DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 733 HE 003 776

TITLE	Colloquium on Higher Education in Connecticut. Presentations by Principal Speakers.
INSTITUTION	Connecticut State Commission for High Education, Hartford.
PUB DATE	Sep 72
NOTE	47p.; Presentations made at the Colloquium on Higher Education in Connecticut, Southern Connecticut State College, New Haven, Connecticut, September 25, 1972
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Conference Reports; *Educational Planning; *Higher Education; *Master Plans; Planning; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

Presented in this document is the text of presentations delivered by the principal speakers at the Colloquium on Higher Education in Connecticut. The colloquium was decided on as one means of accomplishing dual goals: (1) informing the public of the Commission's program for developing a Master Plan for higher education pursuant to the provisions of Public Act 194 of the 1972 General Assembly; and (2) eliciting suggestions and comments over an extended period of time. It is expected that the Master Plan will serve as an instrument to maximize the return on Connecticut's precious investment in higher education. It will help in decisionmaking, and it will project what may be expected from the choices made. Further, by providing accurate information in advance, it will make possible maximum cooperation among institutions as well as maximum utilization of valuable resources. (Author/HS)

State of Connecticut

COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Implementation of Public Act 194 (1972 General Assembly)
(MASTER PLAN)

COLLOQUIUM

ON

HIGHER EDUCATION IN CONNECTICUT

held at

Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven, Connecticut

Presentations by Principal Speakers

Commission for Higher Education
P.O. Box 1320
Hartford, Connecticut 06101

September 1972

Document #6

State of Connecticut

COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Implementation of Public Act 194 (1972 General Assembly)
(MASTER PLAN)

COLLOQUIUM

ON

HIGHER EDUCATION IN CONNECTICUT

held at

Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven, Connecticut

Presentations by Principal Speakers

Commission for Higher Education
P.O. Box 1320
Hartford, Connecticut 06101

September 1972

COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Donald H. McGannon, Chairman, New Canaan

James J. Dutton, Jr., Norwich

Henry E. 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

The Reverend Herbert Smith, Hartford

Orville J. Sweeting, New Haven

Sister Mary Theodore, West Hartford

William J. Sanders, Ex officio, West Hartford

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

by

Warren G. Hill
Chancellor for Higher Education
State of Connecticut

It is with pleasure that the Commission for Higher Education makes available in this report the text of presentations delivered by the principal speakers at the Colloquium on Higher Education in Connecticut held on September 25, 1972 in New Haven.

The Colloquium was decided upon as one means of accomplishing dual goals: (1) informing the public of the Commission's program for developing a Master Plan for higher education pursuant to the provisions of Public Act 194 of the 1972 General Assembly; and (2) eliciting suggestions and comments over an extended period of time.

A master plan may be likened to many things; for example, to a catalogue of what is available or to a road map leading us to identified goals. The Commission's expectations are greater. It is expected that the master plan will serve as an instrument to maximize the return on Connecticut's precious investment in higher education. It will help in decision making, and it will project what may be expected from the choices made. By providing accurate information in advance, it will make possible maximum cooperation among institutions as well as maximum utilization of valuable resources.

In addition to the formal remarks of speakers, there were searching questions which have been recorded. Because the cost of an exact transcription was prohibitive, the information which follows does not record the active discussion which took place. Copies of written questions, however, have been kept for future use.

The events of the Colloquium are now in the past, but the enthusiasm persists. So, too, does the Commission's gratitude to Governor Meskill for his participation, to Lyman Glenny for his challenging address, to Southern Connecticut State College for its unstinting hospitality, and to the more than three hundred invited guests who gave in full measure of their attention and their counsel.

PUBLIC ACT NO. 194

AN ACT CONCERNING A MASTER PLAN FOR

HIGHER EDUCATION

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Subsection (b) of section 10-324 of the 1969 supplement to the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof: Said Commission shall review recent studies of the need for higher education services, with special attention to those completed pursuant to legislative action, and to meet such needs shall initiate additional programs or services through one or more of the constituent units. (1) SAID COMMISSION SHALL PREPARE IN COOPERATION WITH THE CONSTITUENT UNITS A FIVE-YEAR MASTER PLAN FOR APPROVAL BY THE GOVERNOR AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. SAID MASTER PLAN SHALL BE REVISED BIENNIALLY. (2) THE MASTER PLAN SHALL INCLUDE, BUT NOT BE LIMITED TO, THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS: (A) GOALS FOR THE SYSTEM; (B) THE NUMBER AND LOCATION OF INSTITUTIONAL UNITS; (C) THE ROLE AND SCOPE OF EACH UNIT; (D) DISTRIBUTION OF ENROLLMENT; (E) UTILIZATION OF EXISTING FACILITIES AND THE NEED FOR NEW FACILITIES; (F) PROGRAM DISTRIBUTION AND THE NEED FOR PROGRAM REVISION, INCLUDING TERMINATION OF UNPRODUCTIVE, OBSOLETE OR UNNECESSARILY DUPLICATIVE PROGRAMS; (G) MEASURES DESIGNED TO IMPROVE OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION, INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSIVENESS TO THE CHANGING NEEDS OF SOCIETY AND INSTITUTIONAL PRODUCTIVITY, INCLUDING OPTIMAL USE OF NEW MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGIES, AND (H) TRANSFER OF STUDENTS BETWEEN INSTITUTIONS AND PROGRAMS. (3) IN DEVELOPING A MASTER PLAN, CONSIDERATION SHALL BE GIVEN TO THE LONG-RANGE PLANS OF THE INDEPENDENT COLLEGES OF CONNECTICUT. (4) THE FIRST MASTER PLAN SHALL BE PRESENTED NOT LATER THAN JANUARY 1, 1974, AND AN INTERIM REPORT NOT LATER THAN JANUARY 1, 1973, TO THE GOVERNOR AND THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY. IN IMPLEMENTING THIS ACT, THE COMMISSION MAY REQUEST, AND THE CONSTITUENT UNITS OF THE SYSTEM OF HIGHER EDUCATION SHALL PROVIDE, SUCH ASSISTANCE AS MAY BE REQUIRED BY THE COMMISSION AND AGREED UPON BY THE COMMISSION AND THE CONSTITUENT UNITS.

C O L L O Q U I U M
On
Higher Education in Connecticut

Lyman Auditorium
Southern Connecticut State College
September 25, 1972

A G E N D A

8:30 A.M. - BRIEFING OF RESOURCE GROUPS

9:00 A.M. - REGISTRATION AND COFFEE

9:45 A.M. - WELCOME - *Donald H. McGannon*
Chairman
Commission for Higher Education

GREETINGS - *Manson Van B. Jennings*
President
Southern Connecticut State College

10:00 A.M. - REMARKS - *The Honorable Thomas J. Meskill*
Governor of Connecticut

10:15 A.M. - INTRODUCTION - *Warren G. Hill*
Chancellor
Commission for Higher Education

TOWARD STATE PLANNING: IMPERATIVE TRENDS - *Lyman Glenny*
Professor of Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley

QUESTION-AND-ANSWER PERIOD

11:15 A.M. - PRESENTATION TOWARD A MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION - *Donald H. McGannon*

REMARKS - *Rep. Howard M. Klebanoff*
- *Rep. Ruth O. Truex*

12:30 P.M. - LUNCH

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

2:00 P.M. - RESOURCE GROUP FORUM

I

REMARKS OF GOVERNOR THOMAS J. MESKILL

Colloquium on Higher Education in Connecticut
September 25, 1972

Southern Connecticut State College - New Haven

When I signed the Higher Education Master Planning legislation on May 15 of this year, I did so with the conviction that this was not going to be just another study commission, another group which would spend hours describing problems rather than recommending solutions. We need a comprehensive blueprint, a long range plan. I think the Master Plan legislation will fill that need.

Connecticut has needed Master Planning for a long time. While we may have had it in individual units of higher education, or in just one college here and there, we have not had it statewide and we have not had it coordinated through a centralized system which is receiving input from a decentralized level.

Both the Connecticut General Statutes concerning the Commission for Higher Education and the organization chart showing the structure of higher education in Connecticut would seem to indicate that we do have a centralized and coordinated public higher educational system. Of course, everyone who is involved on a day to day basis with state government knows that is not the case. While higher education today may be more centralized and coordinated than in any other time in Connecticut's history, the centralization that exists so far is merely a step in the right direction. We must increase centralization of management and planning. Otherwise, we will get bogged down in duplication of effort, we will lose effectiveness and waste our resources.

The Commission for Higher Education has put together a distinguished list of people to work on the Master Planning process. This will be a volunteer effort, services will be donated. The list includes educators, professionals,

and non-professionals, minority group members, men and women, some young, others older, who will work together to plan higher education in Connecticut.

Today I am not going to tell you what you should plan for. I am not going to recommend that there be two programs here, five programs there and two new buildings somewhere else. Rather, I would like to tell you what I would like to see come out of the Master Planning effort -- sort of a check list of things which I think the State of Connecticut needs.

The list begins with space utilization. Everyone talks about getting better utilization of the space which we already have; yet, unless someone takes over the reins, nothing will be done. Space utilization and facilities planning should be a major concern of the Master Planning effort.

And as we look at these facilities we must realize that the 1950's and 60's were the years of the capital programs and massive construction. We must consider renovation and adaption of these buildings to changing needs.

And there are other questions that must be answered. For example, "Does every community in the state get a community college?" Another question is, "Do we continue to build branches of the University of Connecticut, or do we opt for a totally centralized system of education at Storrs?" Another difficult question is, "Should the Stamford branch of the University of Connecticut become a four-year branch?"

If this type of question is avoided, the Master Plan will not be a master plan at all. These major issues -- some of the most controversial issues -- in the Connecticut public higher educational system must be resolved on a rational, long term basis.

The structure of higher education and its impact on planning should also be considered. For example, should Technical Colleges and Regional Community Colleges come under the jurisdiction of one Board of Trustees? Should there be a separate Board of Trustees for the University of Connecticut Health Center?

These are all difficult questions but questions which must be answered and the answers must be given while we keep in mind the goals of higher education, enrollment distribution, programming and job opportunities within the state.

Should we try to maximize transferability? How do we plan for it?

There will also be a special group in the Master Planning program looking at the financial area. This topic should receive more than the simple comment that we need more money to spend on higher education. If this is the only result of that committee's work, the taxpayers of Connecticut will suffer.

The master plan should also advise us how we can maximize cooperation between the public and private sectors of higher education in this state. This is a trend that must continue. Competition should be minimized. Cooperation, contracting for services, and informational relationships should be pursued to the utmost.

As I consider all these problems, I wish the Master Planning document were ready today. There are many questions to be answered; there is much to be done. If it is done correctly, and I am confident it will be, it will guide Connecticut for many years. It will provide the taxpayers and their elected officials with reasonable, useful information.

(end)

II.

TOWARD STATE PLANNING:

Imperative Trends

Address by Lyman A. Glenny

Colloquium on Higher Education in Connecticut

Monday, September 25, 1972

Southern Connecticut State College
New Haven, Connecticut

TOWARD STATE PLANNING: IMPERATIVE TRENDS

by

LYMAN A. GLENNY
Professor of Higher Education and
Associate Director
Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
University of California
Berkeley, California

We are all aware of the great transitions and upheavals occurring in higher education today. We know of the many dissatisfactions and disaffections with colleges and universities--especially with their apparent inability to respond creatively to the needs of students and to the resolution of society's major problems. Some of us are aware that these changes are demanded at the very time that financial resources available at all levels of government are particularly restricted, forcing some institutions to reexamine existing programs, to reallocate existing resources, and to reassess their relationships to the society. At the same time we seem to be overlooking some of the great significant trends which foretell, in part, where we are heading. This paper attempts two objectives: One is to reveal some trends of which few leaders seem to aware; and the other is to make a few suggestions on master planning as a means for optimizing resources.

What are these social, political, and economic trends? What import do they have for those who plan for higher education?

Once the facts are known, few will question the validity of the first. This one relates to the size of the college-age population. We know that the young people who may attend college from now until about 1990 are already living creatures. We also know that the birthrate is now at the lowest point in the nation's history.* What proportion of young people will actually attend a college or university is less certain and what numbers will attend particular colleges or universities is quite uncertain. However, for all save a few exceptional institutions, the great age of expansion is almost over. The private colleges reached this point several years ago. Following within the next year or so will be the large universities. For the most distinguished universities, graduate enrollments have passed optimum size and undergraduate enrollments are already static in many of them. The state college-emerging university-type institution may have another year or so of increase and the community colleges will be the last to stop growing. A survey by the American Council on Education's "Higher Education Panel" (April 7, 1972) states that:

> . . . although first-time, full-time freshmen enrollments increased by an estimated 12 percent between 1970 and 1971, nearly 85 percent of this total increase was accounted for by public two-year colleges. Increases at other types of institutions were well below 10 percent, and public four-year colleges showed a slight decrease.

---

* U. S. birthrate hits new low. *Oakland Tribune*, June 3, 1972, 3-E.

Moreover, the Census Bureau reports that the number of children under five years of age decreased 15 percent from 1960 to 1970.* Thus, adjusting to slow growth or no growth is and will be the order of the day. We will no longer need to worry about setting maximums on college size or worry about the universities not taking junior college transfers. For example, *The Oakland Tribune* reported that "the University of California's Academic Assembly, representing faculty members from all nine campuses, was thus on solid and practical ground last week when it voted to lower admission standards for transfer students during a four-year test period."** Competition for students will increase to unprecedented levels with the shortage of students, especially in states where operating funds are granted the colleges and universities on the basis of the number of FTE students.

Within each category of institution exceptions to the general enrollment trends will occur, but the exceptions will be much rarer than most faculty members or administrators are willing to believe or to face up to. Factors making a difference are the cost of attending college, the location of the college--urban or rural--and the program offered (i.e., appropriateness to student and societal needs).

The second trend may seem less clear to some of you but I am quite sure that, with the exception of a few states, the proportion

---

* U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. *Current population reports, population estimates, and projections*, Series P-25, No. 476, February 1972, p. 5.

** Editorial. *Oakland Tribune*, June 12, 1972.

of the state budget going to higher education will be no greater in 1980 than in the next year or so--whether we have boom times or bad, or Republicans or Democrats in office. Most states are already at this funding plateau. Others will quickly reach it. If funds increase it will result from a larger state income generally, not from a larger percentage of the state revenue. In the 1960s, enrollment doubled and budgets for higher education tripled, and the GNP going to higher education increased from one to two percent. The proportion of the GNP for higher education cannot keep that pace.

In Connecticut in 1962, higher education institutions received five-and-one-half percent of the state general revenue. By 1967 they received 12 percent. But the proportion has been diminishing since 1967, until in past year it was ten-and-one-half percent, one-and-one-half percent below its highest proportion in 1967. This lowering proportion of state revenue occurred at the same time that a new medical school has grown to a $16 million budget, new community colleges were developing, and aid to nonpublic institutions was increasing.

Other states are in a similar situation. In a study just completed at the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education at Berkeley, we found that twice as many states had a reduced proportion of the state budget for higher education as states with an increased proportion. Nationally we have dropped about one-half of one percentage point.

Moreover, the Census Bureau recently reported that the states were spending more dollars than they were gaining in revenue. During 1971 revenue of the states rose by 9.3 percent, but expenditures rose even more--by 16.2 percent--leaving a deficit of $1.6 billion for all states. It should be noted that normally states have an excess of revenue over expenditures.* And if these factors are not convincing, one has only to think on the possibility that the Serrano decision in California may lead to the full state financing of all community colleges in some other states where localities now pay up to only one-half of the costs.** Thus, slow growth in state general revenue funding over the long haul is an optimistic prediction.

The major trend which forces less funding growth for higher education is the establishment of a new set of social priorities in which higher education drops from the top of the "top ten" to a much lower position.+ Health care, the common schools, and the environment and recreation, among others, are surfacing as high priority concerns in the legislatures of nearly every state. Unless some national catastrophe befalls us for which higher education is believed to be the principal salvation, the colleges and universities will not regain their favored position of the 1960s--at least not during the next 20 years. The exceptional states are likely to be

---

* *The Star and News*, Washington, D. C., July 17, 1972, A-15.

** Education Commission of the States. *Compact*, April 1972, p. 4.

+ Jerome Evens. View from a state capitol. *Change*, September 1971, 3(5), 40 ff.

those with college-going rates below average and/or states which have an extraordinary economic growth pattern.

The so-called "plight of the private colleges" is indeed very real for most of the denominational institutions, even though the problem of some institutions appears to be one of overexpenditure rather than lack of income.* States are beginning to give aid to them. However, state scholarship, grant and loan programs, as well as direct grants to private institutions will all be funded from that same single total amount for higher education in the state budget. The proportion of the state budget for higher education, no matter who or what is included, will remain about the same.

A corollary to this trend is the one which makes private institutions public ones. Some private universities have been taken over fully by the state systems. As financial conditions deteriorate, others will sacrifice their private status for complete public control and funding. But short of this, those private institutions which receive any substantial part of their funds from the state will be increasingly subjected to the master planning, program control, and management constraints of the state to the same extent as the public institutions. Indeed, as the President of the Sloan Foundation has indicated, by definition, if they accept public funds they become public institutions.

The promise of federal aid in substantial amounts to promote higher education (rather than research) has been advanced for 15

---

* Columbia Research Associates. *The cost of college*, as reported in a summary distributed by the USOE, fall 1971, n.d., mimeographed.

or 20 years. Such money, in anything like the sums desired or anticipated, will probably not materialize--not in time to save all the private colleges nor in an amount sufficient to continue the "add-on" method of conducting public college business. The new social problems also turn federal priorities away from higher education. At the moment, federal institutional aid in large amounts seems a remote possibility. A recent Brookings Institution report* prepared by Charles L. Schultze et al., states:

> In past peacetime years, economic growth always has generated a sufficient increase in tax revenues to cover increasing government costs. This is not the case now. . . .

The report also predicts that the national debt will increase from $15 billion to $20 billion per year until 1975--even if the country achieves full-employment prosperity. Revenues, the report says, will catch up in 1977 *if no new spending programs are started.* To rely on federal aid is to lean on a weak reed. Savings from ending the war in Vietnam are already discounted according to Schultze, and defense costs will rise $11 billion in the next four years; inflation is not fully controlled, and other priorities assert themselves. Besides all this the state and federal governments seem unforgiving of the colleges and universities for turning out more doctorates and more teachers for the society than can be easily absorbed. The politician asks, "Why spend hard dollars (that is their euphemism for what universities call "soft money") on a profligate institution

---

* Charles L. Schultze et al. *Setting National Priorities, The 1973 Budget.* Brookings Institution, 1972, p. 15.

when what the world needs is better health, better public schools, better environments, and more recreation."

Still another major trend has been largely ignored. This is the increasing tendency for those who want training in a great variety of skills to attend the proprietary and industrial schools rather than the traditional college and university--including the community college. The Educational Policy Research Center at Syracuse reports* that the rate of increase in enrollment in these so-called "peripheral" institutions has been much greater than in higher institutions. The most recent report indicates enrollment in proprietary schools at the postsecondary level is over one million. Industrial and military schools enroll many more than that. Thus we see a trend for the older student to pay for exactly the type and kind of training which he wants regardless of similar work offered by more traditional colleges and universities. The new 1972 federal aid programs for students give them the right to receive aid even if they attend proprietary trade and technical schools.

The slow-down in enrollments by type of institution is directly correlated with the amount of emphasis which an institution places on the liberal arts. The shift is definitely toward the new types of institutions--the community college and on toward the proprietary training school and technical institute--in other words, occupational training. This shift began over ten years ago and is

---

* Stanley Moses. Notes on the learning force. *Notes on the Future of Education*, February 1970, *1(2)*, Syracuse University, 7.

accelerating. Some of the older and less relevant colleges will no doubt cease operations, as they have so often in the past, when their missions and programs no longer meet the real needs of the society. (For example, from the 1830s to the 1850s college enrollments dropped in spite of a swelling population, the colleges were just not considered relevant. The Latin and Greek classical education of that day seemed less than pertinent to the great westward movement. Reform of institutions slowly changed them to roughly what the liberal arts college stands for today. The 1860s brought a real revolution in traditional university education--but it called for many new institutions, namely the land-grant agricultural and mechanical arts colleges. During the 1890s and early in this century we developed the research university from the German model. Some old institutions reformed and adapted, but many new ones were formed. Today's trend mirrors these historical changes.)

The university and the complex college, especially those offering graduate degrees, are already finding that they too are considered less important than ten years ago. The colleges have been geared to turn out vast numbers of teachers for a diminishing elementary and secondary school population. The university is even worse off than the college. Allan Cartter reports there will be about 25 percent fewer graduate degrees produced in 1986 than in 1979. Even so, only about one-third of the doctorates will be employed in jobs which we would now consider to be commensurate

with their level of training.* Students are already reassessing the relevance of some collegiate education, its high costs in lost income and tuition, and also the job market--and many are turning away from the college and the university toward another type of institution.

Moreover, the external degree, the university without walls, the work-study program, the new emphasis on part-time enrollment, the videotape cassette and closed-circuit TV, along with a host of other nontraditional means of offering a college education, will have profound influence on what is and is not done within the walls of the higher institution. Some members of the legislative master plan committee in California are planning on the assumption that the majority of all collegiate instruction will take place in the home by 1985 through these external means.**

Increasingly, too, we will consider the college degree less and less as certification for particular competencies. External agencies may do much more certifying than in the past and, in addition to degrees or even without them, the postsecondary institutions may be certifying particular skills or knowledge packages. The degree itself may come to mean little as a person acquires a series of lesser certificates which indicate his specific capability to conduct

---

* Allan Cartter. Graduate education in a decade of radical change. *The Research Reporter*, Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California, Berkeley, 1971, *VI*(1), 5-6.

** Revealed in personal conversations with the author.

certain kinds of occupational tasks. This condition will be reenforced by the knowledge that only 20 percent of all jobs in the 1970s will require any college training.*

The final trend, relating to unionization and collective bargaining by faculty members, may turn out to be at least as important for states as any so far mentioned. It could have substantial influence on the autonomy of the institution and on the rational development of postsecondary education.

At the moment, some governing boards are reasserting powers only recently delegated to administrators and faculties. Professors continue to demand more control over policy, and as we all know, students are also demanding a "piece of the action." One can hardly keep tract of the changing power relationships among these constituencies. Yet the future is likely to make the shares of power and the roles of each group much clearer, primarily as a result of unionism and collective bargaining. Contracts will not only reassure a threatened faculty about any possible loss of tenure, but will cover all kinds of working conditions, teaching loads, advising, independent study, and even the curriculum and hours taught. The trade unions have shown time and again that once bargaining starts, regardless of rules and laws to the contrary, anything and everything is negotiable.**

---

* A statement attributed to Sidney Marland in American Council on Education, Higher education and national affairs, April 14, 1972.

** Felix Nigro. The implications for public administration. *Public Administration Review*, March/April 1972, 120 ff.

The new power relationships will be contractual. Since the public institutional leaders and their governing boards cannot bind the state to the financial conditions contained in the bargain, the negotiations and agreements will tend to be between the unions internally and the negotiating experts at the state level. Powers eventually left for the president and his staff could be almost purely ministerial--to carry out contract provisions. The overall trends resulting from unionism will be conserving ones. Faculty will confront both administrators and faculty members, and due process provisions of many kinds will be carefully followed. What will be greatly impaired will be change, flexibility, and adaptability, which all of the trends previously mentioned will demand of an institution successfully responding to the imperative demands of the 1970s and 1980s.

In the face of these trends, several of which are radical departures from the recent past, how do the institutions of higher education and their faculties respond? For the most part faculties still believe we are in a *temporary* setback and that with a change in political parties at the state or national level things will return to the normal of the 1960s. Most administrators are more aware than faculty of the new reality; but first and foremost both administrators and their faculties want autonomy, they want to be left alone. The desire for autonomy and independence is very strong, very deep-seated, and a very difficult attitude to modify. Both

groups also have strong desires for status and prestige, hence we find the phenomena of the junior college trying to become a four-year college, the four-year college a university, and the university a comprehensive graduate-research center. Each tries to obtain as many students as possible since size is also a measure of "success." Another institutional assumption is depicted by the catch phrase, "the university can be all things to all people." Any need can be met and any aspiration satisfied. What this means in terms of *numbers* of programs versus the *quality* of programs has been only occasionally of deep concern. Perhaps in the age of rapid campus expansion by middle-class youth, and with plentiful money these academic attitudes were not as dysfunctional as we now find them. Nevertheless, faculty still assiduously attempt to start new graduate programs in their particular specializations, and the state college maintains its thrust toward becoming a full-fledged comprehensive university. I have recently revealed some of the trends mentioned above to the college and university leaders in several states. The response by state college and emerging-university presidents often has been one of outright antagonism--not because they believe the trends to be invalidly interpreted but because, if public policymakers accept them as reality, the institutional goal to become an advanced graduate center is almost certain to be thwarted. Thus the hard realities would be avoided, the policymaker deluded and, as in Greek times, the bearer of the bad tidings summarily executed.

To summarize this point, the time has come when staffs of colleges and universities must be forced to reevaluate their institutional role and function. They must realize that they can educate only those students for which they have unique capabilities--not all the great diversity of students. They must relinquish the idea that what faculties desire for themselves in terms of courses and programs is necessarily most beneficial to both students and society. Not all students want liberal arts and bachelors degrees, nor do they wish to be treated as second-class citizens because they reject the academic and intellectual life.

Amitai Etzioni, Director of the Center for Policy Research at Columbia, recently wrote that:

> What is becoming increasingly apparent is that to solve social problems by changing people is more expensive and usually less productive than approaches that accept people as they are and seek to mend not them but the circumstances around them.*

Our trends indicate that young people are not going to be "mended" by the colleges and universities and, rather than being stitched and laced with liberal arts, are turning to institutions more responsive to matching their programs to the needs of these students.

No doubt remains that all governments now seek new coordinating and planning agencies to force the faculties and administrators to make the learning environment more responsive to societal and student

---

* *Saturday Review*, June 3, 1972, 45-46.

needs. The Education Commission of the States has just established a new task force on Planning, Coordination and Governance to provide advice to states on better policies in these important areas.*

Most programs and perhaps most courses will not have to be dropped or radically changed. Many of society's requirements have been creatively and substantially met by the colleges and universities. In large measure, the programs and types of degrees offered and often even the instructional methods have been entirely appropriate for most students enrolled in the institution. On the other hand, deficiencies do exist. The staffs of all existing complex colleges and small universities, or almost all, must realize that they cannot become graduate-centered universities. In *all* institutions, highly specialized, high-cost, low productivity programs, even at undergraduate levels, must be reevaluated to determine their quality, effectiveness, and appropriateness to a revised role and function of the institution. Each institution must be considered as one in a web of many different types of institutions making up the composite mosaic of postsecondary education--few if any can be comprehensive.

The trends and conditions I have mentioned point directly to increasing reliance on greater centralization of planning, with the major chore resting squarely on state-level policy planners.

The challenge of planning and coordination in the states encompasses all new postsecondary educational forms, delivery systems,

---

* Letter to author from Governor Winfield Dunn of Tennessee, dated September 5, 1972.

and types of programs while promoting innovation, flexibility, adaptability, and opportunity. These imperatives are now recognized by the federal government which has just enacted a new law which should stimulate better and more comprehensive state planning.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1972 require that there be more coordination of postsecondary education in the state. The exact wording is as follows:

> State Postsecondary Education Commissions
>
> Sec. 1202. (a) Any state which desires to receive assistance under section 1203 of title X shall establish a state commission or agency which is broadly and equitably representative of the general public, public and private nonprofit and proprietary institutions of postsecondary education in the State including community colleges (as defined in title X), junior colleges, postsecondary vocational schools, area vocational schools, technical institutes, four-year institutions of higher education and branches thereof.

The implications for state master planning for education of this provision are greater than from any other single act previously passed by the federal government. The requirement is for a central planning agency which is to have control of the development of the master plan for state postsecondary education. It may delegate to other boards and commissions some of the planning function, but in the end it must approve all state plans forwarded to Washington for funding under the Act. The possibilities for obtaining a single plan with coordinated administration of it at the state level is greatly enhanced by this legislation.

If master planning is the goal, what machinery and what caveats should be observed in its development?

Full recognition is seldom given to the fact that the organization for obtaining data, making analyses, and formulating recommendations may ultimately determine the success of a long-range plan. Because means assume such importance, great care must be exercised in selecting the proper approach for conducting the plan. No single approach in all of its detail is likely to be appropriate for more than a single state. The process should be tailor-made. The form most advantageous to a state needs to be assessed in terms of political attitudes, general parochialism, educational perspective and available state resources.

The chief advantage of employing outside experts is their impartiality in treating sensitive issues on which emotions are running high. At the same time, from broad experience in many states, they provide fresh perspectives which may serve to further solutions on controversial issues. Such experiences may even provide several alternative solutions, all appropriate for your state.

Outside experts may also bring decided disadvantages in that the persons who develop the plan have no responsibility for implementing it or for subsequent consequences. In other words, there is no responsibility for follow-through. Another important disadvantage is that some outside consultants may arrive at "standard" or "pat" solutions which reflect little attention to substantive differences in history, culture, and economy between one state and another.

On the other hand, use of in-state experts and volunteers also has its merits and limitations. On the positive side, these persons may be intimately acquainted with the local history of education, its mores and institutions along with knowledge of the political system and power structure of the state. These factors, with all their subtleties, may decide, in the end, whether a plan is appropriate and acceptable.

Beyond these advantages, the in-state planning process often brings into confrontation and dialogue hostile administrators and faculty members who would not otherwise confer with each other. The in-state or self-survey also provides a cathartic experience. People get a lot off their chests while learning to accept and understand opposing viewpoints. Intense involvement by leading educators and citizens provides commitment and thus a base for acceptance of the completed plan. In addition, the dozens of in-state experts who become involved may provide a broader base of judgment and reflection than a limited number of outside experts.

The principal disadvantage of in-state persons is their probable bias on the major controversial issues. These people, too, may have a pre-set solution prior to further research and study of the issue. Such biases may pre-commit the plan to one side of a long-standing issue without attempting to apply new perspectives or knowledge.

Beyond a built-in bias, in-state persons are not likely to be as broadly oriented and experienced as professionals with national

recognition. They may lack knowledge of alternatives successful in other states. The amount of misconception and misinformation which well-educated professionals (also political leaders) hold in relation to educational systems and practices in other states is amazing. A further disadvantage of in-state persons is their sensitivity and susceptibility to persons and personalities rather than commitment to more ideal long-range solutions. Not infrequently recommendations proposed save someone's face or preserve someone's empire. Naturally, judicious sensitivity toward persons must be exercised in order to arrive at realistic decisions, but the effectiveness of some state planning has been destroyed by this tendency.

The particular procedure which is selected by a state must be chosen with care. In some states legislators and citizen groups appear not to have confidence in proposals in which outsiders are involved; other states have the opposite reputation of accepting only solutions which are not contaminated by participation of in-state educational leaders. While these parochial attitudes may seem archaic, one must remember that in the American political process a plan may not be accepted on its intrinsic merit alone. Thus the "right" procedure must precede a "right" plan.

Also, there are a few cautions which should be observed by states which have had little previous experience in planning:

1. Too many plans are undertaken without realization of adequate planning funds and staff. As a result, extensive studies and background information to determine facts necessary for sound decisions may be lacking.

2. Another pitfall is to select the wrong type of people to head the planning. Many intelligent persons, without planning experience, are unable to detect fallacious data, poor methodology, and phonies among the participants. In other words, technical knowledge and competence is necessary, as well as organizing and administrative ability.

3. Too frequently unrealistic time limits are imposed upon the study at the start so that the staff studies, deliberations, airing of recommendations, and public hearings must be compressed into an incredibly short period of time.

Although most master plans deal with many common features, they vary greatly in the scope and depth of study achieved and in the amount of change recommended. Some rather critical questions must be answered either at the outset or prior to formulation of final recommendations:

1. How much change can be proposed in a statewide plan and be implemented successfully? Is it better to limit the plan to a few essentials or cover the waterfront? What are the practicable limits of achievable change?

2. How short or long-range should the plan be? Should it extend to a five-, ten-, or fifteen-year period? What are the safe limits for projections? What are the motivating elements of a short-term versus long-range plan?

3. How much exposure should be given a drafted master plan before attempting final approval? To what extent should the plan be subjected to institutional negotiations, public hearings, and prior exposure to governmental officials, including legislators, in order to weed out the impractical, faulty, and unachievable proposals?

4. To what extent can a plan become a "package deal?" How does one prevent a sensitively balanced and finely adjusted plan from being dissected and mutilated in the political process of approval? Is it realistic to ask a legislature to accept all of a plan or none of it?

5. How much "reality" should be exposed in a plan? Should the bald financial facts which may frighten the governor and legislature be given or should they be minimized in order not to jeopardize the plan? How much honesty is required, even though self-defeating?

The answers to these perplexing questions will and must vary from state to state and will depend upon existing conditions in the educational system, political and economic realities and the skill of the professional planning staff.

Because of the number and complexity of factors emphasized in a master plan, its implementation becomes no easy matter. Many of the factors are closely interrelated. For example, plans which promote definite sizes, functions, and time stages for development of institutions will require the involvement of the several different state agencies which administer institutions, construct buildings, and finance operations. Depending on existing state machinery, implementation of a plan may require participation by a state building commission, a scholarship commission, or higher education coordinating agency, the several boards governing the colleges and universities, and the department of education, plus the executive and legislative staffs which may review, pre-audit, and approve specific expenditures and activities. The completed master plan most likely will contain

elements which require statutory action and appropriations. Because of the involvement of so many different agencies, each with its own traditions and objectives, the adoption and implementation of a comprehensive master plan is an extremely difficult and hazardous process.

It is at this point that many, if not most, plans fail. Plans are not self-enforcing or fulfilling any more than other activities of government. Concerted effort and coordination among the public agencies is essential in order to overcome the myriad of obstacles that confront the plan's objectives. Failure can normally be attributed to the lack of a single state agency or group fully responsible for keeping the planning elements intermeshed and all moving toward final objectives. Moreover, most, if not all, plans properly set forth broad guidelines to which details and supporting regulations may be added. Some agency needs to be assigned that responsibility.

In summary, the necessity for educational master planning has become almost universally accepted. The general content and objectives to be achieved in such planning are also subject to little disagreement. The choices made in how to organize and conduct a plan may ultimately determine its practicality and acceptability. The solutions recommended in a plan may, in fact, have been made by the choice of machinery for study and recommendation. Finally, no matter how well conceived or developed, a master plan requires a patron board

or council to seek coordination of the pertinent government agencies in order to achieve its long-range goals and objectives. It is failure in implementation rather than in formulation which spells disaster to most plans.

III.

A CONNECTICUT VIEW OF MASTER PLANNING

STATEMENTS BY DONALD H. McGANNON

COLLOQUIUM ON HIGHER EDUCATION IN CONNECTICUT

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1972

SOUTHERN CONNECTICUT STATE COLLEGE
NEW HAVEN, CONNECTICUT

A CONNECTICUT VIEW OF MASTER PLANNING

STATEMENTS BY DONALD H. McGANNON
PRESIDENT, WESTINGHOUSE BROADCASTING COMPANY
and
CHAIRMAN, COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
STATE OF CONNECTICUT

(MR. McGANNON PREPARED THE FOLLOWING STATEMENTS IN OUTLINE FORM AS THE BASIS FOR HIS PRESENTATION, WHICH COVERED THREE SUBJECT AREAS AS INDICATED.)

I. PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

-- TO ACQUAINT LEADERS IN THE STATE (BUSINESS, PROFESSIONS, GOVERNMENT, EDUCATION...) WITH THE MASTER PLAN ACTIVITY AND TO SOLICIT THEIR COUNSEL.

(THIS IS AN IMPORTANT AND COMPLEX UNDERTAKING AND THE COMMISSION WISHES THE PUBLIC TO BE INFORMED, TO HAVE REPRESENTATIVES OF ALL SEGMENTS OF OUR SOCIETY PARTICIPATE, AND TO HAVE COMMITMENTS MADE AND ACTION TAKEN. IF INSTITUTIONAL AND AGENCY PLANNING CAN BE FAULTED FOR ITS PAST PERFORMANCE, ONE OF THE REASONS IS UNQUESTIONABLY THE LIMITED INPUT WHICH HAS BEEN OBTAINED FROM THE PEOPLE WHO LIVE IN THE COMMUNITY BEING SERVED, WHOSE FUTURES--AND WHOSE CHILDREN'S FUTURE--ARE SO OFTEN RELATED TO THE RESOURCES OF THE INSTITUTION, AND WHOSE DOLLARS SUPPORT THE ENTERPRISE. WE WILL MAKE EVERY EFFORT, IN DEVELOPING THIS MASTER PLAN, TO INSURE THAT THOSE WHO CAN AND WISH TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE PLAN WILL HAVE EVERY OPPORTUNITY TO DO SO.)

II. IMPORTANCE OF THE MASTER PLAN

-- TO INDIVIDUAL STUDENTS

(IN TERMS OF THEIR CAREER DEVELOPMENT AND THE ALTERNATIVES AVAILABLE TO THEM. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT WITHOUT CONTINUOUS RE-EXAMINATION FAILS TO MATCH MANPOWER NEEDS WITH WHAT IS BEING OFFERED, CREATES DUPLICATION, AND BLURS THE MISSION OF INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTIONS.)

-- TO THE STATE

(BECAUSE OF THE SIZE OF THE INVESTMENT BEING MADE, AND THE RETURN EXPECTED ON THAT INVESTMENT. CURRENTLY 11¢ OF EVERY STATE OPERATING DOLLAR GOES TO HIGHER EDUCATION--AND THERE ARE LIMITED WAYS OF DESCRIBING THE RESULTS OBTAINED. THE PUBLIC NEEDS TO KNOW WHAT ITS MONEY IS BEING USED FOR, AND DESERVES AN ACCOUNTING OF HOW IT IS SPENT.)

-- TO COST-CONSCIOUS CITIZENS

(GOVERNMENT AT ALL LEVELS IS COSTING MORE AND THERE IS NO QUESTION BUT THAT A MASTER PLANNING ACTIVITY OF THIS MAGNITUDE WILL INSURE A CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES OF ONE OF THE STATE'S MOST EXTENSIVE AND EXPENSIVE OPERATIONS.)

-- OBVIOUSLY TO OUR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(BECAUSE THEIR CHOICES IN THE FUTURE WILL BE HARDER ONES. THE FREE-WHEELING GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE 60's WILL NOT BE REPEATED IN THE 70's. ONE POSITIVE GOOD IS THE OPPORTUNITY FOR

A SEARCHING RE-EXAMINATION OF OBJECTIVES AND THE APPLICATION OF RESOURCES.)

III. COMMISSION FOR HIGHER EDUCATION'S VIEW OF THE MASTER PLAN

THE COMMISSION HAS BEEN PLANNING, AND COORDINATING PLANNING, SINCE ITS INCEPTION IN 1965. IT IS PLEASED TO COOPERATE WITH THE BOARDS OF TRUSTEES OF THE PUBLIC COLLEGES AND THE UNIVERSITY AND WITH REPRESENTATIVES OF THE INDEPENDENT COLLEGES IN AN ACTIVITY WHICH WILL SURELY TEST THE BELIEFS CURRENTLY HELD REGARDING CONNECTICUT HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE FUTURE. THE LISTING THAT FOLLOWS IS INDICATIVE OF THOSE VIEWS AND EXPECTATIONS THAT THE COMMISSION CONSIDERS SHOULD HAVE THE MOST DETAILED STUDY. BRIEFLY STATED, THEY ARE:

-- STUDENT DEMAND WILL PEAK BY 1978 AND DECREASE AFTER THAT DATE.

-- THE STATE DOES NOT NEED ANY MORE TRADITIONAL COLLEGES IN THE FORESEEABLE FUTURE.

-- FACULTY LOAD WILL INCREASE ABOVE PRESENT LEVELS.

-- CONNECTICUT CAN AFFORD QUALITY PROGRAMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION AND SHOULD INSURE THAT EXISTING QUALITY IS NOT DIMINISHED.

-- INCOME, FROM OTHER SOURCES THAN THE STATE'S GENERAL FUND, WILL HAVE TO BE INCREASED.

-- STATE SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH WILL DECREASE IN RELATION TO STATE SUPPORT FOR INSTRUCTION.

-- PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT WILL BE MORE DEPENDENT ON RE-ALIGNMENT OF PRIORITIES THAN ON ADDITIONAL FUNDING.

-- GREATER USE OF INDEPENDENT COLLEGE RESOURCES WILL PERMIT THE DEFERMENT OF NEW OR EXPANDED PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OR PROGRAMS.

-- THE STATE WILL HAVE ONE SYSTEM OF TWO-YEAR PUBLIC COLLEGES.

-- STUDENT FINANCIAL NEEDS WILL INTENSIFY AS COSTS INCREASE AND PARTICULARLY IF THE ECONOMY FAILS TO IMPROVE.

-- CURRENT STATE RELATIONSHIPS WITH INDEPENDENT COLLEGES ARE NOT ADEQUATE IN TERMS OF THE CONTRIBUTION THAT COULD BE SECURED FROM THESE INSTITUTIONS.

-- DISCOUNTING INFLATION, THE TOTAL NUMBER OF DOLLARS APPROPRIATED FOR HIGHER EDUCATION WILL STABILIZE BY THE END OF THE FIVE-YEAR INITIAL PLANNING PERIOD.

-- PROPRIETARY SCHOOLS WILL PLAY A LARGER ROLE IN POST-SECONDARY EDUCATION AND WILL ENROLL AN INCREASING PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS.

-- THE COST TO THE STATE FOR MEDICAL EDUCATION WILL STABILIZE, BUT ONLY IF THE MEDICAL/DENTAL SCHOOL (HEALTH CENTER) IS GRANTED A GREATER DEGREE OF AUTONOMY (SO IT CAN SCRAMBLE FOR THAT "SOFT DOLLAR"!).

-- EXPENDITURES FOR NEW FACILITIES WILL DECREASE, PARTICULARLY AS ALTERNATE MEANS OF DELIVERING EDUCATION ARE IDENTIFIED.

-- PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS WILL CHANGE AS STUDENTS AS WELL AS TRUSTEES REQUEST JUSTIFICATION FOR EXISTING PRACTICES. (SHOULD NEARLY EVERYONE ATTEND FOR FOUR YEARS TO OBTAIN A BACHELOR'S DEGREE?

TEN YEARS AFTER HIGH SCHOOL BEFORE AN M.D. CAN PRACTICE? SHOULD IT BE SO DIFFICULT TO OBTAIN ACADEMIC CREDIT FOR EXPERIENCES OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM?)

-- THERE WILL BE GREATLY INCREASED COOPERATION AMONG INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

-- PLANNING WILL BE ACCEPTED AS A WAY OF LIFE!

THESE ARE CONCEPTS TO BE TESTED AND THERE ARE COUNTLESS OTHERS. WE HAVE BROUGHT TOGETHER MEN AND WOMEN WHO CAN EXAMINE TOPICS OF CONCERN AND DRAW FROM THEM CONCEPTS WHICH CAN BE TESTED, REFINED, AND ULTIMATELY VALIDATED. THEY ARE READY TO BEGIN. WE ARE ANXIOUS TO HAVE THE THOUGHTS OF EVERY INTERESTED PERSON.

IV

LEGISLATORS LOOK AT MASTER PLANNING

Comments by

REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD A. KLEBANOFF
Co-Chairman
Legislative Education Committee

and

REPRESENTATIVE RUTH O. TRUEX
Assistant Minority Leader and
Member of Legislative Education
Committee

COMMENTS BY REPRESENTATIVE HOWARD A. KLEBANOFF

Colloquium on Higher Education in Connecticut
September 25, 1972

I am here to wish you well, but I begin with words of caution: We must not use the Master Plan merely to change the name of present programs, and we must not use the Master Plan merely to develop a lobbying group.

The Legislature in the past has heard many complaints about higher education and many proposals. Public Act 194 presents a tremendous challenge to you. It is both a warning and a sign of faith. It is a warning to do your job, to put your house in order. However, it is a sign of faith in that it is you we invite -- you, the educational leaders -- to develop a Master Plan.

The Act tells you to include many things. Yet what it basically says is to make education responsive to today's needs and prepared to meet tomorrow's challenges. It tells you to meet the needs of students so that equal educational opportunity is available to all.

I have faith that you can do the job.

COMMENTS BY REPRESENTATIVE RUTH O. TRUEX

Colloquium on Higher Education in Connecticut
September 25, 1972

Public Act 194 mandating a Master Plan for Higher Education in my opinion is one of the best pieces of legislation to come out of the 1972 session. It passed both Houses with flying colors, was signed by the Governor, and is now being enthusiastically implemented by the Commission for Higher Education.

I am honored and delighted to be a liaison from the Legislature to the Management/Policy Group. I am also greatly impressed by the number of people who have indicated their willingness to assist in this study. Such able and dedicated people contribute greatly to the discussions of the Plan, and their willingness to work on its preparation will aid in its implementation and acceptance throughout the State.

The 1970's will be critical years for higher education and present many challenges to those who must steer its course through the next few years. The 1960's saw "the horn of plenty" poured upon our institutions of higher learning -- in public and private sectors -- at state and federal levels. Then came the trend toward re-evaluation of priorities.

Many new problems are asking for solutions requiring a share of available public monies, for example, the environment and the cities. One of these problems is the need to absorb many more students in the decade immediately ahead. We have accepted a responsibility to provide quality higher education for all young people who aspire to it. Now we face the challenge of meeting this responsibility within a framework of limited resources.

And so we must take a close look at all aspects of higher education and make sure we are getting the best return for our dollars invested in it. This is why the Master Plan is of such great importance and urgency.

V. MASTER PLAN PERSONNEL

Management/Policy Group

Mr. Henry E. Fagan, Stratford
Chairman, Board of Trustees of Regional Community Colleges

Mr. William Horowitz, New Haven
Chairman, Board of Trustees for State Technical Colleges

Mr. Donald H. McGannon, New Canaan (Chairman)
Chairman, Commission for Higher Education

Mrs. Bernice Niejadlik, Danielson
Chairman, Board of Trustees for State Colleges

Dr. Charles E. Shain, New London
Chairman, Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges

Mr. Gordon W. Tasker, Glastonbury
Chairman, Board of Trustees for University of Connecticut

Legislative and Executive Liaison

Representative Howard M. Klebanoff, Hartford

Representative Ruth O. Truex, Wethersfield

Mr. Stuart Smith, New Britain
Administrative Assistant to the Governor

Resource Groups

I. GOALS:

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

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

II. ENROLLMENT:

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

Staff: Mr. Stanley Macklow
Assistant Professor of Physics
Norwalk State Technical College

III. FACILITIES:

Chairman: Mr. Robert H. Mutrux, AIA
Senior Associate and Director, Fletcher-Thompson, Inc., Bridgeport
President, Connecticut Society of Architects

Staff: Mr. David Basch
Director of Planning
Board of Trustees for State Colleges

IV.	PROGRAMS:	Chairman:	Dr. Harold See Benton Professor of International and Higher Education University of Bridgeport
		Staff:	Dr. Joseph Dunn Director of Research, Central Connecticut State College
V.	ALTERNATE APPROACHES:	Chairman:	The Rev. William C. McInnes, S.J. President, Fairfield University
		Staff:	Dr. Bernard Shea Director of Research, Projects, and Publications Board of Trustees of Regional Community Colleges
VI.	TRANSFER:	Chairman:	Mr. Edgar F. Beckham Associate Provost, Wesleyan University
		Staff:	Mr. Brian Burke Assistant to the Provost, University of Connecticut
VII.	EQUAL OPPORTUNITY:		
		Chairman:	Mr. Joseph Downey Director of Program Operations Community Progress, Inc., New Haven
		Staff:	Mr. Linwood Robinson Special Consultant Commission for Higher Education
VIII.	FINANCE:	Chairman:	Dr. Edwin L. Caldwell Vice-President Connecticut Bank and Trust Company
		Staff:	Mr. Brian Burke Assistant to the Provost, University of Connecticut
IX.	INFORMATION SYSTEM DEVELOPMENT:	Committee of Representatives of Constituent Units	
		Staff:	Dr. Francis J. Degnan Director of Research and Publications Commission for Higher Education