Campus Part-time Students Parking Fee be established at \$10.00 per year.
  - (d) The Thesis Binding Fee (terminal fee) be increased from \$8.00 to \$10.00.

(e) The Acceptance Deposit for the School of Law be increased from \$50.00 to \$100.00, that \$50.00 of the \$100.00 be refunded to students withdrawing on or before June 1 prior to the year of admission, and that the forfeited amounts be credited to the accounts of the School of Law for its use.

Health Center:

Three fee modifications were approved as follows for the 1979-80 year:

(a) An increase in fees charged to medical students of \$200.00 per academic year and to dental students of \$100.00 per academic year, bringing the total level of fees for the students in both schools to \$1,200.00 per academic year for resident students, and \$1,600.00 per academic year for non-resident medical and dental students.

(b) The assessment of an equivalent fee of \$1,200.00 per academic year for those students enrolled in postgraduate dental certificate programs.

(c) An increase of \$5.00 in the application fee charged by the medical and dental schools, bringing that total to \$20.00.

Amendments:

- (1) That the Budget and Finance Committee and the Administration would undertake an analysis of the programs that are presently funded by the Auxiliary Services Fund that may be more appropriately supported by the General Fund as well as General Fund programs that may be more appropriately supported by the Auxiliary Services Fund. This ongoing analysis should be completed by the late Spring of 1979, with the Budget and Finance Committee recommendations to become part of the 1980-81 General Fund request to be considered by the full Board of Trustees at their July meeting.
- (2) Whereas the Board of Trustees has previously endorsed the process of student deliberation of room and board fee increases or decreases with the administration and has given similar support to University fee discussions, the Board formally endorses the concept of holding similar discussions on all fees, where feasible, with the appropriate segments of the University community before final recommendations are made for the Board's consideration.

Mr. Catanese asked to be recorded as voting against action relating to the General University Fee and the Master's of Business Administration Fee. Mr. Donen asked to be recorded as voting against the action pertaining to the Master's of Business Administration.

In response to the concerns expressed earlier with reference to MBA candidates who are paying their own tuition, Mr. Kleban moved that the administration be instructed to study whether or not a lesser MBA fee could be established for those who are not being subsidized; and further, that the administration consult with the Attorney General and that the matter be put on the agenda at the next Board of Trustees meeting for further debate and consideration by this Board to determine whether or not (1) it is legal and (2) whether it is feasible economically or otherwise. The motion was seconded by Mr. Brown. Upon calling for the vote on Mr. Kleban's motion, Chairman Tasker declared the motion was approved. Trustees Brown, Catanese, Cunningham, D'Oliveira, Donen, Kleban, Krogh, Shedd, and Stroh favored the action. Trustees Jacobs, Jorgensen, Lowney, Rich, and Tasker opposed the action.

13. Acting on a motion by Mr. Jacobs, seconded by Dr. Lowney, THE BOARD VOTED to authorize the administration to request a deficiency appropriation in the amount of \$220,000 to cover the operating costs of the Hartford Seminary property for the 1978-79 fiscal year.
  14. On Mr. Jacobs' motion, seconded by Mr. Donen, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the transfer of \$200,000 from the General Fund Personal Services Account to the Other Expense Account to meet the cost of legal fees in connection with the civil suit "Marcia R. Lieberman v. Edward V. Gant, et als, Civil Action No. 15736.
  15. On Mr. Jacobs' motion, seconded by Mr. D'Oliveira, THE BOARD VOTED to authorize the transfer of \$80,000 from the General Fund Personal Services Account to the Other Expense Account to meet the estimated shortage in energy needs. Mrs. Jorgensen opposed the action.
- Mr. Jacobs left the meeting at this time.
16. In the absence of Mrs. Briscoe, Mr. Brown presented the report of the Institutional Policy Committee.

The Committee voted to recommend to the Board that it confirm its approval of the administration's decision on the site of the Co-op Bookstore, and direct the administration to proceed forthwith toward implementation. Mr. Brown's motion to approve this recommendation was seconded by Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Brown remarked that the Institutional Policy Committee shares the ecological and recreational concerns voiced by various students. It would remind the Board, however, (1) that the site fits the 1965 campus plan both as to environment and the needs of growth, traffic, and use; and (2) that the Board continues to address itself to the recreational and athletic issues; it has approved the construction of \$1 million worth of outdoor recreational facilities, and planning funds of \$600,000 for a new field house.

Mr. Catanese moved as an amendment to Mr. Brown's motion that the Board stop the Co-op from adding the additional parking lot, and that the Co-op as now planned be surrounded with appropriate landscaping for recreational use. Mr. Donen seconded the proposed amendment. After a brief discussion, the Chairman, calling for a vote on the amendment, declared the amendment was lost. Mr. Catanese was the only Trustee voting in favor of the amendment.

Upon returning to action on Mr. Brown's motion, THE BOARD VOTED to confirm its approval of the administration's decision on the site of the Co-op Bookstore and directed the administration to proceed forthwith toward implementation. Mr. Catanese opposed the action.

17. Mr. Brown, referring to previous requests for separate commencements for the Medical and Dental Schools, informed the Board that the Institutional Policy Committee had received a report from the University's Commencement Committee; the issue was discussed and the Institutional Policy Committee voted to take no action on the suggested change in the location of the 1979 Commencement for the Schools of Medicine and Dental Medicine.
18. Mr. Brown reported that the Institutional Policy Committee voted to recommend to the Board that the administration conduct a full review, using outside examiners, of the program of the Ratcliffe Hicks School of Agriculture, and as a part of that review, seek the advice of the consultants on the awarding of an Associate degree there, as proposed by the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources and the University Senate. Mr. Brown's motion to approve this recommendation was seconded by Mr. Cunningham. Acting on the motion, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the above recommendation.



19. Acting on Mr. Brown's motion, seconded by Mr. Cunningham, THE BOARD VOTED to approve a new Master of Science in Allied Health Professions by that School and the Graduate School.

20. Mr. Stroh offered the following resolution:

That it is the policy of the University to abide by the Presidential guidelines in relation to salaries and wages.

Mr. Brown seconded the motion.

During the discussion, Mr. Cunningham spoke of the need to fully comply with the spirit and letter of the guidelines. Mr. Donen remarked that it is the intention of the Board of Higher Education to review proposed fee increases or lease arrangements by constituent units to be certain that the increases are within the guidelines.

Upon calling for a vote on the motion, THE BOARD VOTED to adopt the above resolution. Mr. Cunningham voted against the action.

21. Mr. Rich, reporting as Chairman of the Health Affairs Committee, said that the proposed changes in the School of Medicine Council Bylaws had been reviewed by the Committee and were recommended to the full Board.

Mrs. Jorgensen, referring to Section 6.C, page 5, dismissal of members who fail to attend three meetings, questioned whether this is legal due to the fact that the people are elected. Mrs. Jorgensen was of the opinion that they could be asked to resign, but she did not think they could be dismissed.

Mr. Kleban moved that the Board accept the changes in the School of Medicine Council Bylaws subject to the approval of University Counsel, and if the University Counsel finds a problem with any provisions of the Bylaws, he will so advise the Board at which time it will be reconsidered by the Board. Mr. Rich seconded the motion and subsequently the Board voted to approve the changes, subject to the understanding described in Mr. Kleban's motion.

Mrs. Jorgensen abstained from voting on the action.

22. Mr. Rich informed the Trustees that the Health Affairs Committee had discussed the status of the Health Center budgetary request for 1979-80. The Committee also heard a report by

Dr. Marshall, Director of the Department of Facilities Planning and Analysis relating to long-range plans for meeting programmatic requirements and maximum utilization of space.

23. Mr. Rich, reporting on the recent meeting of the Health Affairs-Hospital Committee, said that the Committee had discussed the financial results for the month of November and also for the year to date. Due to a 69% patient census for the month of November, the Hospital sustained a \$41,000 loss. As a result of a decline in the census for the months of November and December, we are going to have to revise the budget for the rest of the year. A revised budget will be considered at the next Health Affairs-Hospital Committee meeting.

Attorney McKenna recently visited the University of Colorado Medical Center to review their medical malpractice program. It is hoped that by studying what has happened in some other states, it may suggest some legislation that will lessen the financial impact of the present insurance costs.

Full accreditation has been granted to Dempsey Hospital by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Hospitals. A letter to that effect was reviewed by the Committee.

The Hospital State License has been renewed and a copy of that renewal was made available to the Committee.

Arrangements have been made with the Colonial Bank of Hartford to enter into a contract with the Health Center to provide both Master Charge and Visa credit cards in patient care service areas. Mr. McKenna has reviewed the proposal and made certain modifications to assure consistency with State Statutes. A final contract will be presented to the Health Affairs-Hospital Committee for approval at the February meeting.

At the Joint Conference Committee meeting, Dr. Milton Markowitz, Chairman of the Department of Pediatrics, described the activities of the pediatrics program at the Health Center. It was a most interesting presentation and it was noted that the activity of this Department as opposed to the activities in other hospitals reflects a considerable increase, basically due to the special programs that are offered at Dempsey.

24. Mr. Rich reported that the Health Affairs-Hospital Committee had reviewed the proposed contracts and agreements and were recommended for Board approval. Mr. Tasker, noting the lack

of comparative data in some of the recurring proposals, suggested that in the future a comparative cost data be included whenever it is appropriate. On Mr. Rich's motion, seconded by Mr. Krogh, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the list of contracts and agreements and authorized the President, Vice Presidents, Associate Executive Director, and Assistant Vice Presidents to sign the necessary documents on behalf of the University. A copy of the approved list is attached to the file copy of the Board minutes.

25. Mr. Rich reported that the Health Affairs-Hospital Committee had reviewed and recommended Board approval of the latest list of recommendations pertaining to the Medical/Dental Staff appointments. On Mr. Rich's motion, seconded by Mr. Krogh, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the list of recommendations. A copy of the approved list is attached to the file copy of the Board minutes.
26. Mr. Shedd moved that the Board approve a formal list of the actions recommended by the President and the actions already taken by the administration on personnel matters pertaining to appointments, leaves of absence, promotions, reassignments, resignations, and retirements, and authorized the Secretary of the Board to sign the necessary documents on behalf of the Board of Trustees. The motion was seconded by Mr. Cunningham.

Dr. Lowney offered as an amendment to the motion that the section pertaining to changes in title, promotions, and salary increases be tabled until the next meeting so that it can be studied and brought into compliance with the Board's policy that all salary increases stay within Presidential guidelines. The motion to amend was seconded by Mr. Donen. Upon calling for the vote on the amendment, Chairman Tasker declared the motion was lost. Trustees Lowney and Stroh favored the amendment, Trustees Brown, Catanese, Cunningham, D'Oliveira, Donen, Jorgensen, Kleban, Krogh, Rich, Shedd, and Tasker opposed the amendment.

Upon returning to Mr. Shedd's original motion, THE BOARD VOTED to approve a formal list of the actions recommended by the President and the actions already taken by the administration on personnel matters pertaining to appointments, leaves of absence, promotions, reassignments, resignations, and retirements, and authorized the Secretary of the Board to sign the necessary documents on behalf of the Board of Trustees. A copy of the approved lists is attached to the file copy of the Board minutes.

Messrs. Brown, Kleban, Krogh, and Rich left the meeting at this time.

27. Mr. D'Oliveira, reminding the Trustees that they had received a copy of his recent letter to the President and the attached news clippings, briefly summarized the events that prompted his communication. "As you all know, Waterbury has a Higher Education Center which is currently under construction, and partially completed. The Center consists of the Mattatuck Community College, the Waterbury State Technical College and the University's Waterbury Branch. It is a unique concept in education, where all institutions share common facilities, such as the library, cafeteria, parking, etc.

"One of the clippings that accompanied my letter referred to an ad hoc committee which was recently formed in Waterbury. This committee was formed to study the five Higher Education Reorganization Plans as assembled by the Legislative Program Review Committee. This legislative report, currently under study by BHE, has one plan in particular that has caused the Waterbury ad hoc committee to get quite upset. This particular plan calls for the consolidation of the higher educational system into two institutions -- the University of Connecticut and Connecticut State University. Within this plan, all University Branches would become the Connecticut State University. In other words, the Waterbury Branch and the Stamford Branch would become part of Western Connecticut State College, and so forth, with the other University Branches. Of the five plans presented in the Legislative Report, this particular plan appears to be the favored plan.

"The Waterbury ad hoc committee does not feel that Danbury should be the educational center for that part of the state. They say we already have an educational center -- and that center is Waterbury's Higher Educational Center. Many millions of dollars have already been spent to develop the Waterbury Center, and there is no valid reason to abandon the Waterbury concept especially when the David Bosch report recommended that Western Connecticut State College should not develop a new campus since a new campus in Danbury would cut enrollment at the other State Colleges.

"The Waterbury ad hoc committee and the Waterbury legislators are all recommending the final and complete development of the Waterbury Center. The legislators are prepared to ask the Legislature for the funds needed for completion. A legislative group is presently studying plans to determine where savings can be made at the Higher Education Center.

"The only way that the proponents of the Higher Education Center can develop any strength, political or otherwise, is for the University to commit itself to complete participation in the Higher Education Center. As Trustees of the University, we have been entrusted to preserve and to expand the University, whenever and wherever we can. The time has come for the Trustees to take a positive stand in support of the Higher Education Center, and for us to lend our prestige, our energies, and our powers to its fulfillment as it was originally conceived."

Mr. D'Oliveira presented the following motion:

That, in regard to the Higher Education Center in Waterbury, the Board wishes to place itself on record as favoring meaningful cooperation at all levels among the University Branch and other institutions of higher education in the Waterbury area, including the development of possible programs and facilities to be shared in common; that the Board recognizes areas in which joint activity may yield substantial advantages, and welcomes cooperative developments in these areas which will at the same time preserve the essential characters and separate identities of the several institutions; and further, that it wishes to participate fully in the development and occupancy of the Center as a full partner with Mattatuck Community College and the Waterbury State Technical College.

Mr. Shedd seconded the motion for the purposes of discussion.

Mr. Shedd remarked that coming as it does for the first time in this form and at such a late hour, he would ask that this matter be referred to the administration for review and comment and for a more complete discussion at the next meeting. Mr. Shedd then moved to table the motion. The motion to table was seconded by Mr. Cunningham and subsequently THE BOARD VOTED to table the motion. Mr. D'Oliveira voted against the action to table.

28. On a motion by Mr. D'Oliveira, seconded by Mrs. Jorgensen, THE BOARD VOTED to accept and/or approve the list of awards and donations. A copy of the approved list is attached to the file copy of the Board minutes.
29. Mrs. Jorgensen, referring to the Central Naugatuck Valley Higher Education Center, expressed the hope that the Board would have all the information that is now available as far as funding, projected funding, operating expenses, what

bonding money has been provided but not yet allocated, and some idea of the coordinating boards projected time schedule. It was agreed that this data would be forthcoming.

30. No further business appearing, the meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Otha N. Brown, Jr.  
Secretary