

AGENDA
Meeting of
BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
University of Connecticut
South Campus Rome Ballroom
Storrs, CT 06269
September 20, 2006

Background
Information
Page

1. Call to Order
2. Approval of the Board Minutes of the June 21, 2006 Meeting
3. Public Participation
4. Report of Board Chairman
5. Report of Commissioner
6. Commissioner's Consent Calendar
 - a. [Appointments to the Advisory Committee on Accreditation, 2005-2006](#) 13
 - b. [Central Connecticut State University](#) – modification of the program in Technology Education, leading to a Bachelor of Science degree 17
 - c. [Fairfield University](#) – approval of a program in Music (with Certification, Pre-K thru 12), leading to a Bachelor of Arts degree 21
 - d. [University of Hartford](#) – program modification: licensure of a concentration in Illustration, leading to a Master of Fine Arts degree 25
 - e. [Approval of Agency's Affirmative Action Plan](#) 77
7. Academic Affairs and Planning Items
 - Action Items
 - a. [Asnuntuck Community College](#) - reaccreditation of the College 3

- b. [University of Massachusetts, Boston](#) - authorization to place students in the programs of teacher of students with visual impairments, school psychology, and school counseling for the required field experience and clinical practice in Connecticut schools 5

Progress Reports

- c. [Quinnipiac University](#) – Master of Science in Organizational Leadership 29
- d. [University of Phoenix, Norwalk Campus](#) 39

Information Item

- e. Monthly Update

8. Finance and Administration Items

Action Items

- a. [Twelve-Month Quarterly Operating Report](#) 41
- b. [DHE Current Services Budget FY08-09](#) 75

Information Item

- c. Preliminary Operating and Capital Budget Requests to be distributed

9. Report of the Standing Advisory Committee

10. Other Business

11. Adjournment to Special Session

12. Luncheon to Celebrate the Visiting Delegation from the Province of Shandong, co-hosted by the Board of Governors of Higher Education and the University of Connecticut

Dialogue among sister-state higher education leadership on Workforce Leadership

STAFF REPORT: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Institution: Asnuntuck Community College

Item: Reaccreditation of the College

Asnuntuck Community College has requested reaccreditation by the Board of Governors for Higher Education on the basis of continuation of its regional accreditation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). The College was reaccredited last by the Board of Governors in May 2001 until September 2006.

Asnuntuck Community College was established in Enfield in 1969 as North Central Connecticut Community College, the twelfth institution in the Connecticut community college system. It was renamed in 1972 and admitted its first students that year. The College serves the educational needs of approximately 2,000 full-time and part-time students in north-central Connecticut who are enrolled in academic programs or program options that lead to associate degrees or certificates in business, the liberal arts, and science and technology. The College offers the first two years of a high quality, low cost college education as well as occupational and career-oriented programs. It also offers a wide variety of community services.

The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the New England Association of Schools and Colleges conducted an evaluation visit of the College on November 13-16, 2005. The Commission, at its meeting on April 20, 2006, voted to continue the College's accreditation. In its letter to the College, dated June 7, 2006, the Commission asked the College to submit a report for consideration in Spring 2008 describing its progress in linking priorities identified through planning with resource allocation and using data to inform planning and evaluation; adopting the newly-proposed governance model and more clearly identifying appropriate roles for students in governance; strengthening the program review and assessment capacity of the institution through identification of the means to assess student learning in the general education component of their studies and the specification for learning outcomes for the various academic programs; implementing the plan for faculty evaluation; and strengthening the institution's focus on helping students develop skills of information literacy. The Commission also asked the College to submit a fifth-year Interim Report in Fall 2010.

Connecticut Regulations 10a-34-6(c) state that "the Board of Governors for Higher Education shall accept regional or, where appropriate, national accreditation, in satisfaction of the requirements of this subsection unless the Board finds cause not to rely upon such accreditation." The letter of notification from the New England Association of Schools and Colleges, dated June 7, 2006, gives no indication of serious problems at the institution. There being no cause, it is recommended that the Board of Governors for Higher Education accept the NEASC assessment and grant reaccreditation to Asnuntuck Community College through September 2011. It is also recommended that the Board of Governors for Higher Education require the College to submit to the Department of Higher Education a copy of its Spring 2008 report to NEASC as well as a copy of its Fall 2010 Interim Report.

STAFF REPORT: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Institution: University of Massachusetts, Boston

Item: Authorization to place students in the programs of teacher of students with visual impairments, school psychology, and school counseling for the required field experience and clinical practice in Connecticut schools

Executive Summary

The University of Massachusetts-Boston has applied to the Board of Governors for Higher Education for authorization to place students in the programs of teacher of students with visual impairments, school psychology, and school counseling for the required field experience and clinical practice in Connecticut schools. The University is accredited regionally by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC), is authorized to offer educator preparation programs in specific certification areas by the Massachusetts Department of Education. The University's Graduate College of Education College is accredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).

According to the University, the program of teacher of students with visual impairments is supported by the Connecticut State Department of Education and the U. S. Department of Education Office of Special Education. This new program completed the informal review process with the Massachusetts Department of Education and was authorized to begin its first year of operation in 2005. It will be reviewed for NCATE accreditation in 2006 as a newly established program of a currently NCATE accredited institution.

The University argues that the school psychology and school counseling requirements are in full alignment with the Connecticut training requirements. The University reports that its school psychology and school counseling programs are grouped together in the Department of Counseling and School Psychology. The school psychology program is offered on campus, while the school counseling program is offered both on campus and online (through distance learning). The school psychology Master of Education and Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study programs have full accreditation approval by both the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) and the NCATE.

The school counseling Master of Education online and on-campus programs also have full accreditation approval by NCATE. Both programs meet Massachusetts state licensure requirements, allowing graduates to obtain their licensure as a school counselor through the Massachusetts State Department of Education. In doing so, students are expected to work toward achieving the Massachusetts State Department of Education school counselor performance standards, which are aligned with the American School Counselors Association (ASCA) National Model.

The Advisory Committee on Accreditation, at its meeting on June 15, 2006, reviewed the program and found it to be in compliance with Board of Governors' approval standards. The vote to recommend approval to the Board of Governors was ten in favor and one opposed.

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Governors for Higher Education grant approval to the University of Massachusetts, Boston to place students in the programs of teacher of students with visual impairments, school psychology, and school counseling for the required field experience and clinical practice in Connecticut schools, for a period of three years, until June 30, 2009.

Description

Purposes and Objectives

The University asserts that the primary goal of the school psychology and school counseling programs at the University of Massachusetts-Boston is to prepare practitioners who are able to provide psychological and educational services to students and their families as part of a school-based multi-disciplinary team.

The University states that the purpose and objectives of the Northeast Regional Center for Vision Education are to foster regional collaboration of resources across the six New England states to effectively address the low incidence needs for highly qualified Teachers and Specialists knowledgeable about the low incidence disability area of Vision Impairment. The philosophy reflects that low incidence disability teacher preparation is sustainable through collaboration of efforts across the states through distance education, and that quality distance education can be accomplished with strong state participation from within the state itself. While the academic base is located in Boston, students participating in Connecticut are Connecticut residents and supported by a University Faculty Supervisor who resides in-state and holds a Connecticut teaching certificate. This position is funded through Connecticut Department of Education. The hiring of a faculty supervisor within the state, and the recruitment and placement of students within the state for pre practicum and practicum experience reflects the University's mission to make the state a full and active collaborator and participant in the regional program. Connecticut participants are being prepared for positions within the state and are best served by practical experience within the working environment they will seek future employment.

Administration

The program chairs report to the Dean of the University's Graduate College of Education.

Field Experience Requirements

School Psychology Field Placement Requirements

The University states that, in arranging field placements, the training needs of the student are considered as well as the mission of the University in serving diverse communities. The first semester, 600 hours, must be in a school setting. Most students complete the second semester in a school setting as well, but it is possible for the second semester to be in a non-school setting such as clinics and community mental health centers. Every student's fieldwork must encompass experiences at both the elementary and secondary level, preferably from the pre-K through 12th grade level. The student should have the opportunity to observe and work with typically developing students. It is also recommended that the student have opportunities to work with diverse student populations including: bilingual or ESL students; students at risk; students eligible for services under Section 504; and students eligible for special education services under IDEA. Students should have opportunities to engage in the full range of school

psychology activities including: consultation, intervention, assessment, training, and research.

School Counseling Field Placement Requirements

The University states that the school counseling field placements (practicum and internship) are supervised field experiences completed in either an elementary, middle or high school. School counseling students need to determine prior to the internship whether they are seeking state licensure as a grade K-8 school counselor (elementary and some middle schools) or a grade 5-12 school counselor (high schools). School counseling students should have opportunities to engage in the full range of school counseling activities including: guidance curriculum, including attending the student assistance team; responsive services, including individual counseling; individual planning, including career advisement; and system support, including teacher consultation.

Teachers for Visually Impaired

The University states that pre-registration for the practicum is required one semester prior to enrollment, along with documentation of 75 clock hours of pre-practicum experiences (field-based experiences completed in correlation to program coursework). Additionally, all required licensure exams must be successfully completed prior to enrollment. The practicum site must be approved by the Program Coordinator.

The Practicum experience and Capstone Portfolio are designed to demonstrate proficiency in the CEC VI-specific Knowledge and Skills standards. Participants are additionally given opportunities to demonstrate proficiency in the licensure-specific pedagogical content knowledge and the common core of teacher competencies required for initial certification in Massachusetts, as required in the state's Pre-Service Performance Assessment. Students demonstrate such proficiency through the assessment and teaching of students with visual impairments, collaborative work with general educators and related service providers, and a Capstone Portfolio that includes reflective papers and evidence (samples) along with other kinds of documentation described in the portfolio requirements.

Evaluation

The University requires students to keep a log and an internship portfolio in order to satisfy internship requirements for the school psychology program. The log should be shared with the University Supervisor during each visit. At the end of the semester, the log will be read by the Seminar Instructor, the University Supervisor, the Program Coordinator and then returned.

For the school counseling program, the University requires students to keep an activity log for the practicum and internship. Students document brief descriptions of the activities they participate in while at the field placement. The log is kept on a daily basis according to the types of service the student engaged in. The log is shared with the

University Supervisor and Field Supervisor during each visit which is used as an evaluation tool to ensure a broad range of experiences.

The University further emphasizes that, throughout their training, students are expected to comply with all legal and professional codes of ethics as well as state and national standards, including the codes of the American Psychological Association and the National Association of School Psychologists (for school psychology students) and the American Counseling Association (for school counseling students). In addition, all students in the counseling and school psychology programs are expected to comply with the standards of academic propriety described in the enclosed University's *Graduate Studies Bulletin*.

For teachers for the visually impaired, the University requires students to work on the consolidation of their teaching skills by means of systematic cycles of planning, observation, and intensive intellectual, data-based analysis of their teaching performance. A dominant focus of supervision is to assist candidates in reflecting upon their assessment, teaching, and consultative practices and to identify specific ways they should make adjustments in their practice to accelerate the academic progress of their students with special needs.

The evaluation system for the Practicum experience consists of standards and requirements from four national and state associations and organizations, including the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), Council for Exceptional Children – Division on Visual Impairments (CEC-DVI), Massachusetts Department of Education and the University's Graduate College of Education (GCOE).

The University expects all students to demonstrate professional behavior throughout their training. If a student is observed to have significant difficulty in any area, individual faculty advisors or supervisors will meet with the student and attempt to help the student address the issue. If the student continues to have difficulty across a number of settings, the Program Coordinator will be notified and a plan of remediation is developed with the student. In circumstances where the student continues to show inadequate skills we may fail the student and require them to complete an additional year of internship. These skills are essential in the profession of school psychology, school counseling, and school adjustment, and extreme deficiencies in these areas may result in dismissal from the program.

On-Site Supervision

School Psychologist and School Counseling On-Site Supervision Requirements

The University states that field supervision shall be conducted by qualified practitioner Field Supervisor at the field setting and by a University Supervisor. School psychology students are required to work under the direct supervision of a licensed/certified school psychologist. For the Massachusetts State Department of Education licensing, the supervising school psychologist(s) must have worked at least three years as a school psychologist and have a standard license. The student must be able to meet face-to-face with the supervisor at least two hours a week, preferably more.

In addition to Field Supervision, the school psychology program requires six site visits and the school counseling program requires three site visits, by a University Supervisor over the course of the year. Three of these visits must be “three way” with the student, field supervisor, and university supervisor meeting together to review internship requirements, student progress, and evaluation procedures. The University Supervision may be provided by a faculty member of the University or by a member of another school psychology program or school counseling program in agreement with the University.

Teachers for Visually Impaired

The University explains that due to the low incidence nature of visual disabilities, there is not a concentration of students in any particular site. It is unusual to have more than one or two children in a school, so services are delivered through an itinerant model, that is, the teacher of the visually impaired travels from one school to another, often with a caseload that includes several school districts. The program plans to use the collaboration that is already set up between the LEAs and the Connecticut Board of Education and Services for the Blind (BESB). BESB provides Teachers of the Visually Impaired to local districts at no cost to assist in meeting the needs of the students with visual disabilities. Currently 26 districts hire their own teachers and are reimbursed for the cost of the teacher by BESB. All the remaining districts are served directly by a BESB Education Consultant.

The University argues that its programs' student placement objectives are aligned with the appropriate Connecticut educator certification standards. The curriculum of 37 credits including 75 hours pre practicum experience and 300 practicum hours are fully aligned and exceed the requirements of the Connecticut Educator certification standards by adhering to the national professional standards of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), Division on Visual Impairments (DVI). The University's Graduate College of Education is also has National Certification Accreditation in Teacher Education (NCATE) so student teaching placements are held to NCATE standards and evaluation.

Assessment of Needs

Need for the Program

There is a national and regional shortage of teachers of the visually impaired. The current average caseload of Connecticut teachers hired by BESB is 25 students. For teachers hired by a local district, the average caseload is 19. State legislation passed in 2003 (RB 03-218) has set a goal of 15 students (including two braille readers) for each teacher. To attain that goal today, the state needs approximately 15 additional teachers. In addition, in a survey conducted by the Connecticut Board of Education and Services for the Blind in 2001 one half of the then 50 teachers for the visually impaired in Connecticut planned to retire by 2011.

There is no university program in Connecticut to train teachers in this specialty. The University of Massachusetts-Boston program is designed to serve the needs of the New England region through its master's level web-based program. Connecticut students are able to access this program through the distance education format while continuing to work and live within the state. The University assists the students in finding pre-practicum and practicum placements within Connecticut.

The University states that its Northeast Regional Center for Vision Education was established as a regional response to a critical need to prepare low incidence Teachers of Students with Visual Impairments (TVI) at the request of the New England Regional Community. The University, being the only TVI teacher preparation program in all of New England, was supported to expand its capability to utilize distance education to regionalize and sustain a critical mass of students across six states.

The University reports that there is an increasing demand for out-of-state placements, and a particular interest in Connecticut due to its proximity, reputation for excellence and opportunity, and larger proportion of paid internship sites. When the University's School Psychology Club electronically surveyed the present student body, over 38% expressed some interest in pursuing an internship and full-time position in the state of Connecticut. The University has also had many prospective students who reside and work in Connecticut inquiring about its school counseling online program. These individuals have expressed interest in eventually working as school counselors in Connecticut. The University's on-campus students in the school adjustment program have also shown interest in completing their field placement in Connecticut, so they can eventually work as school adjustment counselors in Connecticut.

Comments from other Connecticut Institutions

There are no comments from other Connecticut institutions.

Resources

Faculty

The University states that all of its faculty members involved in the programs meet the Connecticut standards of having terminal degrees in the fields in addition to other teaching and researching accomplishments.

The University further states that the program in Visual Impairments has hired a part time non-benefited staff person who happens to have retired from Connecticut with years of experience within the state in the content area of Visual Impairments. The University has assured the Department that the administrative function of this employee is centered in Boston and is not limited to the state of Connecticut. Her job function includes recruitment for the program across the six states and she advises all new students across the region with plans of study and registration. She and one other part time employee assist all field placements with local practitioners serving as cooperating teachers. They do not directly serve as local cooperating field instructors. Both represent the university as the university supervisor of field placement as the University completes the reported five site visits supporting both the student and cooperating practitioner the student is placed with across all six states. Funding for field supervision services of both employees is contributed by each of the six State Departments of Education.

Library and Learning Resources

The University reports that its students will still have access to the University's library resources both on-campus and remotely. The University has invested in electronic media which includes access to over 2000 journal online (full articles) and other electronic resources such as videos. The students will also be able to use the SERC Library in Middletown and the BESB Resource Library.

Advisory Committee on Accreditation

The Advisory Committee on Accreditation, at its meeting on June 15, 2006, reviewed the program and found it to be in compliance with Board of Governors' approval standards. The vote to recommend approval to the Board of Governors was ten in favor and one opposed.

STAFF REPORT: COMMISSIONER'S CONSENT CALENDAR

Subject: Appointments to the Advisory Committee on Accreditation

Background

Board of Governors' regulations for licensure and accreditation call for the appointment of an Advisory Committee on Accreditation (ACA) to advise the Board and the Commissioner. The subject of advice is the review and approval of programs and institutions of higher education in Connecticut. The Committee is asked, in the case of each application for approval, to make a finding regarding compliance or lack of compliance with the Board's approval standards. The Committee also discusses issues related to the approval standards and provides advice on such matters.

The ACA consists of twelve members and twelve alternates appointed by the Board with equal representation of public and independent institutions and two representatives of the public at large. The members of the ACA serve three year staggered terms. This year, there are six vacancies to be filled: one member from the Connecticut State University system, two members from the state's independent colleges and universities, one member from the Community College System, and two members from the public at large. In addition, alternate positions for each member are also to be filled.

To identify candidates to fill the vacancies, Commissioner Lewis solicited nominations from members of the higher education community including chief executive officers and presidents of institutions of higher education, the Connecticut Conference of Independent Colleges (CCIC), the Connecticut Business and Industry Association (CBIA), the Capitol Region Growth Council, the Connecticut Academy of Science and Engineering (CASE), SACIA, and others.

The nominees recommended for appointment to a term until August 2009 are listed below. Full rosters of the 2006-2007 and of the 2005-2006 Advisory Committee on Accreditation membership are attached for the Board's information.

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Governors for Higher Education appoint to the Advisory Committee on Accreditation the members and alternates identified in the staff report for a term until August 2009, and authorize the Commissioner to make interim appointments to fill vacancies that may occur during the coming year.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
Department of Higher Education

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

Terms of Appointment: 2006-2007 Academic Year

Chairman: Dr. Zdzislaw Kremens, Dean, School of Technology
Central Connecticut State University

Vice Chairman: Dr. Roger Brooks, Elie Wiesel Professor of Judaic Studies,
Associate Dean of the Faculty, Connecticut College

Department of Higher Education: Dr. Jonas Zdanys, Associate Commissioner for Academic
Affairs & Chief Academic Officer

To August 31, 2007

Miller Brown/Stephen Peterson	Trinity College
Kathleen McCourt/William Clyde	Quinnipiac University
Krista Rodin/Girish Punj	University of Connecticut

To August 31, 2008

Shirley Adams/Merle Harris	Charter Oak State College
Zdzislaw Kremens/Hakim Salah-Din	Central Connecticut State University
Heidi Hadsell/	Hartford Seminary

To August 31, 2009

Roger Brooks/John Nugent	Connecticut College
Laurence M. Conner/ Hans van der Giessen	University of Bridgeport
Marianne Kennedy/DonnaJean Fredeen	Southern Connecticut State University
Martha McLeod	Asnuntuck Community College
Judith Resnick/Lauren Kaufman	CBIA
Earl Thompson/Leon Newman	CT Academy of Science & Engineering

BOARD OF GOVERNORS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
Department of Higher Education

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION

Terms of Appointment: 2005-2006 Academic Year

Chairman: Dr. Vagos Hadjimichael, Dean, School of Engineering,
Fairfield University

Vice Chairman: Dr. Patricia Kleine, Dean, School of Education and Professional
Studies, Eastern Connecticut State University

Department of Higher Education: Dr. Jonas Zdanys, Associate Commissioner for Academic
Affairs & Chief Academic Officer

To August 31, 2006

Roger Brooks/John Nugent	Connecticut College
Vagos Hadjimichael/Margaret Deignan	Fairfield University
Dorsey Kendrick/Colleen Keyes	Gateway /Tunxis Community College
Patricia Kleine/Shelly Gimenez	Eastern Connecticut State University
Judith Resnick/Lauren Kaufman	CBIA
Earl Thompson/Anthony DeMaria	CT Academy of Science & Engineering

To August 31, 2007

Miller Brown/Stephen Peterson	Trinity College
Kathleen McCourt/William Clyde	Quinnipiac University
Krista Rodin/Girish Punj	University of Connecticut

To August 31, 2008

Shirley Adams/Merle Harris	Charter Oak State College
Zdzislaw Kremens/Hakim Salahu-Din	Central Connecticut State University
Heidi Hadsell/	Hartford Seminary

STAFF REPORT: COMMISSIONER'S CONSENT CALENDAR

Institution: Central Connecticut State University

Item: Modification of the Program in Technology Education, leading to a Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree

Executive Summary

Central Connecticut State University has applied to the Board of Governors for approval of a modification of the University's accredited program in Technology Education, leading to the Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree. The program was accredited in January 1976 and prepares individuals to work as teachers in technology education centers, principally in Connecticut's public schools. The University indicates that its program must be revised if it is to meet changes of expectations as well as substantive requirements for technology education in the state's schools.

The program modification includes a change of program name, to Technology and Engineering Education (K-12) and a modification of the curriculum totaling more than 18 credits.

The Advisory Committee on Accreditation, at its meeting on June 15, 2006, reviewed the program and found it to be in compliance with Board of Governors' approval standards. The vote to recommend approval to the Board of Governors was all in favor, with Zdzislaw Kremens, of Central Connecticut State University, abstaining.

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Governors for Higher Education approve the modification of the program in Technology Education, leading to the Bachelor of Science (B.S.) degree, offered by Central Connecticut State University, for a period of time concurrent with institutional accreditation.

Description

Purposes and Objectives

The modified program will prepare individuals for teacher certification, in grades K-12, in technology and engineering education.

The program is consistent with the University's mission to promote, among other educational goals, technological education to address the educational and employment needs of north central Connecticut. It is consistent with the University's educational activities as a "Center of Excellence" in technology.

Administration

Overall administrative oversight of the program is provided by the Dean of the School of Technology.

Admissions/Enrollment

The University projects an enrollment in the program of 10 full-time and 9 part-time students in the first year; 13 full-time and 15 part-time students in the second year; and 14 full-time and 13 part-time students in the third year.

Curriculum

An outline of current and proposed program requirements and electives is provided in Table 1 at the end of this report.

Assessment of Need

The University, in its application, notes that current technology education programs in Connecticut serve a limited population of learners, they need to include more academically rigorous experiences in order to attract a larger and more diverse population of learners, and they will need to support mathematics, science and language arts initiatives if they are to remain sustainable. The revised program, the University states, integrates real world problem solving with an activity based learning approach; it will better prepare prospective teachers, and will incorporate the math, science, English and technology skills needed for student success. The revised program, the University also notes, is designed to address a national shortage of "highly qualified" teaching professionals in the area of technology and engineering education, as defined by the No Child Left Behind federal initiative.

Resource Support

Faculty

Five full-time faculty members currently teach in the department. The University is also currently conducting a national search to fill one additional full-time position.

Library and Learning Resources

The University's library holdings will continue to be updated, both in regards to textbooks and periodicals relevant to the field.

Facilities

The Dean has already allocated \$93,000 in capital equipment funds to support the revised program. New equipment for the program includes a prototyping laser cutting and engraving machine, a rapid prototyping machine, and a CNC prototyping router. New computer desks and cabinets have also been purchased. In addition, the Technology and Engineering Education Laboratory has been renovated and now includes dedicated areas for computer design, prototyping, and production.

Advisory Committee on Accreditation

The Advisory Committee on Accreditation, at its meeting on June 15, 2006, reviewed the program and found it to be in compliance with Board of Governors' approval standards. The vote to recommend approval to the Board of Governors for Higher Education was all in favor, with Zdzislaw Kremens, of Central Connecticut State University, abstaining.

TABLE 1: Current BSED Technology Education Program Compared to Proposed BSED Technology and Engineering Teacher Education (K-12) Program. E :Existing course; R: Revised course; N: new course

Current BSED: Technology		Proposed BSED: Technology and Engineering Teacher	
Major Technical Courses	Cr.	Major Technical Courses	Cr.
CET I 13 Intro to Info Processing	3	TE 1 15 Electronic Portfolios and Assessment (N)	3
EMEC 114 Intro to Energy	3	MFG 118 Introduction to Materials (E)	3
MFG 118 Intro to Materials	3	MFG 121 Technical Drafting and CAD (E)	3
MFG 121 Technical Drafting &	3	ENG 150 Introduction to Engineering Technology (E)	3
GRT 212 Graphic Arts Processes	3	TE 155 Integrating Engineering Concepts for K-8	3
TE 213 Electrical Energy	3	CET 223 Basic Electrical Circuits (F)	3
TE 214 Mechanical Energy	3	TE 215 Materials Processing (E)	3
IF 215 Materials Processing	3	TE 221 Innovation and invention(N)	3
TE 410 Communication Design		ET 231 Applied Statics and Strength of Materials (N)	3
IF 420 Manufacturing Systems	3	TE 245 Building Design and Construction (R)	3
TE 430 Transportation Systems	3	TE 299 Technology and Engineering Ed. Practic im (N)	3
TE 445 Construction Systems	3	TC 310 Communication Systems (R)	3
TE 450 Technological Enterprise	3	TE 330 Transportation Design (R)	3
		TE 417 Robot Desi • n and Construction (N)	3
		TE 498 Tech. and Eng. Ed. Senior Design Project (N)	3
<i>Technical Courses</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>Technical Courses — 45 credits total</i>	
Professional Course		Professional Courses	Cr.
TE 199 Orientation to Technology	1	TE 399 Teaching Technology and Engineering. Ed (R)	3
TE 399 Professional Strategies of	3	TE 400 Professional Practices and Responsibilities (R)	3
TE 400 Teaching Technology Ed.	3	EDTE 316 Principles of Learning (E)	4
TE 428 Research and	3	EDSC 375 Principles of Evaluation in Education (E)	3
EDTE 316 Principles of Learning	4	EDF 400 Philosophy of Ed. or EDF 415 Fund. of Ed. (E)	3
EDSC 375 Principles of Evaluation	3	SPED 315 Educating. Learners with Exceptionalities (E)	
EDF 400 Philosophy of Ed. or	3	RDG 440 Intro. to Literacy (E)	3
SPED 315 Educating, Learners	3	EDSC 414 Preliminary Student Teaching (E)	6
RDG 440 Intro. to Literacy (3)	3	EDSC 415 Student Teaching (E)	6
EDSC 414 Preliminary Student	6		
EDSC 415 Student Teaching	6		
<i>Professional Courses — 38</i>		<i>Professional Courses — 34 credits total</i>	
Required General Education		Required General Education Courses	Cr .
HIST 261 or 262 History of	3	MIST 261 or 262 History of American Life 1 or II (E)	3
TE 110 Technological Systems	3	TE 1 10 Technological Systems (E)	3
PSY 236 Life Span Development	3	PSY 236 Life Span Development (E)	3
PHSY 11 I Introductory Physics I	3	PHSY 111 Introductory Physics I (E)	3
CHEM 111Introductory Chemistry	3	CHEM I 1 1 Introductory Chemistry I (E)	3
ENG 110 Freshman Composition	3	English 1 10 Freshman Composition (E)	3
COMM 115 Fnd. of Comm. or	3	COMM 115 Fnd Of Com Or COMM 140 Pub. Spkg.(E)	3
STAT 104 Elementary Statistics	3	STAT 104 Elementary Statistics (E)	3
MATH 1 15 Trigonometry (3)	3	MATH 119 Pr calculus with Trigonometry (E)	4
		PE 244 Fit. Well. Or CET 113 Intro to Info. Tech. (E)	2/3
<i>Gen. Ed. Electives.</i>		<i>13-14 credits</i>	
Program Total	130	Program Total — 130 credits	

STAFF REPORT: COMMISSIONER'S CONSENT CALENDAR

Institution: Fairfield University

Item: Approval of a program in Music (with Certification, Pre-K thru 12), leading to a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree

Executive Summary

The proposed program in Music, leading to the Baccalaureate degree, with Certification Pre-K thru 12, was evaluated jointly by the State Department of Education and the Department of Higher Education to determine whether the program meets the relevant approval standards of the respective Departments. The evaluation visit resulted in a determination that all standards were met.

The program responds to student interest and a shortage in the state of music educators.

The Advisory Committee on Accreditation, at its June meeting, found the program to be in compliance with the Boards of Governors' approval standards. The vote to recommend approval to the Board of Governors was all in favor, with Vagos Hadjimichael, of Fairfield University, abstaining.

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Governors for Higher Education approve a program in Music (with Certification, Pre-K thru 12), leading to a Bachelor of Arts (B.A.) degree, to be offered by Fairfield University, for a period of time concurrent with institutional accreditation.

Description

Purpose and Objectives

The newly proposed undergraduate program in music education will provide a planned program to prepare candidates for Connecticut State certification as music educators in grades pre-K through 12. A joint collaboration of the College of Arts and Sciences (CAS) and the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions (GSEAP), the music education program will prepare candidates for careers in teaching music by providing candidates with a liberal arts core, an appropriate major in music and pedagogical instructions, experiences and opportunities to develop critical knowledge and relevant professional skills and dispositions.

Administration

The Director of Certification Programs and the Coordinator of Music Education will work collaboratively within the existing structure for tracking education minors, which includes program meetings as well as meetings with the undergraduate education advisors and the curriculum and instruction advisory board.

Curriculum

The curriculum consists of General Education coursework, a minimum of 30-credits for the Music Major, and Education Coursework (39 credits).

Education Coursework

ED 241	Educational Psychology - 3 credits
ED 329	Philosophical Foundations of Education - 3 credits
ED 350	Special Learners in the Regular Classroom - 3 credits
ED 381	Directed Observation and Student Teaching - 12 credits
ED 382	Student Teaching Seminar - 3 credits
SO 162	Race, Gender, and Ethnic Relations - 3 credits

Fours courses in music methods

MU 360	Elementary General Music Methods - 3 credits
MU 361	Choral Conducting Methods - 3 credits
MU 362	Secondary Instrumental Methods - 3 credits
MU 363	Music Technology for Music Educators - 3 credits

Enrollment

The University plans to enroll 5-7 students a year; the program is expected to grow over the next several years.

Similar Programs

					<u>2001</u>	<u>2002</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>2005</u>
CCONN	13131	Music Education	BS	1971	4	6	3	5	9
CTCOL	13131	Music with Certification in Music	BA	1976	2	1	2	0	0
UCONN	13131	Music Education	BS	1976	13	14	13	14	12
UHTFD	13131	Music Education	B-	1976	18	15	29	20	14
WCONN	13131	Music Education	BS	1974	8	4	7	15	13
Total Number of Mayors					45	40	54	54	48
Total Number of Degrees					42	39	52	52	48

Educational Planning Context

The University reports that there have inquiries about the availability of a music education program and that the proposed program responds to that interest and the noted shortage of music educators in Connecticut.

Resource Support

Faculty

The University lists five faculty members that will teach specialized courses in the program; all have the appropriate credential and teaching experience.

Library and Learning Resources

The library has the following materials in the subject and cognate area.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Books</u>	<u>Volume Equivalent of Microforms</u>	<u>A.V. Titles</u>	<u>Microform (Reels)</u>	<u>Micro- print</u>	<u>Micro- fiche</u>
2003-04	325,166	104,334	9,615	17,198	154,739	702,794
2004-05	333,251	105,807	10,201	17,321	154,739	716,302

Journals and periodicals include: General Music Today, Journal of Music Teacher Education, Music Education Technology, Music Theory Online, Research and Issues in Music Education, and Teaching Music.

Facilities and Equipment

Fairfield University has adequate instructional, administrative, library, and computer facilities to support candidates in meeting teaching and learning standards. The music education program will have a

significant field component; candidates will regularly have access to the facilities and resources of several local P-12 schools where they will be placed for field experiences.

Facilities for instructional purposes also include classrooms with pianos and other instruments, four instrumental/vocal studios, and a computer lab dedicated to keyboarding, MIDI, and other music software located next to one of the main classrooms. In addition, the music education program will have use of the performing spaces on campus:

- The Library multimedia room, seats 90
- Gonzaga Auditorium, seats 350
- The Kelley Theatre at the Quick Center for the Arts, seats 750
- The Wein Experimental Theatre at the Quick Center for the Arts, flexible space
- Eight practice spaces for students

Advisory Committee on Accreditation

The Advisory Committee on Accreditation, at its June meeting, found the program to be in compliance with the Boards of Governors' approval standards. The vote to recommend approval was all in favor, with Vagos Hadjimichael, of Fairfield University, abstaining.

STAFF REPORT: COMMISSIONER'S CONSENT CALENDAR

Institution: University of Hartford

Item: Program Modification: Licensure of a concentration in Illustration, leading to the Master of Fine Arts (MFA) degree

Executive Summary

The Hartford Art School, University of Hartford, has designed a limited residency program, leading to a MFA in Illustration degree. The program is structured to provide non-traditional, working students the opportunity to complete a professional, terminal degree while simultaneously continuing to meet employment and family obligations.

The School has identified three groups of potential applicants; professional illustrators who wish to re-invigorate their career and seek the stimulation and new ideas of a graduate program, graphic designers seeking proficiency in illustration and illustrators teaching or interested in teaching at the college level who require the terminal MFA degree.

The proposed new program would compliment the existing MFA program with concentrations in Painting, Sculpture, and Photography. The University also offers a BFA in several fields.

The Advisory Committee on Accreditation, at its June meeting, found the program to be in compliance with the Board of Governors' approval standards. The vote to recommend approval to the Board of Governors was unanimous.

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Governors for Higher Education license a Master of Fine Arts (MFA) program, with a concentration in Illustration, to be offered by the University of Hartford, until October 2009.

Description

Purpose and Objectives

The major is specifically designed to meet the needs of practicing illustrators and designers seeking the terminal MFA degree in Illustration while maintaining active, full-time professional careers.

Administration

The proposed program will be housed at the Hartford Art School, University of Hartford. A full-time faculty member has been hired to serve as Program Coordinator.

Curriculum

The curriculum consists of 60 credits. The independent, tutorial based, program structure requires two and one-half years to complete. Students are expected to be in residence at the University for two week intensive summer sessions and at one week off-campus residencies, in selected cities, during the fall and spring semesters.

Off-campus host cities are carefully chosen for their proximity to major illustration markets and practicing professionals. During the non-resident portions of the program students will maintain on-going contact with faculty through the use of on-line, faxes, telephone and express mail-type services. A sample curriculum is attached.

Similar Programs

There are no MFA in Illustration programs in Connecticut.

Enrollment

The University projects an enrollment of 20 students in the first year and 25 students in the second year of the program.

Educational Planning Context

The University indicates that there are six accredited MFA and MA in Illustration programs in the country, with none in Connecticut. The MFA, as the terminal degree in the field, is increasingly becoming the requirement for illustrators to teach in colleges and universities. This proposed low residency program will allow illustrators to pursue the degree while continuing their professional careers.

Resource Support

Faculty

The University has four full-time faculty members (1 MFA, 2 Master's, and 1 BFA); all faculty have extensive commercial experience, national acclaim, and teaching experience in the illustration field. Eight adjunct faculty members are identified; they are practicing illustrators and/or teaching at institutions of higher education.

Library and Learning Resources

The University reports that the main library collection includes the Anne Bunce Cheney Art Library collection of approximately 20,000 items. Over 60 periodical subscriptions in support of visual arts education are actively maintained within the art library. The library also subscribes to EBSCOhost with access to 2,730 online periodicals (1,200 full text) and to ArtStor, an online image library with close to 400,000 downloadable images.

The lists of periodicals include some of the following: Step-by-Step Graphics, Art Journal, Art on Paper, Graphis, Typography, Print, Art&Text, American Art and Art News.

The program does not anticipate requiring any new learning materials at start-up. As a program in the Art School, the Illustration MFA will have access, when needed, to funds derived from the Hartford Art School, Inc. Endowment specifically designated for the purchase of faculty resource materials such as books, publications, videos and DVDs.

Facilities

The program will utilize the existing studio and computer lab facilities of the Hartford Art School during the on-campus summer residency. No additional specialized equipment is required. During the fall and spring off-campus meetings, the program will contract for the use of appropriate space in the respective host city.

Advisory Committee on Accreditation

The Advisory Committee on Accreditation, at its June meeting, found the program to be in compliance with the Board of Governors' approval standards. The vote to recommend approval to the Board of Governors was unanimous.

YEAR 1	Summer 1, first week	
ILS 861	Advanced Illustration 1	3.0
ILS 862	Advanced Illustration 2	3.0
ILS 610	Illustration in Context 1 (1850-1950)	2.0
ILS 620	Illustration Summer Lecture Series 1	2.0
	Summer 1, second week	
ILS 760	Digital Illustration	4.0
ILS 611	Illustration in Context 2 (1950-2000)	2.0
ILS 961	Thesis Project I	1.0
	Fall 1, New York City	
ILS 710	New York Illustration Issues 1	2.0
ILS 711	New York Illustration Assignment 1	2.0
	Spring 1, off-campus location	
ILS 720	Illustration Issues 1	2.0
ILS 721	Illustration Assignment I	2.0
ILS 962	Thesis Project 2	1.0
YEAR 2	Summer 2, first week	
ILS 863	Advanced Illustration 3	4.0
ILS 613	Illustration in Context 3 (Genres)	2.0
ILS 621	Illustration Summer Lecture Series 2	2.0
	Summer 2, second week	
ILS 761	Children's Book Illustration	4.0
ILS 640	The Business of Illustration	3.0
ILS 963	Thesis Project .3	1.0
	Fall 2, New York City	
ILS 712	New York Illustration Issues 2	2.0
ILS 713	New York Illustration Assignment 2	1.0
ILS 964	Thesis Project 4	1.0
	Spring 2, off-campus location	
ILS 722	Illustration Issues 2	2.0
ILS 723	Illustration Assignment 2	2.0
ILS 965	Thesis Project 5	1.0
YEAR 3	Summer 3, first week	
ILS 864	Advanced Illustration 4 or	3.0
ILS 762	Reportage Illustration	
	Summer 3, second week	
ILS 865	Advanced Illustration 5	3.0
ILS 970	Thesis Defense and Exhibition	3.0

Total Credit Hours 60.0

PROGRESS REPORT: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Institution: Quinnipiac University

Item: Master of Science in Organizational Leadership

At the time of licensure of the Master of Science in Organizational Leadership in the College of Professional Studies at Quinnipiac University, in May 2005, the Board of Governors for Higher Education required that an interim report providing updates in four areas be provided to the Department of Higher Education. The four areas are: enrollment and admissions profile; program finance; the success of program delivery, including advising support for students, and the success of the accelerated courses as measured by student learning outcomes and competency assessments; faculty hiring and program participation, including advising responsibilities.

1. Enrollment and Admissions Profile

The enrollment plan for the first year was to enroll an entering class of 20 students at the start of the Fall 1 and Spring 1 terms [given the 7-week terms, there are two fall terms, two spring terms, and two summer terms, but students are only admitted for September (Fall 1) and January (Spring 1) starts], building to a total enrollment in all courses of 40 by the start of Spring Term 1 (which began January 7, 2006). Table 1 compares the actual sizes of our two incoming classes with those forecasts.

We are pleased to report that we exceeded forecasts in both Incoming Class Size and Course Enrollment as shown in the tables below.

	Fall 05	Spr 06	Fall 06
<i>Projected Entering Class Size</i>	20	20	20
Actual Entering Class Size	28	27	NA

Table 1: Comparison of Actual and Projected Incoming Classes

	Fall 05 Term 1	Fall 05 Term 2	Spr 06 Term 1	Spr 06 Term 2	Sum 06 Term 1	Sum 06 Term 2
<i>Projected Course Enrollments</i>	20	20	40	40	40	20
Actual Course Enrollments	28	24	53	45	48	34

Table 2: Comparison of Actual Course Enrollment with the Projected Course Enrollment

Applicants to the program will be enrolled in the College of Professional Studies. Students must meet the following admissions standards:

1. A baccalaureate diploma from a regionally accredited institution of higher learning,
2. Generally, a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.75 for courses taken in achieving that baccalaureate diploma, (If this standard is not met, other factors such as work experience and GPA on most recently taken courses are considered.)
3. Minimum of four years of work experience.
4. Demonstrated potential for study of Organizational Leadership at the graduate level.

Every student admitted into the program has received at least a baccalaureate diploma from a regionally accredited institution of higher learning. The average cumulative GPA of admitted students is approximately 3.2. Eight students with cumulative GPAs slightly below 2.75 have been admitted, in all cases having achieved much higher GPAs on recently taken courses. On average, admitted students have work experience of about 10 years, and no students have been admitted without the required work experience. Recommendations and interviews have been used to document that all admitted students possess demonstrated potential for study of Organizational Leadership at the graduate level.

2. Program Finances

Table 3 presents the projected and actual revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets resulting from operation of the M.S. in Organizational Leadership degree program through summer term 2, 2006. We are pleased to report that we exceeded forecasts in revenue. The increase in actual expenses for summer 2006 was a result of the hiring of an additional full-time faculty member in anticipation of growth in fall 2006.

	<u>Fall 05</u>	<u>Fall 05</u>	<u>Spr 06</u>	<u>Spr 06</u>	<u>Sum 06</u>	<u>Sum 06</u>	<u>Total to</u>
	<u>Term 1</u>	<u>Term 2</u>	<u>Term 1</u>	<u>Term 2</u>	<u>Term 1</u>	<u>Term 2</u>	<u>Date</u>
<i>Projected Tuition Revenue</i>	\$34,200	\$34,200	\$68,400	\$68,400	\$68,400	\$68,400	\$342,000
<i>Actual Tuition Revenue</i>	\$47,880	\$41,040	\$90,630	\$76,950	\$82,080	\$58,140	\$396,720
<i>Projected Expenses</i>	\$18,667	\$18,667	\$18,667	\$18,667	\$18,667	\$18,667	\$112,002
<i>Actual Expenses</i>	\$18,667	\$22,567	\$18,667	\$22,567	\$45,233	\$45,233	\$172,934
<i>Projected Net</i>	\$15,533	\$15,533	\$49,733	\$49,733	\$49,733	\$49,733	\$229,998
<i>Actual Net</i>	\$29,213	\$18,473	\$71,963	\$54,383	\$36,847	\$12,907	\$223,783

Table 3: Comparison of Actual and Projected Finances Resulting in Operation of the M.S. in Organizational Leadership Degree Program

The Success of Program Delivery

The success of program delivery, advising support for students, and acceleration of courses are measured by student learning outcomes and competency assessments. Other academic and student services aspects of the program being assessed and improved through feedback using a wide range of tools include:

- Evaluations are completed by students for every course. The evaluation is composed of 20 questions to assess 1) course organization, 2) student assessment methods, 3) the faculty, 4) course materials, and 5) students services. Although there is not enough data to do true factor analysis, overall, students are satisfied with their educational and learning experience.
- Periodic phone calls and email to individual students and to student groups request feedback on specific aspects of the program, including the hybrid and accelerated components, systems reliability and availability, convenience and value of on-ground sessions, workload and learning compared to traditional fifteen week, on-ground courses, and overall design and organization of the program. Students have been open and forthcoming, providing many constructive comments and suggestions.
- We have or will assess student knowledge and growth in each required course relative to these Measurable Performance Criteria in four ways:
 1. Student Surveys: Students are asked to indicate how well each course was designed to help students grow in the Measurable Performance Criteria to which the course is mapped
 2. Surveys of Course Faculty: Faculty are asked to assess student competency as demonstrated in each course relative to the Measurable Performance Criteria to which the course is mapped
 3. Assessment of portfolios of student work in each of the courses relative to the Measurable Performance Criteria to which each course is mapped—this assessment is done by faculty who are members of the Organizational Leadership Curriculum Committee, but not faculty in the assessed courses
 4. Employer Surveys: Employers who agree to participate will be asked to reflect upon student/employee growth relative to the Measurable Performance Criteria for the program.
- Direct observation of student behavior and performance in both on-ground and online environments—by the Dean and Executive Director
- Student retention data
- A Capstone Course (OL 690—which will be offered for the first time in November, 2006) pulling together the Educational Objectives, Learning Outcomes, and Measurable Performance Criteria for the program into a leadership consulting project that will be assessed relative to Measurable Performance Criteria for the program

- Interviews and surveys of graduates and alumni (beginning with the first graduating class)

The overall conclusions of these various assessment efforts relative to Program Delivery are as follows:

- Students are generally highly satisfied the program. Surveys indicate that students agree or strongly agree that courses are clearly organized, are presented with rigor and appropriate levels of student contact, and cover concepts that are highly relevant to their work. Student evaluated 75% of the questions directly related to the quality of the program as “agree” or “strongly agree” that the goal was achieved. Students did not response “disagree” or “strongly disagree” to any of the questions. Students offer many suggestions in the narrative section of the evaluation, many of which have been used to improve the program.
- Faculty are comfortable with the accelerated format, most having previously taught accelerated courses at Quinnipiac, either over the summer term or in the University’s on-ground accelerated courses offered during the school year. They indicate that the total material covered, learning outcomes targeted, and workload are comparable to those expected in a traditional fifteen week on-ground course.
- Faculty undergo training (including shadowing a course) for teaching online and most have previously taught online. Like students, faculty indicate that the total material covered, learning outcomes targeted, and workload are comparable to those expected in an on-ground course.
- Retention has been good since the beginning of the program in fall 2005. Of the total number of students who started in one of the first three cohorts in the master’s program since fall 2005, retention has been 87%. Since students frequently take a break from their studies, retention was calculated based on who we know dropped their degree program.

Advising Support for Students

Prospective students are encouraged to set up in an advising session to explore the appropriateness of the program to their career goals. Advising sessions are given over the phone or in-person.

Students participating in an advising session are offered

- An overview of all aspects of the program,
- Discussion of student comfort with technology, hybrid learning and accelerated courses, and
- Discussion and development of a plan for completion of a degree.

Once enrolled, students call or email advisors with advising questions at a rate of approximately one such contact for each student every two terms.

All advising of graduate students has been done by the Executive Director of Organizational Leadership programs with support from the Assistant Director of Admissions and Advising.

The Success of Accelerated Courses

The accelerated aspect of program delivery is very important to our students because it allows them to focus on classes when they are taking classes and take a term off when they know that work or life will be interfering with classes. They indicate they might typically miss several meetings over 15 week programs due to travel for work or personal issues. However, they are better able to schedule around 7 week terms so that they do not miss any of the Saturday sessions in the accelerated format. They also typically take terms off as needed for personal and professional reasons.

The hybrid nature of courses in the program also contributes to this higher participation rate, and is appreciated by the students. Online training materials and technology training sessions during orientation have supported student proficiency and comfort in the online components of the program. As indicated in the overall conclusions above, all assessment and feedback indicates that students are satisfied with the accelerated hybrid delivery model,

Educational Objectives by Course

The Master of Science in Organizational Leadership program is designed around Educational Objectives in the areas of:

- Interpersonal and Communication Skills
- Self Awareness and Growth
- Understanding, Interpreting, and Using Data to Improve Performance
- Understanding and Leading Organizations and Complex Teams
- Strategic Analysis and Implementation
- Ethics of Leadership

Required courses are mapped to the Educational Objectives as indicated in the grid below.

Required Courses	Interpersonal and Communication Skills	Self Awareness and Growth	Understanding, Interpreting, and Using Data to Improve Performance	Understanding and Leading Organizations and Complex Teams	Strategic Analysis and Implementation	Ethics of Leadership
OL 601-Foundations of Organizational Leadership	X	X		X	X	X
OL 610-The Power and Politics of Communication	X		X			X
OL 615-Leadership Across Boundaries	X	X		X	X	X
OL 620-Leading through metrics-based results			X		X	X
OL 630-Performance Management	X	X	X	X	X	X
OL 640-Collaborative Project Management	X		X	X	X	X
OL 650-Leading Organizational Change	X	X		X	X	X
OL 690-Leadership Consulting	X	X	X	X	X	X

4. Faculty Hiring and Participation

In 2004, the College of Professional Studies hired the Executive Director of Organizational Leadership Programs who has a doctorate in organizational behavior, and corporate and academic experience in leadership to teach, work on and oversee course development, and serve as executive director of the program.

The Executive Director has developed or overseen development of all courses for the program, with the support of full time faculty from throughout the University, who make up the Organizational Leadership curriculum committee. All faculty teaching in the program, whether full time or part time, have significant professional experience, have been approved for teaching by faculty and department chairs in the relevant fields, and have undergone several hours of faculty development in support of their success in the hybrid environment and in understanding and supporting the specified student learning outcomes.

The College has had some staffing changes in the last year. Last spring, the College hired two Associate Directors, one has an earned doctorate and one is expected to complete her doctorate in November 2006. The Associate Directors have teaching, administrative and undergraduate advising responsibilities. In addition, the College hired a new Dean who will head the College of Professional Studies in addition to assuming teaching responsibilities. The Dean has a Ph.D. and extensive experience in administration of graduate and professional studies, distance education and programs for adult learners.

APPENDIX: Master of Science in Organizational Leadership

Program Objectives, Outcomes, and Performance Criteria

Educational Objective

Learning Outcome Areas

Measurable Performance Criteria

I. Interpersonal and Communication Skills

Written and Oral Communication

1. Prepares and delivers concise, clear and smooth presentations
2. Conveys information in a clear and effective manner
3. Discussion responses are consistently stated clearly and integrate course material or other students' comments.

Relationship Building

1. Demonstrates consideration for opinions and feelings of others.
2. Motivates while directing others in team efforts.
3. Develops and maintains cooperative working relationships with peers and others.

Conflict Management

1. Uses conflict or dissent productively
2. Arrives at constructive solutions while maintaining positive relationships
3. Understands the role of conflict

II. Self Awareness and Growth

Perception and Self-Concept (reflection)

1. Recognizes one's own strengths and weaknesses
2. Gathers and reviews others' perception of self
3. Understands the impact of self concept and one's ability/willingness to take risks and/or engage in high performance
4. Recognizes the impact of one's own ethical standards on behavior

Self-development /Self-improvement

1. Understands one's own cognitive style, attitudes, and behavior
2. Engages in activities that are considered "stretch" and/or require change
3. Creates personal development plan

III. Understanding, Interpreting, and Using Data to Improve Performance

Data Gathering and Analysis

1. Prepares a plan for effective data gathering
2. Data is organized and presented in a way that allows for accurate analysis
3. Accurately interprets data that relates to performance improvement

Linking Data to Performance

1. Appreciates the limitations for improving someone else's performance
2. Understands how data can be utilized to support evidence of developmental areas.

<u>Educational Objective</u>	<u>Learning Outcome Areas</u>	<u>Measurable Performance Criteria</u>
IV. Understanding and Leading Organizations and Complex Teams	<i>Team Development and Management</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Practices the principles of effective teamwork in an effort to achieve specific goals or objectives 2. Appreciates various types of diversity as a team enhancer 3. Applies conflict management techniques in team situations
	<i>Organizational Analysis and Development</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Uses financial and quantitative information to help develop organizational profile and/or perform needs assessment 2. Utilizes benchmarking and other competitive analysis techniques to perform organizational analysis 3. Utilizes organizational assessment tools to determine organizational needs for increased effectiveness and efficiency.
	<i>Leadership</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Uses influence techniques effectively 2. Coaches others in an appropriate manner 3. Distinguishes between when it is appropriate to empower and when authority should be imposed.
V. Strategic Analysis and Implementation	<i>Situational Analysis</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draws accurate conclusions based on any changes in data or situation 2. Uses SWOT method effectively 3. Applies analytical tools effectively and efficiently
	<i>Strategy Development</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considers a broad range of factors when problem solving and decision making 2. Identifies critical success factors for strategic planning 3. Demonstrates knowledge of steps involved in the strategic planning process
	<i>Strategic Implementation</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Adjusts actions and decisions for focus on critical strategic issues 2. Explains or recommends what appropriate infrastructures should be in place when introducing new plans, practices and/or policies 3. Recognizes or creates appropriate implementation steps for introducing new plans, practices and/or policies

VI. Leadership Ethics

Acting with Integrity

1. Understands the impact of the lack of moral management
2. Applies ethical principles to actions of individuals
3. Demonstrates principled leadership

Developing organization-wide ethics

1. Recognizes or establishes an organizational code of ethics
2. Leads others by modeling ethical behavior and making sound ethical judgments
3. Understands and applies stages of moral development

Trust building

1. Shows consistency among principles, values and behavior
2. Consistently demonstrates follow through on commitments
3. Establishes trust via open and honest feedback

INFORMATION ITEM: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

Item: University of Phoenix, Norwalk Campus

When the Board of Governors for Higher Education licensed the University of Phoenix to offer courses in Connecticut, the Board of Governors required the University to affirm to the Department of Higher Education the progress the University has made in its implementation of its Library Plan for the proposed Norwalk campus and fulfillment of its commitment to create and sustain an appropriate and adequate on-site library – with core and supporting collections – to support all of the programs licensed for the University’s proposed Norwalk campus; its fulfillment of its commitment to hire eleven full-time faculty members, one for each of the programs to be offered at the Norwalk campus; and its implementation, in Norwalk, of its newly-created University College curriculum.

This is an update informational report to the Board of Governors for Higher Education about the University of Phoenix facility in Norwalk.

The University has established a Connecticut campus at 535 Connecticut Avenue, Suite 400, in Norwalk. The visit to that facility by the Department of Higher Education resulted in the finding that the newly-established campus meets the standards of an educational center in Connecticut.

The Norwalk campus includes a dedicated library which is open during the day and during the evenings. The University of Phoenix has committed \$100,000 annually to the library in Norwalk, including \$25,000 annually to build the core collection.

During that visit, the Department of Higher Education raised a question about the lack of a “wet lab” at the University of Phoenix’s Norwalk campus. The Department’s representative affirmed with representatives of the University of Phoenix that all appropriate general education courses must be available to students who enroll in any undergraduate program offered in Connecticut. Those students, for example, who have no former undergraduate credits must have access to science courses and to laboratories, as appropriate, as they work toward completing their degrees.

The University of Phoenix noted that the typical University of Phoenix student enters the University with a significant number of General Education transfer credits from one or from many institutions. Included in the transfer credits the University may accept are courses that may have required laboratory work. For this reason, the University has not offered lab-based courses in the natural and physical sciences at its campuses throughout the country, though it does offer science survey courses that do not require laboratory work. This is why the University’s facility in Norwalk does not have a “wet lab” facility.

The Department of Higher Education was pleased to note that the University of Phoenix is aware of the Department's expectation that the University will need to reassess its current practices in the event that the University begins to admit a large number of undergraduate students with no prior college credits, or students who are directly out of high school and who need to take their entire General Studies credits before enrolling in their major course of study. The Department noted, too, that if the University starts to enroll such beginning college students, the University will reconsider its curriculum, facilities and services to ensure that they are appropriate for those students, their present careers, and their future career goals. This may include the addition of appropriate science laboratory facilities.

The University of Phoenix assured the Department of Higher Education that it will make appropriate accommodations for its students and that it will provide facilities, curriculum and services which meet the standards of the Board of Governors for Higher Education.

STAFF REPORT: FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Constituent Units: University of Connecticut
University of Connecticut Health Center
Connecticut State University
Community-Technical Colleges
Board for State Academic Awards

Item: Operating Fund Quarterly Reports for the Twelve-Month Period
Ending June 30, 2006

Executive Summary

Public Act 91-256 requires the constituent units of higher education to submit quarterly reports on operating fund expenditures. The Board is to complete its quarterly review and report its findings to the Office of Policy and Management and the Higher Education and Appropriations Committees of the General Assembly within 60 days of the close of each quarter.

The University of Connecticut recorded 102.7 percent of budgeted revenue through the end of the fiscal year and expended 102.0 percent of budgeted expenditures. The University reports an operating fund balance of \$43.3 million and a research fund balance of \$15.1 million as of June 30, 2005, not including accrued compensated absences totaling \$24.8 million. The University reports an un-audited operating fund loss of \$3.5 million and a research fund gain of \$2.5 million for a combined \$1.0 million loss. This will reduce the estimated June 30, 2006 operating fund balance to \$39.8 million and increase the research fund balance to \$17.6 million, not including estimated accrued compensated absences of \$23.3 million. (See Attachments A1 through A3.)

The University of Connecticut Health Center recorded 98.9 percent of budgeted revenue through the end of the year and expended 100.0 percent of budgeted expenditures. As of June 30, 2005, the Health Center reports an operating fund balance of \$30.1 million, not including the accrued compensated absences total of \$20.2 million. The Health Center currently projects an operating fund balance reduction of \$1.1 million for a new balance of \$29.0 million. (See Attachments B1 and B3.)

The Connecticut State University recorded 102.8 percent of budgeted revenue through the end of the fiscal year and expended 101.9 percent of budgeted expenditures. The State University reports an operating fund balance of \$10.0 million as of June 30, 2005, not including the accrued compensated absences total of \$29.1 million, and leaves the projected the fund balance at \$7.7 million as originally planned for June 30, 2006 with an update pending completion of the audited financial statements in December. (See Attachments C1 through C3.)

The Community-Technical College System recorded 104.7 percent of budgeted revenue through the end of the fiscal year and expended 103.3 percent of budgeted expenditures.

The community colleges report an operating fund balance of \$15.5 million as of June 30, 2005, not including the accrued compensated absences total of \$33.4 million, and project the fund balance will decrease slightly to \$14.1 million as of June 30, 2006. (See Attachments D1 through D3.)

Charter Oak State College and the Connecticut Distance Learning Consortium are the two entities that make up the Board for State Academic Awards (BSAA). The BSAA recorded 109.0 percent of budgeted revenue through the fiscal year and expended 93.1 percent of budgeted expenditures. The BSAA ended the fiscal year with a consolidated fund balance of \$2.69 million, an increase of just over \$800,000 from the June 30, 2005 fund balance. (See Attachments E1 through E3.)

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Governors approve the operating fund quarterly reports for the twelve-month period ending June 30, 2006, for the University of Connecticut, University of Connecticut Health Center, Connecticut State University, Community-Technical College System and Board for State Academic Awards for submission to the Office of Policy and Management and the Appropriations and Education Committees.

9/20/06

Background

Public Act 91-256 requires the constituent units of higher education to submit quarterly reports on operating fund expenditures. These reports must be submitted to the Office of Policy and Management and the Appropriations Committee through the Board of Governors in a format determined by the Board.

Please note that the financial information contained in the comparisons of budgeted versus actual revenues and expenditures is reported on a cash basis unless otherwise noted (all receipts and disbursements in the current year regardless of which fiscal year earned or obligated). Included on these statements is a beginning and ending cash balance (cash on hand at a point-in-time, not to be confused with fund balance). The cash basis was adopted because it could be readily provided by all units, and it would allow the Office of Policy and Management to reconcile with records maintained by the State Comptroller. A separate statement on operating fund balances (the excess of assets over liabilities, or equity) is provided by the units, when available.

University of Connecticut

Operating Budget -- (Attachment A1)

The University of Connecticut's budget for FY 2006 included \$798.2 million in revenues and \$806.3 million in expenditures and transfers for a planned loss of \$8.0 million. This net loss was comprised of a \$1.0 million gain to repay the reserve for the November 2001 drawdown of \$11.5 million for the Towers Dining Center and Student Union and \$9.0 million of additional equipment expenditures carried forward, along with the attendant revenue, from FY 2005. The operating budget was comprised of \$205.2 million in state appropriations, \$511.7 million in other operating revenues, of which approximately \$75.8 million was budgeted as the University's allotment of fringe benefit expenditures for employees funded by the general fund, and \$81.4 million of research fund revenues.

Budgeted operating fund expenditures and transfers totaled \$724.9 million and research expenditures totaled \$81.4 million. The budget included mandatory transfers of \$19.8 million for debt service and non-mandatory transfers of \$5.7 million from auxiliary enterprises to the University's plant fund to support various capital improvement programs.

Through the end of the year, the University recorded \$736.1 million or 102.7 percent of budgeted operating revenue. The appropriation accounted for 101.7 percent of the budgeted State funding, while other operating fund revenue represents 103.3 percent of the remaining revenue. The appropriation ended the year \$4.7 million above plan as a result of additional support to cover the first of three payments to retired employees under the Early Retirement Incentive Program (ERIP) and general fund accruals not previously reported. Tuition revenue collections were 99.8 percent of budget and reflected a 5.6 percent rate increase coupled with a 2.9 percent increase in undergraduate

students. Fee revenue was 2.4 percent above budget as a result of higher than planned course fee revenue as well as increased General University and Infrastructure Maintenance Fee income. Grants and contracts revenue was above plan by \$7.6 million due to higher than planned private sponsored activity. Investment income exceeded the full-year budget by \$8.2 million due to a combination of increased interest rates and larger cash balances resulting from more timely fringe benefit transfers. The additional revenue was instrumental in reducing the size of the projected net loss, helping to offset increases in energy costs. Auxiliary Enterprise revenue was 97.9 percent of budget due to rebates given to residential students to compensate them for early housing closure necessitated by additional code compliance construction. Research revenue of \$70.0 million represented 86.0 percent of budget. This is a reflection of the continued decline in federal grant funding.

Operating fund expenditures and transfers of \$739.6 million represented 102.0 percent of the total budgeted expenditures of \$724.9 million, and research expenditures of \$67.5 million represent 82.9 percent of budget. The decrease in research expenditures was due to the departure of faculty as a result of ERIP, the time delay in research start-ups for new faculty and reduced federal grant activity. At the end of the year, the percentage of the budget expended by major area was as follows:

Personal Services	103.8%
Fringe Benefits	98.2%
Other Expenses	98.8%
Equipment	92.5%
Student Aid	96.8%

All spending was generally within historical limits except energy costs which were notably ahead of budget due to the increased unit price for electricity and gas, and the transitional position of the University's cogeneration plant project. In addition, personal services expenditures were ahead of budget due to the hiring of 51 additional full-time faculty to meet the course coverage demands of increased undergraduate enrollment and 64 full-time non-faculty staff. These additions were funded through internal reallocation of funds and the faculty additions have contributed to a slight decrease in the student/faculty ratio. The operating fund equipment budget of \$16.0 million was a substantial increase over previous years and, as noted previously, reflected the anticipated expenditure of \$9.0 million of unexpended equipment purchases carried forward from FY 2005. Full year equipment spending was under budget, however, due to much lower than planned Auxiliary Enterprise equipment purchases and \$42.6 million in designated equipment funding that was not spent will be carried forward to 2007.

Collective bargaining settlements are reflected in budgeted and actual revenues and expenditures.

Overall, there was a projected net increase to the operating cash balance of \$3.1 million, for an estimated total cash balance of \$96.4 million at the end of the year.

Projected Fund Balance – (Attachment A2)

The University reported an unaudited operating fund balance of \$43.3 million as of June 30, 2005. In FY 2006, the operating fund balance is projected to decrease by \$3.5 million to \$39.8 million, not including accrued compensated absences of \$23.3 million.

Unit Comments – (Attachment A3)

As part of the expanded quarterly report process, each unit agreed to include a brief narrative that highlights major programmatic and financial issues. This can be found on attachment A3.

University of Connecticut Health Center

Operating Budget -- (Attachment B1)

The University of Connecticut Health Center's operating budget for FY 2006 included \$634.5 million in revenues and \$633.8 million in expenditures, generating a planned surplus of \$0.7 million. The budget included a \$76.0 million general fund appropriation, \$281.4 million in net patient care, \$98.6 million in research grants and contracts, \$30.9 million in income from interns and residents and \$84.2 million for the Correctional Managed Health Care Program.

Budgeted expenditures were comprised of \$212.4 million in academic expenditures, \$371.9 million in clinical expenditures and \$50.1 million in operating support. Academic expenditures included research as well as the medical and dental schools. Clinical expenditures included the John Dempsey Hospital, the UConn Medical Group and the Correctional Managed Care Health Program.

At the end of the year, the Health Center recorded \$627.5 million, or 98.9 percent of budgeted revenue. General fund revenue, including the fringe benefit allotment, accounted for \$101.9 million or 99.3 percent of total budgeted general fund revenue and other revenue was \$522.6 million or 98.3 percent of the total budgeted. Other revenue was significantly lower than the historical trend due largely to low patient volumes in the first half of the year, increased external market competition, such as expanded cardiology programs at New Britain and Waterbury hospitals, and a change in referral patterns from the Department of Veterans Affairs. A corrective action and remediation plan was implemented, which was partly responsible for improved results at John Dempsey Hospital that continue into the 2007 fiscal year. In addition, research awards were down 6.3 percent in 2005 and an additional 5.2 percent in 2006. It is most troubling that the decline was in the federal line, which contained the facilities and administrative cost add-on. This means that funding for indirect costs that was counted on in the plan was lost and department reserve funds had to be used to close the gap. Finally, medical malpractice reserves had to be increased by an unplanned \$8.1 million to cover the potential impact of claims. Although new claims were down, the first eight figure

settlement in a Connecticut malpractice suit drove the actuarial formula for malpractice reserves higher, calling for the large infusion of funds.

Operating expenditures of \$634.4 million represent 100.1 percent of the total budgeted. Through the end of the year, the percentage of the budget expended by major area is as follows:

Personal Services	100.3%
Fringe Benefits	95.7%
Other Expenses	105.3%
Medical/Dental House Staff	95.7%

All categories were generally in line with historic spending patterns. However, the revenue shortages coupled with the infusion of funds to the malpractice reserve were the major contributors to the operating loss of \$6.9 million, compared to a planned gain of \$655,000. The primary causes of the deficiency were revenue shortages in clinical operations (\$4.2 million), where surpluses generally offset academic and operating support losses and research operations (\$1.8 million). Additional malpractice and energy overages were offset by Medicare and Medicaid cost settlements.

Overall, there was a net decrease to the operating cash balance of \$6.9 million, for an estimated total cash balance of \$19.9 million as of the end of the year.

Projected Fund Balances – (Attachment B2)

As of the June 30, 2005 there was an operating fund balance of \$30.1 million, an all funds balance of \$73.1 million, not including the accrued compensated absences total of \$20.2 million, and investments in plant of \$115.8 million. At the end of the year the Health Center is projecting an operating fund balance of \$29.0 million and an all funds balance of \$81.0 million, excluding the accrued compensated absences total of \$19.0 million, and investments in plant of \$114.4 million.

Unit Comments -- (Attachment B3)

As part of the expanded quarterly report process, each unit agreed to include a brief narrative that highlights major programmatic and financial issues. This can be found with attachment B3.

Connecticut State University

Operating Budget -- (Attachment C1)

The Connecticut State University's operating budget for FY 2006 included \$492.0 million in revenues and \$494.4 million in expenditures generating a planned deficit of \$2.4 million. The operating budget included \$145.7 million in state appropriations, \$63.3 million in fringe benefit allotments for employees paid by the general fund and \$283.0 million in operating revenues. The state appropriation included an estimate for the ERIP payout of \$1.9 million which was subsequently issued at \$1.5 million or \$393,526 less than budgeted.

At the close of the fiscal year, Connecticut State University recorded \$506.0 million in operating budget revenue or 102.8 percent of budgeted revenue. The state appropriation accounted for \$145.5 million or 99.9 percent of budget and the fringe benefit allotment was \$62.9 million or 99.4 percent of budget. Other operating revenue was \$297.6 million or 105.2 percent of the total budgeted. Tuition and fee revenue collections exceeded the budget by \$2.8 million due to a 1.8 percent increase in FTE enrollment over plan. However, extension fees were under plan by \$4.1 million or 7.0 percent as part time enrollment declined for the fifth straight year. Grant revenues from federal financial aid exceeded plan by \$4.9 million or 15.5 percent. Other revenue exceeded plan by \$10.5 million primarily due to higher interest income from improving rates along with higher than planned program income, ticket sales, library fines, athletic revenue, and sale of equipment.

Operating expenditures at the end of the fiscal year were \$504.0 million or 101.9 percent of the total budgeted expenditures. The percentage of the budgeted amount expended by major category is as follows:

Personal Services	100.6%
Fringe Benefits	96.5%
Other Expenses	107.0%
Equipment	121.5%
Student Aid	114.4%

Personal services and fringe benefits spending were consistent with prior year trends, however, fringes are slightly lower than budgeted due to the employee mix. Other expenses exceeded plan by 7.0 percent with the majority attributable to climbing utility costs throughout the year. Equipment and library acquisitions spending also exceeded budget as several universities purchased additional needed equipment. Spending on student aid exceeded plan due to additional grant revenue and increased enrollment.

The operating fund cash balance as of June 30, 2005 was \$81.9 million. Through the end of the fiscal year, there was a net increase to the cash balance of \$12.0 million bringing the total to \$93.9 million.

Projected Fund Balance -- (Attachment C2)

The State University recorded an operating fund balance of \$10.0 million as of June 30, 2005, not including the accrued compensated absences totaling \$29.1 million. For FY 2006, the estimated operating fund balance remained at the projected level of \$7.7 million reflecting a decrease of \$2.4 million as was originally planned. The University will update the fund balance statement upon completion of the FY 2006 independent financial statement audit at the end of December 2006.

Unit Comments -- (Attachment C3)

As part of the expanded quarterly report process, each unit agreed to include a brief narrative which highlights major programmatic and financial issues. This can be found on Attachment C3.

Community-Technical College System

Operating Budget -- (Attachment D1)

The Community-Technical College System's operating budget for FY 2006 included \$337.6 million in revenues and \$337.3 million in expenditures, leaving a planned surplus of about \$329,000. The original revenue budget was comprised of \$134.3 million in state appropriations, fringe benefits of \$56.2 million for employees paid by the general fund and \$146.2 million in operating revenues. During the fiscal year, the state appropriation increased by \$1.5 million to \$135.8 million to reflect the first of three payouts to employees who retired under the 2003 Early Retirement Incentive Plan (ERIP) and a collective bargaining adjustment .

At the close of the fiscal year, the System recorded \$353.5 million in operating budget revenue or 104.7 percent of total budgeted revenue. The state appropriation accounted for \$135.8 million or 101.1 percent of the budgeted state appropriation. Other operating revenue was \$217.7 million or 107.1 percent of the total budgeted. Tuition revenue collections, at 100.5 percent of budget, reflected a 5.7 percent increase in tuition coupled with fall and spring FTE enrollment increases of 2.1 and 2.0 percent, respectively. Government grants, which are primarily made up of federal financial aid, finished the year at 113.1 percent of budget and have exceeded plan by \$4.6 million. Private grants were 155.5 percent of the adjusted budget and included receipt of funding for scholarship aid, foundation and hospital supported nursing programs and other private support for various academic initiatives. All other revenue also exceeded plan primarily because of higher than anticipated interest income.

Operating expenditures at the end of the fiscal year were \$348.3 million or 103.3 percent of the total budgeted expenditures. The percentage of the budgeted amount expended by major category is as follows:

Personal Services	100.9%
Fringe Benefits	105.7%
Other Expenses	104.2%
Equipment	176.0%
Student Aid	106.1%

All expenditure categories were generally in line with historic spending patterns with the exception of equipment which reflected carry-forward spending from the FY 2005 budget as well as a large unanticipated expenditure to repair the roof at Three Rivers since deferred maintenance bond funds were not available. Other expense exceeded the budget due to energy cost increases of 24 percent over the previous year. Student aid expenditures exceeded plan by 6.1 percent or \$2.6 million due to higher than planned federal financial aid and enrollment.

The operating fund cash balance as of June 30, 2005 was \$64.9 million. Through the end of the fiscal year, there was a net increase to the cash balance of \$6.7 million bringing the total to \$71.6 million.

Projected Fund Balance -- (Attachment D2)

The Community-Technical College System’s fund balance for FY 2005 was \$15.5 million, excluding accrued compensated absences of \$33.4 million. In FY 2006, the System is estimating a small decrease of \$1.4 million to the fund balance bringing it to \$14.1 million excluding the accrued compensated absence liability and pending completion of the audited financial statements in early 2007.

Unit Comments -- (Attachment D3)

As part of the expanded quarterly report process, each unit agreed to include a brief narrative which highlights major programmatic and financial issues. This can be found on Attachment D3.

Board for State Academic Awards

Operating Budget -- (Attachment E1)

General fund appropriations, as well as operating fund resources, were included within BSAA’s operating fund. The operating budget for FY 2006 included \$7.67 million in revenues and \$8.12 million in expenditures, indicating a planned deficit of just under \$450,000 for a host of initiatives including a new student information system. The budget was comprised of \$2.24 million in general fund appropriations, \$1.65 million for Charter Oak State College and \$.59 million for the Connecticut Distance Learning Consortium. Operating revenues were budgeted at \$5.43 million and operating expenditures were budgeted at \$5.87 million.

At the close of the fiscal year, the BSAA recorded \$8.37 million in operating budget revenue or 109.0 percent of total budgeted revenue. General fund revenue was \$2.24 million or 100.0 percent of the total budget, and other operating revenue totaled \$6.12 million or 112.7 percent of total budget. At Charter Oak, revenues exceeded plan by 18 percent or \$736,000, and were driven by the continued growth in Charter Oak’s distance learning program where course enrollment grew 47 percent. Also contributing was a large payment for services from the Bridgepoint Education Partnership which was phased out. The CTDLC increased all other revenues, the majority of which was instructional design and technical services for clients, by 33 percent or \$233,000 above last year and nearly met its aggressive budget targets.

Operating expenditures at the end of the fiscal year were \$7.56 million or 93.1 percent of total budgeted expenditures. The percentage of the budgeted amount expended by major category is as follows:

Personal Services	95.6%
Fringe Benefits	87.1%
Other Expenses	94.4%
Equipment	49.3%
Student Aid	124.7%

In general, expenditures ended the year slightly behind for several reasons: leased space and tenant fit-out at Alumni Road was delayed until FY 2007 along with the data center expansion project, delays in hiring personnel and the late start on implementation of the new Jenzabar student information system. Personal services expenditures and fringe benefits were in line with historic spending as was student aid.

The increase in revenues and reduction in expenditures caused by the delay of those projects mentioned above allowed Charter Oak to end the year with a surplus rather than the planned use of reserves. Overall, the net increase to the operating cash balance at the end of the fiscal year was about \$806,000, bringing the cash balance to \$2.69 million.

Projected Fund Balance -- (Attachment E2)

Charter Oak and the CTDLC ended the fiscal year with surpluses of \$641,000 and \$165,000. These surpluses resulted in an increase to the consolidated fund balance of \$806,000 for an end of year fund balance of \$2.69 million, excluding accrued compensated absences of approximately \$1.35 million.

Unit Comments -- (Attachment E3)

As part of the expanded quarterly report process, each unit agreed to include a brief narrative which highlights major programmatic and financial issues. This can be found on Attachment E3.

Commissioner's Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board of Governors approve the operating fund quarterly reports for the twelve-month period ending June 30, 2006, for the University of Connecticut, University of Connecticut Health Center, Connecticut State University, Community-Technical College System and Board for State Academic Awards for submission to the Office of Policy and Management and the Appropriations and Education Committees.

9/20/06

**University of Connecticut
Statement of Operating Budget Revenues and Expenses
for the Twelve Months Ending June 30, 2006**

	Operating Budget					Actual				
	Total	Research	Operating Fund			Total	Research	Operating Fund		
			Subtotal	E&G	Auxiliary Enterprise			Subtotal	E&G	Auxiliary Enterprise
Revenues										
State Appropriations (1)	\$ 205,219,028	\$ -	\$ 205,219,028	\$ 205,219,028	\$ -	\$ 210,541,682	\$ -	\$ 210,541,682	\$ 210,541,682	\$ -
Fringe Benefit Allotment	75,761,728	-	75,761,728	75,761,728	-	75,134,212	-	75,134,212	75,134,212	-
Tuition	166,972,831	-	166,972,831	162,829,701	4,143,130	166,647,868	-	166,647,868	162,504,738	4,143,130
Fees	68,429,495	-	68,429,495	50,278,783	18,150,712	70,065,810	-	70,065,810	51,915,098	18,150,712
Grants & Contracts	115,356,266	80,044,000	35,312,266	34,801,296	510,970	109,317,931	68,080,799	41,237,132	41,168,097	69,035
Endowment/Foundation	17,101,267	700,000	16,401,267	5,618,267	10,783,000	18,361,331	285,415	18,075,916	7,892,693	10,183,223
Investment Income	3,464,468	170,000	3,294,468	3,294,468	-	8,905,929	662,403	8,243,526	8,078,366	165,160
Sales & Services of Educ.	12,674,000	180,000	12,494,000	12,494,000	-	15,504,841	727,351	14,777,490	14,777,490	-
Auxiliary Enterprises	123,829,260	-	123,829,260	-	123,829,260	121,397,932	-	121,397,932	-	121,397,932
All Other Revenues	9,420,000	260,000	9,160,000	9,160,000	-	10,231,123	211,885	10,019,238	9,959,568	59,670
Total Revenue	\$ 798,228,342	\$ 81,354,000	\$ 716,874,342	\$ 559,457,270	\$ 157,417,072	\$ 806,108,659	\$ 69,967,853	\$ 736,140,806	\$ 581,971,944	\$ 154,168,862
Expenses										
Personal Services	\$ 371,919,984	\$ 40,133,001	\$ 331,786,983	\$ 289,258,134	\$ 42,528,849	\$ 378,916,119	\$ 34,675,685	\$ 344,240,434	\$ 303,622,702	\$ 40,617,732
Fringe Benefits	120,750,314	8,913,759	111,836,555	96,738,237	15,098,318	117,677,702	7,891,011	109,786,691	94,631,435	15,155,256
Other Expenses	196,134,898	25,927,879	170,207,019	100,347,971	69,859,048	187,776,060	19,661,273	168,114,787	101,783,850	66,330,937
Equipment	21,427,631	5,379,361	16,048,270	11,950,919	4,097,351	19,412,656	4,565,461	14,847,195	12,818,865	2,028,330
Student Aid (2)	70,550,444	1,000,000	69,550,444	60,490,444	9,060,000	68,199,927	896,905	67,303,022	58,909,524	8,393,498
Debt Service	19,782,956	-	19,782,956	8,691,477	11,091,479	19,201,166	67,244	19,133,922	8,085,996	11,047,926
Non-Mandatory Transfers	5,682,027	-	5,682,027	-	5,682,027	15,913,883	(281,415)	16,195,298	5,104,994	11,090,304
Total Expenses/Transfers	\$ 806,248,254	\$ 81,354,000	\$ 724,894,254	\$ 567,477,181	\$ 157,417,072	\$ 807,097,513	\$ 67,476,164	\$ 739,621,348	\$ 584,957,366	\$ 154,663,983
Adjustments	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Net Gain(Loss)	\$ (8,019,912)	\$ -	\$ (8,019,912)	\$ (8,019,911)	\$ -	\$ (988,854)	\$ 2,491,689	\$ (3,480,542)	\$ (2,985,422)	\$ (495,121)
Net Inc (Dec) to Cash										3,086,943
Cash Balance 6/30/05										93,354,266
Balance 6/30/06										96,441,209

(1) State Appropriation	205,219,028
A&R Settlement	7,615
ERIP Payout	573,234
Total Support	205,799,877

(2) An additional \$1.8 million of student labor financial aid is included in the personal services line.

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT
Statement of Changes in Fund Balance
FY 2006

	<u>Operating</u>	<u>Research</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Revenues and Expenditures</u>				
Revenues	\$ 736,140,806	\$ 69,967,853	\$ 210,992,183	\$ 1,017,100,842
Expenditures and Transfers	<u>739,621,349</u>	<u>67,476,164</u>	<u>195,816,485</u>	<u>1,002,913,999</u>
Net Increase (Decrease)	\$ (3,480,543)	\$ 2,491,689	\$ 15,175,699	\$ 14,186,843
<u>Fund Balance and Reserves</u>				
Fund Balance, 6/30/05				
Restricted/Capital Assets	\$ 11,757,758	\$ (1,863,667)	\$ 1,267,866,707	\$ 1,277,760,798
Unrestricted	<u>31,504,650</u>	<u>16,992,163</u>	<u>43,179,315</u>	<u>91,676,129</u>
Total	\$ 43,262,408	\$ 15,128,497	\$ 1,311,046,022	\$ 1,369,436,927
Compensated Absences	\$ 24,836,341			
Operating Change Restricted	\$ (458,128)	\$ 1,837,114	\$ 10,153,772	\$ 11,532,758
Unrestricted	<u>(3,022,415)</u>	<u>654,575</u>	<u>5,021,927</u>	<u>2,654,087</u>
Net Increase (Decrease)	\$ (3,480,543)	\$ 2,491,689	\$ 15,175,699	\$ 14,186,843
Fund Balance, 6/30/06				
Restricted/Capital Assets	\$ 11,299,630	\$ (26,553)	\$ 1,278,020,479	\$ 1,289,293,556
Unrestricted	<u>28,482,234</u>	<u>17,646,737</u>	<u>48,201,242</u>	<u>94,330,213</u>
Total	\$ 39,781,864	\$ 17,620,186	\$ 1,326,221,721	\$ 1,383,623,769
Compensated Absences	\$ 23,262,901			

University of Connecticut (Storrs & Regional Campuses)
Overview of the Quarterly Report of the Operating and Research Funds
Analysis of the Twelve Months Ended June 30, 2006

Results of Annual Operations

The enclosed report comparing the Operating and Research Funds actual results to budget for the twelve month period ended June 30, 2006 reflects unaudited figures and is subject to additional accounting year-end and audit adjustments.

The University ended the year with an unrestricted Operating Budget loss of \$2.4 million and a restricted gain of \$1.4 million. A summary analysis of the results of operations for various categories of accounts is presented below.

	<u>Operating Fund</u>	<u>Research Fund</u>	<u>Total</u>
Unrestricted	(\$3,022,416)	\$654,575	(\$2,367,841)
Restricted	<u>(458,128)</u>	<u>1,837,114</u>	<u>1,378,986</u>
Total	(\$3,480,543)	\$2,491,689	(\$988,854)

A more detailed review of FY 2006 operations is presented below.

Revenues – Operating Fund

Total **Operating fund** revenue collections for the year were \$736.1 million which represented 102.7% of the annual budget. A major source of revenue, **State Support** totaling \$285.7 million, consisted of a \$210.6 million appropriation and a fringe benefit allotment of \$75.1 million. State Support represented 38.8% of total Operating Fund receipts for the year. The net state support is a positive variance of \$4.7 million. This represents additional support to cover the first of three payments to retired employees for accrued sick and vacation time under the Early Retirement Incentive Program (ERIP) and accruals associated with the general fund appropriation. **Tuition** collections are the second largest source of revenue, totaling \$166.6 million, which represented 22.6% of total Operating Fund receipts for the year. Tuition revenue collections reflect a 5.6% rate increase coupled with a 2.9% increase in undergraduate degree seeking students who generate approximately 86% of actual tuition revenues.

Fee revenue is comprised of course fees from summer school, part-time, and non-degree students as well as self-supporting programs (off campus MBA, EMBA, etc.). Also included in this category is the General University Fee, which primarily supports four Auxiliary Enterprise programs and various other fees such as the Infrastructure Maintenance Fee, Application Fees and Late Payment Fees. Fee collections for fiscal year 2006 were \$70.1 million or 2.4% more than budget. This was primarily attributed to greater than budgeted course fee revenue as well as increased General University and Infrastructure Maintenance Fee income.

Auxiliary Enterprise Revenue of \$121.4 million represented 98% of the annual budgeted amount. Auxiliary revenue consists primarily of Room and Board Fees and Athletic Department receipts and is under budget primarily due to rebates given to residential students to compensate them for changes in their summer accommodations. Although the need for additional code compliance construction was discovered last year in residential facilities, it initially did not appear necessary to close the facilities early. However, early closure was necessary and therefore a refunding of fees was required.

The remaining revenue categories are (1) Grants and Contracts (non-research), (2) Investment Income, (3) Sales and Services of Educational Activities, and (4) Other Revenue (primarily parking, transit fee, and rental income).

Gifts, Grants and Contracts revenue consists of restricted revenues from a granting agency or private donor and gifts transferred from the UConn Foundation. At the end of fiscal year 2006, Gifts, Grants and Contracts revenue of \$59.3 million is ahead of budget by \$7.6 million. The state and federal grants and contracts were

