

January 2003

Minutes January 14, 2003

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/bot_agendas

Recommended Citation

"Minutes January 14, 2003" (2003). *Agendas and Minutes*. 3.
http://digitalcommons.uconn.edu/bot_agendas/3

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT

University of Connecticut
Rome Commons Ballroom
South Campus Complex
Storrs, Connecticut

January 14, 2003

OPEN SESSION

The meeting was called to order at 11:44 a.m. by Chairman Roger Gelfenbien. Trustees present were: James Abromaitis, Louise Bailey, Philip Barry, Linda Gatling, Christopher Hattayer, Lenworth Jacobs, Claire Leonardi, Michael Martinez, Frank Napolitano, Denis Nayden, Richard Twilley, and Brenda Sisco, who represents the Governor's Office.

Trustees William Berkley, Michael Cicchetti, Shirley Ferris, David O'Leary, Theodore Sergi, and Richard Treibick were absent from the meeting.

University staff and Senate representatives present were: President Austin, Chancellor and Provost for University Affairs Petersen, Vice President for Financial Planning and Management Aronson, Vice Chancellor for Business and Administration Dreyfuss, Vice Chancellor for Academic Administration Maryanski, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs Triponey, Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education Greger, Assistant Attorney General Shapiro, Dr. Schurin, University Architect Schilling, Faculty Senate Representative Kent Holsinger, and Ms. Locke.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On a motion by Ms. Leonardi, seconded by Ms. Bailey, **THE BOARD VOTED** to go into Executive Session at 11:45 a.m. to discuss a public safety contract for which the transaction has not been terminated, matters pertaining to law enforcement and law enforcement records where it was determined disclosure would not be in the public interest, and a matter pertaining to pending litigation. The Chairman noted that on the advice of counsel only staff members whose presence was necessary to provide their opinion would be permitted to attend Executive Session.

Trustees present were: Abromaitis, Bailey, Barry, Gatling, Gelfenbien, Hattayer, Jacobs, Leonardi, Martinez, Napolitano, Nayden, Twilley, and Brenda Sisco, who represents the Governor's Office.

President Austin, Chancellor and Provost for University Affairs Petersen, Vice President for Financial Planning and Management Aronson, Vice Chancellor for Business and Administration Dreyfuss, Health Center Chief Financial Officer Upton, Assistant Attorney General Shapiro, Assistant Attorney General McCarthy, Assistant Attorney General Kleinman, Dr. Schurin, Health Center Chief of Staff Carlson, Police Chief Hudd, Master Sergeant Moshier, University Architect Schilling, and Mr. Derek Dahlen and Mr. Steven Sandman from Dahlen, Berg & Co. were also present.

1. Close Executive Session and recess for lunch.

Executive Session ended at 12:25 p.m. and the Board returned to Open Session at 1:14 p.m. Trustees Cicchetti and Ferris participated by telephone. Trustee O'Leary, Executive Vice President for Health Affairs Deckers, Vice Provost for Multicultural Affairs Taylor, Athletic Director Perkins, and Faculty Senate Representatives Cameron Faustman and Robert Tilton joined the meeting at this time.

All actions taken were by unanimous vote of the Trustees present.

January 14, 2003

OPEN SESSION**1. Public Participation**

The following members of the public addressed the Board on the topic noted:

- Ms. Elizabeth Paterson, Bursar, University of Connecticut and Mayor, Town of Mansfield.
 - (1) Mayor Paterson responded to the University's response to the Environmental Impact Evaluation for the Graduate Student Apartments and Downtown Mansfield Master Plan Projects. Based upon a quick review of the University's response to the issues raised by the Town in their analysis of the EIE, she offered the following. She believed that most of the concerns of the Downtown Partnership and the Town of Mansfield have been addressed. She noted that any minor differences could be addressed through discussions among the Board of Directors of the Downtown Partnership. She expressed her commitment to the process that includes the public, and information sharing with the public in various steps that will be needed to reach their mutual goal, which is a downtown center that includes a multi-use mix of student housing, apartments, retail, office space, and other commercial and cultural developments. The document at first glance indicates that the University is committed to the same approach and goal. Mayor Paterson noted that the EIE is a comprehensive, well-researched document, which addresses the problems and concerns that have been previously discussed. The key at this point is to assure that the review process incorporates the mitigation measures identified in the report as evidenced by the level of participation by the parties involved and continued increase in the membership of the Downtown Partnership. This plan has strong and widespread support. Mayor Paterson also believes this to be an opportunity, not unlike UCONN 2000, to enhance and revitalize the community of Mansfield for the benefit of all participants, which includes the University, the Town of Mansfield, the business community, and the general public.

2. Chairman's Report

- (a) Minutes of the meeting of November 13, 2002

On a motion by Ms. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Nayden, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 13, 2002.

Chairman Gelfenbien asked that the minutes of the meeting of November 13, 2002 reflect a typographical error noted on page 8538 in the first sentence of the first paragraph of item 5(a) under the Financial Affairs report. The minutes incorrectly referred to the "Institutional Advancement" Committee instead of the "Financial Affairs" Committee.

- (b) Board recognition

Trustee Bailey read the following resolution in honor of Trustee Shirley Cole Ferris.

**SHIRLEY COLE FERRIS
1995-2003**

WHEREAS, Shirley Cole Ferris has announced her resignation as Connecticut's Commissioner of Agriculture effective March 1, 2003; and

January 14, 2003

WHEREAS, in leaving her position as Commissioner, Ms. Ferris will leave the University of Connecticut Board of Trustees; and

WHEREAS, as Commissioner of Agriculture and as a member of the Board, Shirley Cole Ferris has demonstrated a high commitment to the interests of Connecticut's farmers and consumers, the interests of the University's students, and, above all, to the highest standards of public service; and

WHEREAS, over the course of eight years, Commissioner Ferris has participated actively and constructively in the University's progress at a critical point in its history; and

WHEREAS, in addition to her general concerns with academic quality, fiscal responsibility, and excellence in research, Commissioner Ferris has displayed a particular interest in matters of historical preservation and effective land use; and

WHEREAS, Commissioner Ferris has been an excellent colleague whose presence on this Board will be sorely missed;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of the University of Connecticut records its gratitude to Shirley Cole Ferris for her distinguished service to this institution, and extends its best wishes for a happy and productive future as one of Connecticut's leading public citizens.

On a motion by Ms. Bailey, seconded by Dr. Jacobs, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the resolution for Shirley Cole Ferris.

Chairman Gelfenbien introduced Brenda Sisco, Legislative Director to Governor Rowland, who will replace Anne George as the Governor's representative to the Board.

(c) Consent Agenda Items:

Chairman Gelfenbien directed Trustee attention to a revised contract, item 6, which deals with Quinebaug Valley Youth & Family Services, who have changed their name to United Services, Inc.

On a motion by Mr. Martinez, seconded by Ms. Leonardi, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the following items listed on the Consent Agenda.

- (1) Contracts and Agreements for the Storrs-based programs (Attachment 1)
- (2) Master of Professional Studies Degree, with Fields of Study in Human Resources Management and Humanitarian Services Administration (Attachment 2)
- (3) Master of Arts Degree in Education Plus Recommendation for Teacher Certification at Stamford and the Tri-Campus (Attachment 3)

(d) Personnel matters (Storrs-based programs) (Attachment 4)

On a motion by Mr. Martinez, seconded by Mr. Twilley, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the personnel action recommendations.

- (1) Emeritus Faculty Retirements
- (2) Sabbatics
- (3) Informational matters

January 14, 2003

3. **President's Report**

President Austin directed Trustee attention to the notification of a bylaw change that would provide for a Fall Commencement (Attachment 5). He noted that the University Senate approved a calendar change several months ago, which would allow for a second Commencement ceremony. A Fall ceremony was highly desirable because of the University's increasing enrollment. This resolution is tabled until the next meeting of the Board in April.

President Austin noted that at the last meeting he updated the Board on the creation of a Substance Abuse Task Force. Since then Professor John DeWolf has agreed to Chair the Task Force, which is made up of faculty, administrators, students, the Head of Psychology at E.O. Smith High School, members of the Town of Mansfield administration, and several Health Center faculty members whose areas of expertise deal with addiction and alcohol abuse. He charged the Task Force with developing practical applications based on their experiences and expertise to identify ten or twelve tangible steps that can be applied to provide incentives if not barriers to inappropriate and illegal behavior. He noted that the legal and responsible use of alcohol is not something that the University is trying to discourage. Individuals can make their own judgments, but the University insists that it be done in a way that is both personally responsible and does not endanger the general social welfare. The Task Force will prepare a report within a few months.

President Austin directed Trustee attention to several recent articles from national publications. He was pleased to note that these publications choose to write stories about the University's progress and to make UConn more visible nationally.

He noted that later today the Board will have an opportunity to meet some of the University's most distinguished faculty members. Chancellor Petersen and Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education Janet Greger will introduce several faculty members that were able to attend the meeting.

President Austin reported that that he did not have any new information about the budget situation, but he was grateful for the support that Governor Rowland and the Legislative leadership have provided to the University not only in the capital budget, but in the University's operating budget. He noted that the reduction imposed on the University was less than that of other units of higher education.

President Austin asked Associate Vice President Thomas Callahan and Mr. Philip Lodewick to discuss the status of the Town of Mansfield project. He introduced Mr. Lodewick, who was former Chair of the UConn Foundation and currently serves as the President of the Mansfield Downtown Partnership Board of Directors.

Mr. Lodewick thanked the Board for the opportunity to profile the work of the Mansfield Downtown Partnership. About three years ago, he and President Austin discussed the importance of a strong downtown area surrounding the campus. Mr. Lodewick identified several of his colleagues on the Board of Directors that were present, including Mayor Betsy Paterson, Executive Director Cynthia van Zelm, Vice Chancellor Dale Dreyfuss, Associate Vice President Thomas Callahan, and *ex officio* member Chancellor John Petersen. He noted that the Mansfield Downtown Partnership is a combination of the University of Connecticut, the Town of Mansfield, and the business, civic, and community leadership of the Town. The Partnership consists of an 18-member Board that meets regularly once a month and a subcommittee structure that meets regularly outside the Board meetings.

He provided the Board an overview of the activities over the past two years and the plans for the next six to nine months. Over the past two years, the Board has organized and developed a mission statement, which

January 14, 2003

is to develop a vital, mixed-use core center within the Town of Mansfield. Specifically, the area being reviewed begins with the University Communications' building and extends South to the Plaza and stretching 35 acres behind the building formerly occupied by Husky Blues. Currently, there exist three strip malls, two of which are privately owned and will be integral to the future development of this project. The Board of Directors held public hearings and monthly meetings to gather community input. They also hired the consulting firm of Milone and MacBroom to help establish a concept master plan, which many have had an opportunity to review. Mr. Lodewick believed that they have developed a fairly broad consensus among the University, the Town, and the community that this project needed to move forward. There is some question about the site for graduate housing, but graduate housing and market-rate housing, and possibly life-style housing are also integral to a vital Town center. The Partnership views the center to be a place that will have retail shops, restaurants, and places to socialize, which is critically important to the University. University students need to have more places to go to outside of the Athletic fields and academic classrooms.

The master plan is not architecturally detailed, but it illustrates the types of uses, such as residential, retail, commercial space that will be flushed out more fully. The Town of Mansfield has designated the Partnership as a municipal development authority. Over the next six to nine months, the Partnership will work the firm Looney Ricks from Princeton to help them establish a development process. Mr. Lodewick noted that this firm is ideal, because Princeton has a vital town area. The process would include public input regarding the concept master plan, which will be worked into a full municipal development plan that the Town and the University would approve initially. Part of that process would be to engage private developers to join the team, who would be interested in this as a project to build and help through the process develop the full municipal development plan. In six to nine months, they anticipate to come back before the Board for approval of the plan and then to work with the Partnership to begin construction of the project.

Chairman Gelfenbien thanked Mr. Lodewick for his leadership.

- (a) Notification of Proposed Changes to the *University of Connecticut Laws and By-Laws* (Commencement) (Attachment 5)

On a motion by Dr. Jacobs, seconded by Ms. Bailey, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the notification of proposed changes (Article XVI) to the *University of Connecticut Laws and By-Laws*.

Trustee Leonardi asked if this ceremony would be similar to the Spring ceremony.

President Austin responded that he expected this Commencement to be similar to the spring ceremony, because these students and their families deserve the same attention.

Trustee Gatling asked if the ceremony would be held for undergraduates or graduates.

President Austin responded that the ceremony will be held for only undergraduate students at this time. Concerns have been raised about holding ceremonies outside, because of the weather in the spring. He noted that the University is constrained to multiple ceremonies until we can acquire comparable space to Gampel Pavilion or limit ticket distribution, which is not desirable.

- (b) Other matters

January 14, 2003

4. Academic Affairs Committee Report

(a) Committee Chairman's report on Committee activities

Dr. Jacobs reported that the Academic Affairs Committee met this morning and heard a presentation from Chancellor Petersen on the Academic Plan Task Force. The Committee reviewed the charge set forth by Chairman Gelfenbien to identify areas of excellence. Chancellor Petersen and the co-chairs of the Task Force, Associate Vice Chancellor Karla Fox and Dr. Richard Brown, reviewed the history of the University and have identified potential areas of emphasis to be integrated into the budgetary process.

Trustee Ferris joined the meeting at this time.

Dr. Jacobs noted that the Committee is satisfied that the issues and timetable are moving forward. The Committee discussed this topic at great length.

The Committee also heard a presentation about on-line courses, but ran out of time for questions. Vice-Chair Jacobs noted that there will be ongoing updates provided to the Board regarding on-line education.

(b) Item requiring Board discussion and approval:

- (1) Notification of Proposed Changes to the *University of Connecticut Laws and By-Laws* to Clarify the Definition and Terms of Appointment of Academic Department Heads (Attachment 6)

On a motion by Dr. Jacobs, seconded by Mr. Nayden, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the notification of proposed changes (Article XIV) to the *University of Connecticut Laws and By-Laws*.

5. Financial Affairs Committee Report

(a) Committee Chairman's report on Committee activities

Vice-Chair Nayden reported that the Financial Affairs Committee met this morning and discussed the current status of the balance of UCONN 2000 projects. The Committee also discussed the early planning stages for 21st Century UConn and ways to integrate the new infrastructure proposals with the academic resource requirements that will be proposed by the Chancellor's Academic Plan Task Force. He expects that the administration will achieve an integrated system of academic programming and infrastructure capital spending over the next four months, which the Board will have an opportunity to review.

In addition, there was a separate review of UCONN 2000 projects by the Program Review and Investigations Committee of the General Assembly. The Committee prepared a report, in which the University received a positive report regarding the management of the UCONN 2000 projects based on terms of cost, timeliness, and efficiency.

The Committee also heard a report from Police Chief Hudd regarding public safety and the statistics of criminal activity.

The Committee discussed deferred maintenance and follow through of UCONN 2000 projects. The Committee is confident that there are very strict criteria that monitor decisions related to health and safety issues for students, faculty, and staff.

January 14, 2003

(b) Item requiring Board discussion and approval:

- (2) Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE) Graduate Student Apartments and Downtown Mansfield Master Plan Projects (Attachment 7)

On a motion by Mr. Nayden, seconded by Ms. Leonardi, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the Environmental Impact Evaluation (EIE) for the proposed Graduate Student Apartments and Downtown Mansfield Master Plan Projects.

(Trustee Abromaitis abstained on this item.)

Chairman Gelfenbien introduced the following item that was added to the agenda.

On a motion by Mr. Nayden, seconded by Ms. Leonardi, **THE BOARD VOTED** to add to the agenda a resolution of the Board of Trustees to make a declaration of official intent pursuant to Section 1.150-2 of the Internal Revenue Service Regulations for reimbursement purposes for UCONN 2000 General Obligation Debt Service Commitment Bonds.

On a motion by Mr. Nayden, seconded by Ms. Leonardi, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve a resolution of the Board of Trustees to make a declaration of official intent pursuant to Section 1.150-2 of the Internal Revenue Service Regulations for reimbursement purposes for UCONN 2000 General Obligation Debt Service Commitment Bonds.

6. Health Center Board of Directors Committee Report

- (a) Committee Chairwoman's report on Committee activities

Vice-Chair Leonardi reported that the University of Connecticut Board of Directors met on December 9, 2002. She noted that the Board of Directors recently formed an additional subcommittee for Compliance, which will review the Compliance Program and serve as an advisory body to the administration.

The Committee heard a status report on the School of Medicine reorganization as well the Liaison Committee for Medical Education (LCME) Review. The Board was alerted that tuition increases will be under review.

The first item the Board approved was a joint venture agreement between the Health Center and Shields Imaging to provide high field, high resolution MRI services in selected Connecticut communities. This proposal will be sent to the Office of Health Care Access for a Certificate of Need.

The Board of Directors also approved the UConn Medical Group's Clinical Compensation Plan, which was described at the November meeting.

The Committee also discussed and finalized an agenda for the upcoming year, which will include specific issues to be discussed, such as the School of Medicine reorganization, Signature Program operation plans, Information Technology Plan, performance measures, capital plan, and budget issues.

Vice-Chair Leonardi directed Trustee attention to the notification of a change in the *University of Connecticut Laws and By-Laws* in Attachment 8. Currently the Board of Directors makes decisions as a committee of the whole, but there are several items that could be dealt more

January 14, 2003

efficiently and effectively at the subcommittee level. She noted that this change would also allow for more flexibility and a better examination of the issues. One of the most important issues would be to credential the clinical staff at the John Dempsey Hospital on a more regular basis, because until these staff appointments are approved, the physicians cannot charge for their services. Because the Board of Directors only meets four times a year, they have requested permission to delegate this action to the Clinical Affairs Committee, which will meet on a monthly basis.

(b) Items requiring Board discussion and approval:

- (1) Notification of Proposed Changes to the *University of Connecticut Laws and By-Laws* (Outlines process for assignment of duties and authorities to subcommittees of the Health Center Board of Directors) (Attachment 8)

“On a motion by Ms. Leonardi, seconded by Mr. Nayden, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the notification of proposed changes (Article V) to the *University of Connecticut Laws and By-Laws*.”

- (2) Medical Arts and Research Building of Farmington (MARB) (Attachment 9)

“On a motion by Ms. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Twilley, **THE BOARD VOTED** to authorize the University of Connecticut Health Center (UCHC) and the University of Connecticut Health Center Finance Corporation on behalf of UConn Medical Group (UCHCFC), to proceed with a transaction for the creation of the Medical Arts and Research Building of Farmington (MARB), a building to be located on the campus of UCHC.”

7. Student Life Committee Report

- (a) Committee Chairwoman’s report on Committee activities

Vice-Chair Bailey reported that the Student Life Committee met on December 2, 2002. The Committee heard an update on the President’s Task Force on Substance Abuse.

In addition, Associate Vice President Thomas Callahan and Cynthia van Zelm presented a report on the progress of the Mansfield Downtown Partnership. Vice Chancellor Triponey updated the Committee on student housing.

Vice-Chair Bailey noted that the Committee will discuss the Student Fee Advisory Committee’s findings at their next meeting.

8. Institutional Advancement Committee Report

- (a) Committee Chairman’s report on Committee activities

- (1) Development Progress Executive Summary (Attachment 10)

Trustee Napolitano presented the report of the Institutional Advancement Committee on behalf of Vice-Chair Treibick. He noted that the Committee last met on January 8, 2003. He directed Trustee attention to the Development Progress Executive Summary in Attachment 10. Trustee Napolitano noted that the Development Office reported that the gift volume for December was the highest it has ever been. He noted that as of December 31, 2002, pledges to Campaign UConn were estimated to be \$234 million. The Campaign is on target to achieve the \$300 million goal by June, 2004.

January 14, 2003

The State Matching Grant Program for endowments was estimated to be slightly under-subscribed. According to Vice President Kessler's estimate, the Foundation needs to raise \$7.5 million to generate the \$15 million in the State Matching Funds. It is estimated that the amount will be between \$13 and \$14 million.

Trustee Napolitano reported that the new gift goal for this year is \$50 million. The Foundation has raised \$25 million and they are on target for that objective. With respect to gift receipts or cash-based receipts, we are trailing our goal, but Mr. Kessler noted that we have two \$5 million-plus gifts that are to be counted.

The University has raised \$500,000 toward the goal of \$1.25 million for the unrestricted operating fund of the Annual Fund. He noted that we are on pace for achieving our target of 40,000 donors.

Trustee Napolitano noted that Director of University Communications Brohinsky gave an updated legislative report.

(b) Items requiring Board discussion and approval:

(1) Naming Recommendations: (Attachment 11)

On a motion by Mr. Napolitano, seconded by Ms. Bailey, **THE BOARD VOTED** to approve the following naming recommendations:

- (a) William R. Davis '55 Courtroom (Law School)
- (b) Gregory P. Mullen Structural Biology Facility (Health Center)

Chairman Gelfenbien expressed his satisfaction with the achieve \$25 million in gifts through the first six months against the goal of \$50 million is impressive.

9. Presentations on University Objectives

President Austin noted that there would be three programmatic presentations dealing with the University's objectives. The first presentation would be on Athletics and would include data on the enormous programmatic successes that the Division has enjoyed in recent years, but also a discussion of the financial prospects as the University makes a significant move to Division I-A Football. Second, he noted that Vice Chancellor Triponey would discuss several of the components of student life at UConn, and in the third presentation Vice Provost Greger would give a presentation on research, which is central to the University's mission and would also introduce some of our most accomplished research faculty during her presentation. President Austin noted that due to time constraints, Lew Perkins would be the first presenter.

(a) Athletics

Mr. Perkins commented that he agreed with earlier comments made by Mr. Lodewick regarding the lack of opportunities for students in the Mansfield Downtown area. This issue becomes critical when students are recruited by other schools, such as Stanford, Michigan, Ohio State, North Carolina, Duke, and Florida, which are all schools that have opportunities for socialization outside of the library, classroom, or athletic fields. Mr. Perkins noted that they are very excited about the possibility of having this project completed and that the whole University will benefit from an improved downtown area.

January 14, 2003

Mr. Perkins noted that the mission statement, which was adopted in consultation with faculty and students about three or four years ago, is to be the very best that they can be without compromising the student-athletes or the institution. The Division's mission is to recruit good student-athletes and to ensure that they are successful academically, socially, and athletically.

He briefly discussed the overarching organizational structure. He highlighted the role that Dr. Scott Brown plays as the NCAA Faculty Athletic Representative and the President's Athletic Advisory Committee, which is made up of faculty, alumni, and students. This Committee meets five or six times a year and discusses issues that the Division needs consultation with, such as the registrar issues, eligibility, certification, financial aid, and Title IX. Every year a concept is chosen to review in detail.

Mr. Perkins also outlined the history of the Division's structure. In 1990, the Division of Athletics employed approximately 87 individuals. Today there are approximately 240 employees. According to NCAA statistics, the University is considered average regarding the number of people who work in an Athletic program comparable to the University's size. Mr. Perkins stressed that each member of the Division has an important role and many are responsible for issues dealing with the NCAA, ethics, development, and other responsibilities, which have direct reporting lines to the director.

He emphasized the role of the Department of Recreational Services, which many are not aware is part of the Division. For the University's size and the amount of limited space, the University's recreational program is very comparable and considered to be one of the best in the nation. He noted that during the 2001-02 year, the Department received almost 36,000 participants. Last year there was a 3% increase, which amounted to approximately 4,000 more participants from the previous year. The Department reported approximately 3,300 recreational games and matches last year. Mr. Perkins noted that in sum there are close to a half a million people that informally participate in recreation on this campus. We have over 44,000 participants in special programs and classes as well. The Department works very hard to meet the needs of the community. As they move ahead, Athletics will need more recreation space, fields, and opportunities to address the needs on campus. He noted the significant increase in participation since 1997-98. Director Patti Bostic and her staff are committed to providing quality recreational services.

The Division of Athletics consists of 24 Varsity sports – 11 men's and 13 women's with over 600 student-athletes. *US News & World Report* ranked UConn's intercollegiate athletic program among the top 20 in the country based on academics, athletics, and NCAA compliance and *Sports Illustrated* ranked UConn's athletic program 31st in the country based on academic and athletic achievements. The National Association of Collegiate Directors of Athletics Director's Cup ranked UConn's athletic program 14th in the country based on fall 2002 team results. Mr. Perkins noted that the schools that we have remained competitive with include Michigan, Virginia, Georgia Tech, Duke, Maryland, UCLA, Southern California, and Stanford. Nationally we have become competitive and many look at us at having one of the strongest athletic programs in the country.

Mr. Perkins reported that over 40% of the student-athletes earned a 3.0 or better GPA in 2001-02 and were named to the Director of Athletics Honor Roll. Twelve student-athletes

January 14, 2003

earned a perfect 4.0 GPA in 2001-02. Since 1990, almost 800 student-athletes have been selected to the BIG EAST Academic All-Star teams, which is one of the highest for an institution. He also noted that since 1990, University's teams have won 35 BIG EAST regular season championships; won 33 BIG EAST tournament championships; appeared in 58 NCAA tournaments; reached 14 Final Fours; and won five National Championships. Mr. Perkins noted that the Division has been successful at balancing the academic side with the athletic side.

Mr. Perkins noted that one of the important missions he was charged with was to achieve gender equity in the Division. In 1990, the participation rate was 38% female and 62% male. For the academic year 2001-02, the participation rate was 52% female and 48% male. Mr. Perkins stressed that he has placed a high priority on gender equity and compliance. This means that an institution has to have the same balance as the undergraduate student population. He noted that the numbers change slightly each semester. Mr. Perkins emphasized that the Division monitors the numbers closely in order to meet the criteria of Title IX. For example, in FY 2001, women's participation opportunities increased to 51%. In FY 2003, the number of women's sports increased from 11 to 13 programs, which has placed the Division on target with compliance. The Division hires an auditor every year in order to maintain compliance, which has been recognized nationally.

Mr. Perkins noted that as the Division moves forward, the following items represent issues that must be considered more carefully; these issues include: 1) student-athlete experience, 2) gender equity compliance, 3) future intercollegiate capital project needs, which are secondary to the academic programs, by increasing recreation play space, 4) tuition increases and future scholarship costs by increasing the number of donors and/or donations and annual giving, 5) scholarship endowment level increases to offset current market decline; and 6) successful transition to Division I-A Football. The Division must work hard each year to try to attain the level of success from the previous year.

Trustee Jacobs acknowledged that the facilities are important to the athletic program and asked if Athletics needs new facilities or needs to upgrade the current facilities.

Mr. Perkins responded that the Division will need some new facilities, especially for the football program. The new multi-purpose building, which is in the beginning stages, will be a huge advance for recreation and intramurals. He also noted that the Division recently spent \$6 million to renovate the basketball locker rooms and training rooms. He noted that when the facilities were new, the BIG EAST schools modeled their facilities after ours, but now our facilities are old by comparison. Mr. Perkins emphasized the value of additional space, because the teams currently share fields, equipment, and space with other athletic programs and they require their own facilities.

Trustee Hattayer asked how the University's level of facilities, both in terms of space and quality, compare to other institutions.

Mr. Perkins responded that the University has very good facilities, but that they are small in size when compared to other schools. He also noted that newer facilities are not always better, but more space is absolutely essential. Because the Division does not have an indoor facility, our teams may lose playing time in bad weather. He noted that the

January 14, 2003

University is one of a few schools in the country that does not have an indoor practice or recreation facility.

Vice President Aronson noted that she and her staff worked very closely with the Division of Athletics in preparing this presentation. She noted that the big story is the Division's growth over the last twelve years and the change in the revenue source. Vice President Aronson noted that there was a heavy reliance on University funding approximately twelve years ago, which has shifted greatly. Currently, about 22% of the Division's revenue comes from the University. There is also the capital support that the Board just discussed.

Vice President Aronson directed Trustee attention to the powerpoint slide dealing with the breakdown of Division revenues for the previous years, the current year, and the projections for the coming biennium. She noted that there has been a rise in University support that was related to University commitment to provide additional funding as we moved toward gender equity, then it flattens out in terms of University support because we hit our full commitment. She noted that another issue that the administration is mindful of is the revenue that the Division brings in. The fact of the matter is that that administration also believes that the current budget environment has to be shared. The Division received a \$350,000 reduction in University funding this year. The Division is subject to all the same rules and processes that the administration created around position establishment and position refills in this tough budget environment.

On the expenditure side, there is a loss \$1.9 million in actual FY 02 and there is a gain of \$1.9 million in FY 03. Vice President Aronson explained that in the past the Division had a policy of accelerating some revenue with upfront (in June) ticket prepayment so that purchasers received some financial incentives. They reviewed this issue last year and decided to realign for two reasons. The first reason was that they no longer needed or wanted to provide a price break and the other reason was that they wanted to make sure that they had an absolutely clear alignment of revenues and expenditures from fiscal year to fiscal year. This represents a one-time increase.

The next slide deals with what Mr. Perkins spoke about previously in terms of the market effects on the endowment and how that has affected the Division. She noted that in FY02 about one-third of the endowment is related to Athletics. She noted that the depressed affects of the market affect the spin off of endowment, it is also clear that the University continues to see progress in terms of overall private support for Division activities.

She noted that the capital activities that the Board previously discussed were detailed in the presentation and were not reviewed individually.

Vice President Aronson noted that they are working together very closely as they plan for the expansion of the football program. All of the expenses will be monitored and will be within the guidelines that the Board set.

Trustee Napolitano asked Mr. Perkins to discuss the Football Complex and the Multi-Purpose Building.

Mr. Perkins responded that they have two separate complexes – the Burton Family Football Complex or more commonly referred to as the Burton Building, which is for football activities, and the Multi-Purpose Building, which is for recreation/intramural activities. The Burton Building will house all the football locker rooms, meeting rooms,

January 14, 2003

coaches offices, video rooms, etc. The Multi-Purpose Building will be a 120-yard, indoor, artificial surface area for team practices for lacrosse, soccer, and baseball. They envision adding a basketball floor on the backside of the building where they can conduct some intramural championships.

Trustee Napolitano asked if they were going to be located in Memorial Stadium. Mr. Perkins agreed.

Trustee Twilley asked if the University will be adding opportunities for women through Title IX, since more scholarships will be added to the football program.

Mr. Perkins responded that in order to meet the gender equity criteria, the percentages of male and female student athletes must be the same as those of the student population. Currently 52% of the student-athletes are women and 48% of the student-athletes are men.

Mr. Perkins acknowledged the hard work and cooperation of Vice President Aronson, Vice Chancellor Dreyfuss and their staff. He thanked all those involved, especially those dealing with the budgetary issues.

He noted that less than eight months from now, the first Division IA football game will be played against Indiana on August 30, 2003. The Stadium seats about 41-42,000 with the ability to add approximately 10,000 additional seats. They will play in the BIG EAST in 2005. He noted that the Stadium cost has come under budget. They have sold approximately 14,000 season tickets to date. He acknowledged those involved at Pratt & Whitney.

In sum, Mr. Perkins acknowledged that the Division is one part of the University and will do whatever necessary to work with the University during this tough budget climate.

Chairman Gelfenbien congratulated Director Perkins and his staff on their accomplishments.

(b) Research support

President Austin introduced Vice Provost Greger , who provided a presentation on research support. She reported that external awards have increased steadily during the past five years and that external awards were 50% greater in FY02 than in FY98. She made reference to the powerpoint slide represents a pictorial view of the same data, which showed that the increase in grant and contract awards over the last five years reflected an increase in federal funding. Currently, the University receives approximately 60% of its research awards from federal sources. The graph also shows that state funding has been fairly constant over the last four years and corporate funding accounts for about 8% of the total. She noted that the fourth category, referred to as "other," is somewhat misleading, because it includes subcontracts from other universities, but it also includes money that comes from industrial consortiums. Over the last two years, the faculty have submitted approximately 1,000 proposals per year worth over \$300 million, which means that approximately 70% of the grants and contracts that the University requested were funded, but the dollar amount represented about one-quarter of the funds that were actually received. On average, the best research universities usually only receive one-third of the dollars requested. She attributed the lower percentage of funds received at UConn to the fact that our faculty may be requesting smaller grants than faculty at other major

January 14, 2003

universities. The average grant size at UConn is \$144,000. According to the NIH last year, the average NIH grant was \$300,000 a year.

According to benchmarking studies, in 2000 (all campuses together) the University ranked 65th in the National Science Foundation Survey of all universities with research and development expenditures and we ranked 46th among public universities. Vice Provost Greger noted that these statistics have varied a lot over the years. In 1993, UConn was ranked 47th and in 1998 and 1999, we were ranked 70th and 75th, consecutively. She noted that it was not that UConn has not done as well at obtaining grants, but that during the same time period the NIH budget doubled and many schools took advantage of the opportunity more quickly than we did. She noted that another interesting benchmark was 8% coming from corporate sources. The National Academy of Science (NAS) conducted a survey of its members and they found that the average member of the NAS received about two-thirds of their funding from federal support. At UConn, faculty are receiving approximately 60% of their funding from federal sources. Vice Provost Greger speculated that the difference might be that UConn faculty receive more funding from the State and less from corporate sources than some major universities.

The University receives federal funding from the following agencies: 1) Health and Human Services, which includes the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which provides 23% of our federal dollars, and 2) NSF and USDA each provide 18% of our federal support.

Vice Provost Greger discussed this data in comparison to the national statistics. She reported that Defense Research & Development in FY03 will be \$59 billion and non-defense Research & Development will be \$53 billion. Of the \$53 billion for non-defense spending in FY03, 50% will be funded through NIH, which has increased considerably since FY01. On the other hand, NSF funding will constitute only 7% of the non-defense R & D budget and USDA will constitute about 4% of the non-defense R & D budget. Vice Provost Greger further explained that the biggest growth area in research and development has been through NIH. UConn competes well for NSF, USDA, Education, and EPA funding. Our percentages from those sources are much higher than the total amount nationally. Many have raised concerns about potential funding from the Department of Homeland Security. She noted that that funding is still an unknown, but it appears that a very large part of that money will be funneled through NIH for immunology and allergic reactions and infectious diseases research.

She noted that another way to look at the University's grants and awards was in terms of external awards by schools and colleges. The College of Liberal Arts and Sciences represents over half of the University and receives over 40% of the research awards. Vice Provost Greger noted that what is surprising is how successful the School of Engineering and the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources are at obtaining large amounts of federal dollars. A number of other schools are also very competitive. She emphasized that there is a large difference in obtaining federal research funding and obtaining contributions from foundations. The Schools of Business, Education, and Fine Arts have been phenomenally successful in receiving foundation contributions.

Vice Provost Greger noted that as an institution of higher education, it is not critical to capture as much funding as possible, but to consider a balanced program of research

January 14, 2003

among the life sciences, physical sciences, social sciences, and humanities. These units differ in terms of their funding needs and access to external funds. Foundation commitments vs. grants and contracts vary from college to college. In those research areas that require labs or clinical facilities have more funding needs than those that require only office space. Vice Provost Greger also noted that there are differences in funding agencies in terms of how much of the research costs will be covered, for example, NIH has a greater commitment to paying the full cost of research than does NSF or USDA. Another thing to remember is the schools and colleges differ in terms of size and in teaching and service commitments as well. Quality in research reflects more than just external funding.

The next slide illustrates funding by areas of research. This will help explain the numbers and the comments made in the previous slide. The external funds awarded to faculty in departments are divided by the number faculty FTE. For example, the average faculty member in marine sciences, which is considered a physical and a biological science, was \$261,000 per faculty member. These faculty are bringing in funds in excess of their salaries that the University pays them. Other areas of life sciences are well funded. Psychology, which is included in social sciences and biological sciences, is included under life sciences. The high funding in the life sciences reflect a high need and high quality of faculty and the willingness of agencies to pay the cost. The physical sciences also have a high need for funding, perhaps the agencies are little less willing to pay the full cost, but the grants are still sizeable. The social sciences reveal those that are related to health-related areas are more apt to have larger funding possibilities than those that are not, with education being an exception.

Vice Provost Greger introduced another important way to benchmark research quality. The National Academy of Science Division - National Research Council conducts a survey every ten years of research doctorate programs. In the 1995 survey, the two highest rated programs at UConn were the Department of Psychology and the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. The survey will be conducted again at the end of this year or at the beginning of next year and those areas not previously included will be part of the survey.

Vice Provost Greger noted that another measure of research success is an emerging source of income—technology transfer of research. This directed Trustee attention to the powerpoint slide that includes some figures with respect to the University's Technology Transfer activities, which reflect the combined efforts of the Storrs-based programs and the Health Center.

Vice Provost Greger introduced some of the University faculty who were awarded over \$1 million from federal sources in FY02. She noted that eight faculty members have been awarded over \$1 million and six faculty are here today. She noted that there may be faculty who received in excess of \$1 million last year and not this year. She introduced Dr. Alexandros Makryiannis, who is a Distinguished Professor in the School of Pharmacy and the Director of an emerging Center for Drug Discovery. His major funding is granted by the NIH. His research focus is on drug development, in particular for the treatment of pain.

Dr. Josephy Renzulli is also a Board of Trustees Distinguished Professor in the School of Education and Director of the Neag Center for Gifted Education and Talent Development

January 14, 2003

and Director of the National Center on the Gifted and Talented. Professor Renzulli's major grants come from Education & the Connecticut Department of Higher Education. His focus is on meeting the needs of high potential, but disadvantaged, youth.

Vice Provost Greger introduced Dr. Ann Ferris, who is a full professor in the Department of Nutritional Sciences. Her major grants come from USDA. Her current grant is involved in the identification of iron deficiency anemia in low income Connecticut children & the creation of coalitions for diagnosis and treatment. She noted that Dr. Carol Lammi-Keefe is also a faculty member in the Department of Nutritional Sciences. She has major grants from USDA and NIH. Her focus is on the assessment of fatty acid supplementation through a functional food on neurobehavioral development of infants.

Vice Provost Greger noted that there were two faculty members who not present at the meeting. Dr. Peter Turchin is a full professor in the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. His major grants come from NSF. His research focus is based on the development of models that predict the movement of elk on the basis of ecological conditions. Dr. John Mathieu is a full professor in the Department of Management and is also a Northeast Utilities Scholar. His major grants come from Defense. His research focus is on the coordination of teams from single or multiple organizations to optimize their effectiveness.

Vice Provost Greger introduced two more faculty members present today. She noted that Dr. John Silander is a faculty member in the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. He obtains grants from USDA and NSF. His research focus is on the assessment of invasive plant species in New England and the development of models for predicting their spread. Dr. Jeffrey Fisher is a full professor in the Department of Psychology and the Director of an emerging Center for Health/HIV Intervention and Prevention (CHIPS). His research focus has been on the assessment of unhealthy behavior, particularly HIV risk behavior, and the evaluation of theory-based interventions to change unhealthy behavior.

She thanked the faculty members for attending the meeting and for contributing to the success of the University's research productivity.

Vice Provost Greger outlined the following plans for improving and increasing research productivity: 1) convene cross-departmental research interest groups with more collaboration with the Health Center, 2) improve service to researchers by upgrading information technology and communications networks to assist researchers as they develop proposals and administer grants and protocols, 3) foster more strategic planning and benchmarking, in regard to centers, research services, graduate education rankings, and 4) improve preventive measures in regard to compliance.

Vice Provost Greger directed Trustee attention to a packet of pamphlets put out by the Office of Sponsored Programs.

(c) Student life

Vice Chancellor Triponey presented an overview about college students nationally and those at UConn. She also discussed how the Division will try to meet the students' needs and expectations.

January 14, 2003

She noted that in the field of student affairs, many professionals consult the literature and also turn to scholars in the field. Many of her staff have graduate degrees and have made it their life's work to understand college students. She and other student affairs administrators tap their own knowledge and first-hand experiences as well as research studies and literature in order to understand the changing nature of the student population.

Some of the national demographic enrollment trends include: 1) approximately 56% are women – at UConn 52% are women, 2) 28 % of the students are minorities – at UConn 17% are minorities, 3) 59.4% are full-time students – at UConn 85% are full-time students, 4) 39% receive some form of financial aid – at UConn 58% receive receive financial aid, 5) 87% of the students commute – at UConn 28% commute from some place other than a University-owned residential facility; 6) the median age of college students nationally is about 23 – at UConn the median age is 20; 7) the national SAT average is 1020 – at UConn the SAT average is 1140.

Vice Chancellor Triponey noted that more research on college students is needed. She cited the book, *When Hope and Fear Collide* by Art Levine, who has conducted some very important research on college students. He has found that students are now facing a world of unchanging, unceasing, and unknowable change, which is very unsettling for them. He also finds that these students are coming to college at much larger numbers than ever before and that the value of a college education may be diminishing. He also suggests that the college students coming to our campuses today are in need of an education that provides more of a sense of hope, ethic of responsibility, appreciation of differences, and an understanding that they really can make a difference. Because they are coming from a world that is rapidly changing, they are unsure about their power to make an impact.

Vice Chancellor Triponey noted that authors Howe and Strauss have conducted important research on the cycles of generations. They have looked at the “baby boomers,” the “me” generation, and “Generation X, and are now suggesting that we are moving into a very new and different kind of a generation called the “Millennials.” These are students born between 1982 and 2002 and are now entering college. At UConn, this year's freshman class was dominated by students from this generation. These students are coming from very affluent and ethnically diverse backgrounds. They are also demonstrating an extreme need to succeed and show great gains in their first few years as well as in the math, sciences, and technology fields. This generation is taking up the problems and the challenges that perhaps the “baby boomers” talked about, but were not able to fix. In fact, the authors are suggesting that they do not have a lot of patience for those in administration who are “stuck in the past” and are perceived as being “obstructionists” to getting the job done.

The “Millennials” are different from any group that student affairs professionals have worked with in the college environment. She noted that many of them are the biggest youth-spenders in history, but it does not necessarily mean that they are spending their own money, but that of their “baby boomer” parents.

She also noted that the “Millennials” are showing to be taking a very positive turn and a new confidence about the future. They are showing signs of decreases in crime and violence and showing a greater sense of peer solidarity and are feeling very hopeful. Howe and Strauss suggest that when “Millennials” come to college, they will have a greater sense

January 14, 2003

of school spirit and will be concerned about the quality of life, like the kinds of residence halls they will live in. Their parents are going to be more concerned about their experience and will have a difficult time letting go. They are also suggesting that female students will take on greater leadership positions starting in college or perhaps in high school. Male students will continue to have even greater difficulty with dropping out of college and we will have to focus on retaining more male students in our population. They also suggest that this population will be a very multi-ethnic student body and their common ground will be based not so much on different races, but on concern about different classes, economic status, and will strive to rise above the gender and race issues. The authors also suggest that this is the generation that could have the kind of impact that the G.I. generation did on society.

Vice Chancellor Triponey also acknowledged the work of Patricia Hersch. In her book, *A Tribe Apart: A Journey into the Hearts of American Adolescence* she suggests that these students do not have a lot of adult influence or role models in their lives prior to entering college. She also suggests that college students today are spending 5% of their time with their parents and 2% of their time with other adults. They say that this generation may lack those "rites of passage" that help individuals move into adulthood and take on responsibility. Also, these students have been brought up in a boundless world without a lot of rules or parameters or limits in their lives. The implications on campus, which are evident, are that when they come to college and we inform them that there are community standards, a student code, and certain expectations, they are baffled. They thought they were fleeing to freedom, but they are coming into a community where there are standards and expectations and many have difficulty adjusting.

She provided the national backdrop to put the University into perspective about what makes our students different. She noted that there are some differences at UConn that are clearly identified. The University is mostly a residential campus, which means that 72% of our undergraduates live on campus. Nationally, other institutions similar to UConn only provide on-campus housing for 55% of their students. We also have a larger than average, full-time, traditional age dependent population who are fully engaged in the academic experience. Less of our students are working and less of them are torn by other commitments beyond the campus. We have a growing number of high-achieving students and students from diverse backgrounds. And more than ever, our students are staying on campus on the weekends, which was not the case five years ago. We are dealing with very significant growth and enrollment, and growth in the residential population in an extremely short period of time.

Vice Chancellor Triponey noted that she provided this backdrop to help the Board understand what the Division of Student Affairs is trying to accomplish as they address the student experience and student life at UConn. In an effort to begin, they are increasing their effort to understand the students who chose UConn. She noted that one of the key positions in her Division is the Dean of Students, so they re-wrote the description and conducted a national search, which attracted John Saddlemire, a gifted student affairs administrator. An integral part of his job is to help the student affairs staff understand our students, so that we can serve them appropriately. Under his leadership, we have begun participating in other national studies so that we can benchmark ourselves and understand how our students compare to national student populations. We have engaged in the

January 14, 2003

National Study on Student Engagement (NSSE) and have participated in a residence hall study that compares our students to a huge population of other residence hall students around the country. UConn has also been involved in the CORE study to see how we compare to other college students in the area of alcohol and substance abuse. We continue to work to educate ourselves and to share that knowledge and information with the rest of the campus, including our faculty, student leaders, administrators and others, so that we can all better understand what we need to do as we address the student experience.

She highlighted the University foundation for change and listed some items that provide a glimpse of what guides their efforts, they include: the University's Strategic Plan and Master Plan, the building programs in UCONN 2000 and 21st Century UConn, the Chancellor's Task Force on Community and Civility recommendations, which has driven the Division's efforts to build a greater sense of community, and then a few years ago the Division engaged in a planning process as they looked at enhancing the student experience and engaged several stakeholders from all over campus and beyond to develop what is referred to as our common ground agenda, which is a great document to guide their efforts. They have had several peer reviews and have invited consultants to come on campus to look at different pieces of the Student Affairs operation to help the staff and administration understand how we compare to other institution and to give us outside perspectives about what we could do differently. She noted that they continue to engage in dialogue and partnerships with students to make sure that they help keep the staff in check about meeting their needs.

Vice Chancellor Triponey reiterated Ernest Boyer's Principles to build a greater sense of community and these principles continue to guide their efforts today:

She directed Trustee attention to the University common ground Agenda, which represents the goals that they have established as they try to enhance the total student experience. This set of goals has become the document that assists the student affairs staff to complete their annual reports, which each member completes and informs the administration about what they have done to contribute to these goals. She offered a copy of the Division's multi-year report to anyone interested.

The underlying goals that guide student affairs professional include: 1) raising the bar, whereby more is expected of ourselves and of our students, 2) enhancing the educational experience, which means creating an experience that is truly fitting of a world-class university; and 3) trying to build a greater sense of community.

Vice Chancellor Triponey provided some examples of their progress. She noted that in talking with colleagues around the country, they are amazed at some of the building projects that offer a spectrum of housing options from traditional residence halls to suites to private bedroom apartments. Also, we are enhancing the experience inside of those facilities as well. We are not just building structures, but we are making sure that we are making sure that we are enhancing the student experience. Wilbur Cross Student Service Center is another example of the incredible renovation project, which has allowed us to also transform how we serve students. The Student Union Renovation Project now underway has been a phenomenal effort. On the list for the 21st Century UConn projects is the Student Health Services Building is on the list.

January 14, 2003

Vice Chancellor Triponey noted that she sees her role as the leader of the Division of Student Affairs and as a member of the Buildings and Grounds Committee to make sure that any building on this campus is renovated or rebuilt has the opportunity to create gathering places or space that is appropriate for building communities, for students to connect, for students to be part of an enriched experience. She feels that it is a part of her job to advocate in that arena.

More examples of our progress: We are engaged in all kinds of partnerships in the academic arena. They know that we cannot just focus on the students out of classroom experience without helping them to understand that it is connected to their academic experience. To address this, we have created Living Learning Communities and are working with the Honors Program to enhance their living experiences even more. They have developed a predominantly freshman neighborhood and they are engaged in partnerships around the new student experience including orientation, first year experience, and Husky WOW.

They have also engaged in a variety of very deliberate efforts to building community. First, we have a variety of new campus-wide events, including the Midnight Breakfast, which has been a very successful event for the past several years. President Austin and Chancellor Petersen have attended regularly and the students enjoy the opportunity to come together and to meet the faculty, staff, and the administration. This event has had an incredible impact on the students. Second, the Dean of Students Office focus has changed to one that is leading our community-building efforts. Third, we continue to communicate our community standards and hold the students accountable, and fourth, we are digging deeply around the topic of substance abuse.

With respect to maximizing resources, the Division has created the Husky One Card, so that the old meal plan card will be expanded to allow students to utilize their financial capacity around campus and it also serves as a key to the front door of their residence hall.

They have engaged in an extensive student fee review process that allows students to have a greater voice in how those fees are spent. They are moving forward on reorganizing the structure of mental health and counseling services, so that they can better serve the crucial, most immediate needs of students as well as providing assistance for long-term care.

The challenges that still exist include the following: 1) maximize fiscal resources, 2) identify more alternate resources of funding, other than state support, student fees, generated revenue, 3) emphasize critical functions and abandon non-essential functions, 4) support a quality student body and a rigorous learning environment, 5) create a welcoming environment for an increasingly diverse student body, 6) find ways to accommodate student needs both on and off campus, 7) clarify and communicate the University's expectations for students, 8) engage the entire campus community, 9) confront substance abuse.

Vice Chancellor Triponey emphasized that the Division hopes to accomplish the following: 1) engage students actively in academic and community life, 2) provide a vibrant, enriching, and engaged student experience, 3) and instill a sense of personal responsibility to the campus community and to the world. If we are to prepare leaders and good citizens for tomorrow, then we have to ensure that that total experience is one that is challenging

January 14, 2003

and supportive, so that students can make the most of their experiences and face the world beyond the campus.

The Division is made up of a talented and dedicated team of professional staff, support staff, students, and student leaders who are engaged in this effort and enthusiastic about transforming student life at UConn.

Trustee Napolitano acknowledged Vice Chancellor Triponey's hard work and her outstanding team. He applauded the Division of Student Affairs and its commitment to the student population. He noted that the Division is an integral part of the institution and is considered to be one of the best in the country.

Chairman Gelfenbien acknowledged Vice Chancellor Triponey's efforts.

Executive Vice President Deckers acknowledged the quality of the three presentations.

Chairman Gelfenbien suggested that some of the presentations held at the Health Center be exposed at a full Board meeting.

10. Other

11. Adjournment

Chairman Gelfenbien announced that the next regular meeting of the Board of Trustees is scheduled for Tuesday, April 15, 2003.

There being no further business, the Board meeting adjourned at 3:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Louise M. Bailey
Secretary