

THE CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

P.O. Box 2008 • New Britain, Connecticut 06050 • (203) 827-7700

RESOLUTION

concerning

STATEMENTS OF MISSION AND "ROLE AND SCOPE"

for the

CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

March 2, 1984

WHEREAS, The staff of the Department of Higher Education has proposed guidelines for the development of required statements of mission and "role and scope" for the units of public higher education in Connecticut, and

WHEREAS, These proposed guidelines, if adopted by the Board of Governors, will have the effect of creating cumbersome new approval procedures for most new academic programs in addition to the already lengthy, expensive, and demoralizing approval procedures now in effect, and

WHEREAS, The proposed guidelines appear to require the definition of campus "roles" as merely what is being done at the present without the possibility of including contemplated future activities in the "roles," and

WHEREAS, The proposed guidelines are interpreted by Department of Higher Education staff as divesting Boards of Trustees of authority for final approval of internal academic organization of campuses, and

WHEREAS, The proposed guidelines are interpreted by Department of Higher Education staff as divesting Boards of Trustees of authority for final approval of research centers and public service activities thereby making efforts to obtain grants from non-state government sources much more difficult if not impossible, and

WHEREAS, The proposed guidelines require the description of remedial instruction activities, transfer policies, "nontraditional" educational activities, and continuing education activities which are areas in which faculty must be extensively involved and in which trustees need to retain authority in collaboration with faculty and administration to make reasonable changes, therefore be it

RESOLVED, The Board of Trustees of Connecticut State University urges the Board of Governors to

- a) permit campus "roles" to include a future orientation so as to be a basis for planning and so as not to require amendment to the "role" statements when new programs within the contemplated "role" are presented to the Board of Governors for approval, and
- b) permit Boards of Trustees to retain final authority over the internal organization of academic resources on the campuses so as to be able to manage the delivery of approved programs, and
- c) permit the Boards of Trustees to retain final authority to organize research and public service activities of the faculties so as to maximize possibilities for obtaining non-state financial support and to provide the greatest possible opportunity for the encouragement of scholarly activities on the part of faculty members, and
- d) permit the Trustees to retain the broadest possible authority consistent with reasonable coordination to develop and change, in cooperation with the faculty and administration, the basic academic policies of the system without pre-audit or prior approval by the Board of Governors.

A Certified True Copy:

James A. Frost

President

MRS. HOAR'S STATEMENT ON MISSION, ROLE AND SCOPE

The reorganization act passed last year requires each Board of Trustees to develop mission statements for the system under its jurisdiction. As a part of the mission statement the Board must include a role and scope statement for each campus. That board of trustees must act "subject to statewide policy and guidelines established by the Board of Governors..." Once the trustees submit the mission and role and scope statements, the Board of Governors is empowered by the reorganization act to "review and approve" them.

We are at the very first stage of this process, namely, the stage at which the Board of Governors is considering its policy and guidelines to guide our efforts in preparing these documents.

To make a very long story short, we have some problems with the guidelines proposed by Department of Higher Education staff to the Board of Governors for their adoption. We complained and the Board of Governors postponed its decision until its March meeting.

To step back in time for a minute—we have always had a mission statement for our system as a whole, and we have no problem with the proposed BOG guidelines for a mission statement. In the past, each campus was guided by the mission of the system. Now, however, we are required to develop what amounts to a distinct mission statement for each campus. These are to be called "role and scope statements."

As proposed by BCG staff, these role and scope statements are mere snap shots of what the campuses are doing now. If the campus wants to do something new, chances are it will have to get an amendment to its role and scope statement and then get approval for a new program. This will especially be the case at the Master's level. In other words, a whole new approval process is being added to an already lengthy and expensive and demoralizing process for approval of new programs.

So problem number one is that campus "roles" are to be only what the campus is doing now rather than what we would want them to be doing in the foreseeable future. In other words, we would like to include a future-orientation in the definition of a campus role.

Problem number two is that by means of the guidelines, the Board of Governors staff is proposing to require Board of Governors approval of Trustees decisions to establish new schools on our campuses. This is an intrusion into our management decision—making. The Board of Governors has the statutory power to do this but, as you can see from my statement to the Board of Governors on February 21st which is included in our agenda book, I argued that they should not try to take over the matter of establishing new schools, but should leave it to us. They have control over new programs. I argued that they should leave to us the decision as to how to organize our staff to present the programs. I regarded this as a technique of management, not a matter of statewide policy. A similar sentiment was expressed on behalf of the community colleges by Father David Cannon who is the chairperson of their Board of Trustees. His remarks are also included in our book today.

The third problem we have with the Board of Governors staff's recommended guidelines is that they require that certain policies and academic activities be described. These include admissions policies, transfer policies, and remedial activities. By describing these things and part of a campus role, the implication is that Board of Governors approval will be needed for changes. This constitutes a kind of pre-audit in academic areas where we have had no pre-audit in the past. Obviously, this is not a welcome development.

A fourth and very major problem was that the procedure for amending role and scope statements was not revealed by BOG staff. It was supposed to be considered later. One of the things which was achieved in the postponement of the decision on the guidelines until March was a commitment that the procedures for amendment would be spelled out. We expect to receive a draft of these from the BOG staff shortly.

I expect to be in attendance at the March 20th meeting of the Board of Governors to express these concerns and I would encourage other members of the Board of Trustees to join me.

As an expression of this Board's sentiments, I ask you to turn to Tab 21 for a resolution which I offer for your consideration. I'll read the resolution and ask that someone move its adoption.



THE CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY

P.O. Box 2008 • New Britain, Connecticut 06050 • (203) 827-7700

March 5, 1984

Dr. Norma Foreman Glasgow Commissioner of Higher Education 61 Woodland Street Hartford, CT 06105

Dear Norma:

On March 2, 1984, the Board of Trustees passed the enclosed resolution on Mission and Role and Scope Statements.

Dr. Frost has asked that I forward it to you with the request that it be shared with members of the Board of Governors.

Sincerely,

Thomas A. Porter Vice President for

Academic and Student Affairs

Encl.
cc: Dr. Frost