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OPEN SESSION

The meeting was called to order at 11:50 a.m. by Chairman John Rowe. Trustees present were:

Trustees Rebecca Lobo and Richard Treibick, and Brenda Sisco, who represents the Governor’s Office, participated by telephone.

Trustees Michael Bozzuto, Lenworth Jacobs, Michael Martinez, Denis Nayden, F. Philip Prelli, and Betty Sternberg were absent from the meeting.

University staff present were: President Austin, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Nicholls, Executive Vice President for Health Affairs Deckers, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Aronson, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Flaherty-Goldsmith, Vice President for Student Affairs Saddlemire, Vice Provost for Academic Administration Singha, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs Makowsky, Vice Provost for Multicultural Affairs Taylor, Vice Provost for Enrollment Management Evanovich, Interim Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education Anderson, Dr. Schurin, Interim Vice President for Operations Callahan, University Communications Director Brohinsky, Chief Audit and Compliance Officer Walker, Interim Director of Architectural and Engineering Services Bradley, Health Center Chief of Staff Carlson, University Senate representatives Gerald Gianutsos and Michael Turvey, and Ms. Locke. Assistant Attorney General McCarthy was also present.

Also in attendance were Aetna Chief of Staff Patricia Hassett, and Attorney John Reid and Attorney Laurann Asklof, who represent the law firm of Gordon Muir and Foley, LLP.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On a motion by Ms. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Barry, THE BOARD VOTED to go into Executive Session at 11:55 a.m. to discuss matters pertaining to personnel and 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, Burrow, Dennis-LaVigne, Drotch, Gatling, Kazerounian, Kuchta, Ritter, Rowe, and Shepperd.

Trustees Lobo and Treibick, and Brenda Sisco, who represents the Governor’s Office, participated by telephone.

University staff present were: President Austin, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Nicholls, Executive Vice President for Health Affairs Deckers, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Aronson, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Flaherty-Goldsmith, Dr. Schurin, Special Assistant to the President Callahan, and Chief Audit and Compliance Officer Walker. Assistant Attorney General McCarthy was also present.
Also in attendance were Aetna Chief of Staff Patricia Hassett, and Attorneys John Reid and Laurann Asklof, who represent the law firm of Gordon Muir and Foley, LLP.

Executive Session ended at 12:40 p.m. The Board returned to Open Session at 1:05 p.m. University Senate representative Gary English joined the meeting at this time. Trustees Lobo and Treibick participated by telephone. University Senate representative Michael Turvey left the meeting at this time. University Relations Director Brohinsky joined the meeting at this time.

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

1. Public Participation

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

- Mr. Edward Marth, Executive Director, University of Connecticut Chapter of the American Association of University Professors Academic Restructuring Plan

Mr. Marth thanked Provost Nicholls and Vice Provost Makowsky for involving the AAUP in the decision to restructure the Schools of Family Studies and Allied Health and the College of Continuing Studies. He stated that there did not seem to be much prior consultation regarding this action. There were earlier recommendations, which usually stemmed from times of crisis. He estimated there were about three earlier reports. He received a call from a retired faculty member who recalled being involved in a recommendation over 25 years ago.

Mr. Marth said that the Provost informed the AAUP about his plans for reorganization and wanted to work with the union regarding a smooth transition for the faculty. They have had a series of meetings with the tenure-track faculty in Family Studies, and the non-tenure track faculty in the College of Continuing Studies. He noted that the work in Continuing Studies is unusual in that they offer both degree and non-degree programs, often jointly with different schools, such as Allied Health or Business. They also work with companies like Sikorsky and others. Mr. Marth said he is hopeful that, as Dean Krista Rodin urged, we can work to make sure that this very cohesive and dynamic group of people continues to be both innovative and add to degree programs that are in place across the campus. The AAUP will be working with the non-tenure track and tenure-track faculty in the School of Family Studies so that they their new environment will be one in which their appointment expectations and research expectations fit seamlessly within the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. That College has, he said, done a good job of making sure that the Promotion, Tenure, and Re-appointment (PTR) process works in a fair and balanced manner and that expectations are met and properly evaluated. But there is a difference in culture when schools and colleges merge. Mr. Marth said that although there is a lot of work to be done, he is encouraged by the openness and welcoming attitude from the Provost’s Office.

Mr. Marth understood that the reorganization entails no degree or course cancellations or faculty layoffs, and hopefully there will be no other layoffs as Vice Provost Evanovich works to realign staff. Change is difficult, but it is preferred in an atmosphere that is not one of budgetary constraints. If the programs can be enhanced, then that is the direction the University should be heading. Mr. Marth said he has not received calls of protest and received one anonymous letter regarding concerned faculty.
Mr. Marth stressed that there is still a lot to be done in working with employees who do not want to see their careers jeopardized. As with a number of other problems over the years, they can work successfully with the senior administration to make it work.

Chairman Rowe thanked Mr. Marth for his comments and said that the Board will take up this matter again at the next Board meeting. He noted that if Mr. Marth was available to attend, then the Board would like to hear from him at that point to share his perspective as well as that of the faculty he represents. In the interim, Chairman Rowe suggested that Mr. Marth touch base with him.

**Mr. Derek Li, 7th semester finance major and Senior management at UConn USG diversity & multicultural senator**

Mr. Li expressed concern that over the past year he has seen the University face scrutiny of one issue after another. Although President Austin is at the center of these issues, Mr. Li said, he does not believe the President is entirely at fault. He commended President Austin for recruiting students nationally and internationally. The University has seen the number of applicants increase dramatically over the past ten years. There are, however, some key responsibilities that in his opinion the President does not seem to be focused on. He said he has never seen or heard the President address a large number of undergraduates, except for graduation or orientation. The first time he met him in person was last week at that small luncheon in the African-American Cultural Center. He said that he is not sure why the President does not spend a lot of time speaking to undergraduates and asking them about their needs. As students, they are the University’s primary clients. Yet even their most basic needs, such as the need to fix an elevator, are not being met. Mr. Li feels that the undergraduate students represent the largest percent of UConn’s annual revenue, but they have an implicit value which is that they are the reason, at least in part, that this institution is a university. If the number of applicants and enrollments significantly dropped year after year, revenues would shrink not only from students, but from donors too.

Chairman Rowe asked Mr. Li if he believed that the number of applicants was declining. Mr. Li responded that he was giving a hypothetical example.

Mr. Li said that his other concern was the lack of control of immediate subordinates, including Mr. Larry Schilling and Mr. Dale Dreyfuss. The most recent event was the surprise announcement by Provost Nicholls regarding the consolidation of the School of Family Studies, the College of Continuing Studies, and the School of Allied Health. Neither the students nor the deans of these schools knew about this consolidation until an e-mail was sent out on November 2, 2005. When Dr. Nicholls came to speak at the USG meeting last Wednesday, Mr. Li said that he asked him if he had any documented proof that this consolidation would work or if people wanted this to occur. He said that the Provost said that he had none. Mr. Li interpreted that as a total disregard for the opinions of students and faculty. Mr. Li said that it was unacceptable and wondered why it happened in the first place. He also wondered why many of the Trustees are willing to support the President, who has performed questionably as a manager. During the luncheon at the African-American Cultural Center, he asked President Austin what his efforts were to improve communication between the administration and the students, the administration and the faculty, and between the administrators themselves. Mr. Li said that the President told
Mr. James Zipadelli, 7th semester journalism and Academic Restructuring Plan political science major

Mr. Zipadelli noted that he has always had a great deal of pride as a student and an observer as UConn becomes a world-class university. It began with a vision from UConn’s senior leadership and involved some help from the State’s Legislature. This collaborative effort has paid huge dividends. UConn has been the top public university in New England for the past seven years, and frequently one of the top 30 in the nation. Mr. Zipadelli believes that this academic reputation will no doubt get stronger in the years to come.

Collaboration is important on campus as well. Over the past few weeks, he has heard and read about Provost Nicholls’ proposal to restructure the Schools of Family Studies and Allied Health, and the College of Continuing Studies. He believes that what has been missing is collaboration. If there were questions for 12 years about what to do with the smaller schools, such as Family Studies, he believes that a task force should have been appointed. What has troubled him is that it appears that neither the deans, nor the faculty, nor the students were properly consulted about this proposal until after the transition teams were already in place.

Mr. Zipadelli said that he and Shawn Logue, a commuter senator on USG, wanted to find out what types of programs comparable schools had. They used the most up-to-date U.S. News and World Report rankings. They found that of the 28 colleges listed above UConn, 13 had family studies programs and 12 had allied health programs, especially dealing with nutrition and dietetics.

Chairman Rowe asked Mr. Zipadelli about these data. He noted that U.S. World News Report is not a publication of high academic stature and is not necessarily viewed as the gold standard, but nonetheless it is widely read. Thirteen out of the 28 public universities ranked higher or equal to UConn had family studies programs, which would mean that more than half of them did not. He asked how Mr. Zipadelli would interpret that data. Mr. Zipadelli responded that he and Shawn were trying to emphasize that a lot of the schools that were ranked higher than UConn had these programs, and that family studies programs represented a large part of a school, such as a combination of schools or as an interdisciplinary program. Chairman Rowe stated that many could take the opposite stand and state that the data indicated that most schools ranked higher do not have family studies programs.
Mr. Zipadelli said that President Austin created an Academic Plan Task Force to implement and report on UConn’s Academic Plan. The Academic Plan Task Force developed a report in 2003 that produced very specific guidelines about how the Chancellor must implement the Academic Plan. He quoted from the report, “The Chancellor, through his designees, is responsible for implementation of the plan. The primary advisory group for implementation of the plan will be the Academic Deans and such members of the Chancellor’s Staff as the Chancellor deems appropriate.”

Mr. Zipadelli believed that because the decision to restructure was largely arbitrary, Provost Nicholls did not follow the guidelines. In addition, the Plan also groups “Health and Human Services” (Plan, p. 9) as closely related fields, which appears contrary to Provost Nicholls’ opinion that the majors in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS) and the College of Agriculture and Natural Resources (CANR) are of similar disciplines.

Mr. Zipadelli also expressed concern about the size of CLAS and the College’s inability to handle another department. For example, CLAS still has a moratorium on “W” requirements because there were not enough faculty and staff to teach them. As priorities change from year to year, he imagined that the schools and programs would change as well. In Provost Nicholls’ e-mail dated November 2, he said that “while the assessment is taking place, it is difficult to predict the final impact. However, we are committed to maintaining current operations in the interim, to meeting our obligations under the relevant collective bargaining agreements, and to implementing any changes in a manner that is respectful of the concerns of faculty, staff, and students.”

Mr. Zipadelli urged the Board to reject the proposed restructuring, go back to the drawing board, and include the deans, faulty, staff, and students in this process. He believes that collaborating in this manner will allow the University to focus on other outstanding issues while coming to a consensus that would be most beneficial to the parties involved.

Chairman Rowe thanked Mr. Zipadelli for his thoughtful comments.

• Mr. Philip Lodewick, President, Mansfield Storrs Center Municipal Development Plan Downtown Partnership Board of Directors

Mr. Lodewick spoke on behalf of the Mansfield Downtown Partnership Board of Directors and members to express their thanks for the support and encouragement the Board of Trustees has provided over the past five years. The University and the Town of Mansfield have provided some of the financial resources needed to help them pursue the goal of creating a vital mixed-use retail, residential and commercial town center commonly referred to as the “Storrs Center Project.” The Board of Directors has pursued this effort cognizant of their need to balance the interest of a university in transformation and the careful management of all the resources to which the Board has been entrusted. The Board has also encouraged and committed valuable personnel to be part of the team. From key Board members and committee positions, they have lent their time and talent to keep the Partnership focused while expanding the community profile. Mr. Lodewick expressed his opinion that the Storrs Center Project may be as important a project as any undertaken thus far in the UCONN 2000 and 21st Century UConn initiatives. Indeed, he would dare to say there is not one great public university in America that does not have a core town center. For the Board to achieve and sustain UConn’s reputation as one of
America’s premier educational institutions, the Mansfield Town Center Project must be a priority. It is estimated that in this $165 million private/public partnership approximately 900 new jobs at build out and $2.5 million of enhanced revenue streams per year going forward will emanate. Today in particular Mr. Lodewick encouraged the Board to support the Partnership’s Municipal Development Plan. As the Board is already aware, the Plan has a preliminary positive review by the State of Connecticut Office of Policy Management and Department of Economic and Community Development. It was reviewed in September by the Windham Regional Council of Government and the Mansfield Planning & Zoning Commission where the Plan was found to be consistent with the respective regional and local plans of conservation and development. On October 24, 2005 the Town of Mansfield gave its approval. These are only first steps in the eventual creation of a vital Storrs Center. They will now begin the process of creating a special design district to be called the Storrs Center Special Design District with appropriate new zoning, construction, and sustainability guidelines. With a disciplined events-driven work plan, they hope to begin the actual construction of this multi-phase project in the fall of 2006. He encouraged the Board to endorse the Municipal Development Plan.

- Mr. Bruce Clouette, Member, Storrs Center Municipal Development Plan
  Mansfield Town Council

Mr. Clouette is a member of the Mansfield Town Council and a Graduate School alum in history. He spoke on behalf of Mayor Betsy Patterson, who was unable to attend. Mayor Patterson asked Mr. Clouette to convey a message from the Town of Mansfield. The first part of her message represented the Council’s point of view in which the members felt that the work that has been completed on the Storrs Center Project is a model of cooperative undertaking by both the University and the Town. At every level there has been participation from the members of the community, Town of Mansfield officials, and University officials.

Secondly, the Council members were extremely impressed with the amount of energy that has been put into this Plan. Mr. Clouette noted that there were many members of the University community involved in this effort, but he especially wanted to mention Mr. Thomas Callahan, who has not only been faithful in attending all the meetings, but has undertaken some of the most difficult and challenging committee assignments and performed them with a great deal of competence. The process so far shows the essential confluence of interests between the University and the Town. In the vote to approve the Municipal Development Plan, they listened to a great deal of testimony from members of the public. Topics of concern included civil liberties, traffic, adequacy of water, and business retention, which represent valid concerns for which the citizens have charged the Council members to keep upper most in their minds moving forward. In raising these concerns, virtually every speaker at the three public meetings supported the Plan. As a result, the Mansfield Town Council approved the Plan by a vote of 9:0. Many of the speakers, including those in opposition, were in favor of the overall concept. He thanked the Board for its support.

In the event there were questions, Chairman Rowe asked Mr. Clouette to remain in the audience until the Plan was voted on by the Board. Chairman Rowe expressed warmest regards to Mayor Patterson, who is recovering from an illness.
Mr. Shawn Logue

7th semester political science major

Mr. Logue expressed concerns about Provost Nicholls’ plan to close the School of Family Studies and the School of Allied Health. He commended Provost Nicholls for taking the time to address concerns at the USG Senate meeting last Wednesday, in addition to meeting with students of the School of Family Studies in the past week. He was also aware that the Provost plans to meet with students in the School of Allied Health at a later date.

Mr. Logue said it is his mission as a student advocate to ensure that the administration and the faculty actively communicate with the undergraduate student body. He raised concerns about how disciplines within the affected schools are going to be realigned. As the Board may already know, the Human Development & Family Studies degree program has five concentrations at the undergraduate level, including Childhood and Adolescence, Early Childhood Development and Education, Adult Development and Aging, Family Services and Counseling, and Family and Society: Policy and Planning. Such programs prepare students for careers in health care ranging from children to the elderly, education programs for young children and parents, various social service programs, therapy, and policy to name a few.

The Provost makes a compelling argument that several arts and sciences areas, such as anthropology, sociology, history, and even Puerto Rican & Latino Studies are covered in the Family Studies curriculum. However, Mr. Logue urged the Board to not only review the courses but what the degree is intended to prepare students for. A Family Studies major can already benefit from several classes in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS). However, students within this program could also benefit from classes in health and education areas that they do not currently have access to.

Schools and colleges with combinations that include any or all of the disciplines of agriculture, allied health, education, and family studies are not uncommon among our peer institutions and institutions we aspire to emulate (those from the Academic Plan Task Force Report 2003). Admittedly, dietetics programs and other programs similar to those in the School of Allied Health are common in a school of agriculture and natural resources. However, no peer institutions have a family studies program in a college of liberal arts and sciences. Among those we wish to emulate, the University of Texas-Austin is the only institution, which has its family studies degree in a college with majors similar to CLAS. However, it is a college of natural sciences, which does not include liberal arts, and also includes an entire department in areas of human ecology. The University of California at San Diego appears to have an interdepartmental program, but its affiliation, if any, to a school or college within the university was not made clear in my findings.

Mr. Logue asked the Board to examine how well the school restructuring as presented to you today represents the implementation of the Academic Plan. The Academic Plan Task Force Report calls on the then-titled chancellor to consider academic deans as part of the primary advisory group. However, in the final decision made by Provost Nicholls, academic deans were not consulted nor were faculty members or students. He recognized that discussion of consolidation dates back over 12 years; however, one could not know exactly what to expect from a new Provost unless he were to actively communicate with all parties prior to his decision. Mr. Logue indicated that he is a strong believer in the potential of the University of Connecticut. He said he hopes that in this afternoon’s meeting the Board will conclude that better
communication with the academic deans, faculty, and students is necessary to make a decision that best implements the Academic Plan.

2. Chairman’s Report

(a) Minutes of the meeting of September 20, 2005

On a motion by Dr. Burrow, seconded by Ms. Bailey, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the minutes of the meeting of September 20, 2005.

(b) Matters outstanding

Chairman Rowe reported that they conveyed to the Governor’s Office the University and Board’s response to the Governor’s Panel recommendations. The report was well received by the Governor’s Office. In addition, the report was shared with lead members of the Legislature, including relevant committees, chairs, and ranking members. We are in discussion with members of the Legislature with respect to their plans regarding changes for implementation. There may be some legal requirements, but we are making significant progress.

Secondly, the matter of the Fenton and Willimantic Rivers has been mentioned. In mid-October, Chairman Rowe convened a meeting with President Austin, Thomas Callahan, Mansfield Town Manager Martin Berliner, Mayor Betsy Patterson, Dr. Robert Galvin, Commissioner of Public Health, and Regina McCarthy, Commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection. They held a wide-ranging discussion of matters related to water.

They expect in January a report from a study that was conducted over a three-year period of the Fenton River, which will provide very specific guidelines in terms of how much water can be drawn at different times and under different river conditions. In addition, extensive work will be completed on some of the pipes from the Willimantic River, which is supported by one of the proposals to be voted on later in the meeting. The University has also implemented a number of conservation efforts with respect to water usage. They talked about approaches going forward to “get the University out of the water business” and to have a managing company come in over the short term and will consider proposals for the long term that would be most suitable.

Lastly, they discussed the development of policies and consideration of the role of the University, the role of the Town of Mansfield, and other relevant parties to provide input into policies established by the University with respect to water. Much progress had been made and the group will meet again in January.

At the last meeting of the Board, Chairman Rowe read a letter from Senator Donald Williams and Representative Denise Merrill in which they requested that the Board be involved in this process. Chairman Rowe met with Senator Williams and has spoken to Representative Merrill and updated them on the progress thus far.

(c) Consent Agenda Items:

On a motion by Ms. Bailey, seconded by Mr. Barry, 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) Discontinuation of the Ed.D. Program in Educational Leadership at the Stamford Campus (Attachment 2)
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(3) Discontinuation of the MBA/MS Accounting Program at Storrs, Stamford, and Tri-Campus (Attachment 3)

(4) Discontinuation of the MS in Technology Management Program at Stamford and Tri-Campus (Attachment 4)

(d) Personnel matters (Storrs-based programs) (Attachment 5)

(1) Awards of Tenure

On a motion by Dr. Dennis-LaVigne, seconded by Mr. Abromaitis, THE BOARD VOTED to award tenure to the following faculty members:

1. Anderson, Amy C., Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, School of Pharmacy, effective January 1, 2006.

2. Wright, Dennis L., Associate Professor, Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, School of Pharmacy, effective January 1, 2006.

(2) Sabbatics

On a motion by Dr. Burrow, seconded Mr. Barry, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the sabbatic leave list.

(3) Informational matters

3. President’s Report

President Austin reported that the University is approaching its ten-year re-accreditation by the New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC). The two essential elements of this process are the preparation of the self-study that is a vast undertaking, and a visitation subsequent to the submission of the report. Dr. Karla Fox has agreed to coordinate the self-study.

(a) Presenter: Dr. Karla H. Fox, Special Assistant to the Provost
Presentation: New England Association of Schools and Colleges (NEASC) Accreditation

Dr. Fox gave a brief presentation on the NEASC accreditation. A copy of the handout is attached to the file copy of the minutes.

Chairman Rowe asked if enterprise risk management was included anywhere in the 11 standards. Dr. Fox responded that it is to a certain extent within the discussion of financial resources. There is a standard that indicates that the institution has at its disposal and allocates adequate resources to accomplish its mission. She supposed that risk management is part of that allocation of resources.

Chairman Rowe noted that from a financial point of view there are other risks, such as reputation, compliance with various regulatory requirements related to sprinklers, for example. He asked that Mr. Walker review the report and provide the Board with a brief perspective from a risk-management point of view considering how our processes compare with the standards.

Dr. Fox added that Mr. Walker and Ms. Rubin are each a member of two of their committees that are dealing with public disclosure and integrity.

Mr. Drotch asked if the report will include recommendations for areas of improvement. Dr. Fox responded that the report will be presented in three components: Discussion, Appraisal, and
Projection. The Projection and Institutional Effectiveness parts may have areas that may need further work, which is one of the largest tasks for the visitation team. The head of our visitation team will be Dr. Mark A. Nordenberg, Chancellor of the University of Pittsburgh. President Austin and Dr. Schurin participated in a self-study visitation team last year for NEASC.

Mr. Drotch asked if the report will also consider findings from the previous report, specifically comments on how effective we have been in implementing recommendations made during the previous review.

Dr. Fox said that the report will provide comments. She also stated that a five-year interim report was conducted as well. It is likely that the primary focus will be on the last five years, since the five-year report focused on the previous five years.

Mr. Barry added that he and Dr. Schurin were asked to serve on the ten-year accreditation committee and to address Standard 3, which deals with the organization and governance. Several specific standards relate to the Board of Trustees, some examples include: responsibility and relationships among the governing board; administration, faculty and staff as described in the institution’s bylaws or an equivalent document; the governing board is ultimately responsible for the institution’s quality and integrity and demonstrates sufficient independence to ensure that it can act in the institution’s best interest; and the board has clear understanding of the institution’s distinctive mission and purposes. They prepared the self-study on this Standard and for the most part, the University’s Board of Trustees is in compliance and can be documented as such. The Board is not yet in full compliance of Standard 3.4 - “The board systematically develops and ensure its own effectiveness. The board enhances its effectiveness through periodic evaluation.” Based on this position, Trustee Barry proposed to Chairman Rowe that he develop a recommendation for Board action at the January 31, 2006 Board meeting or as soon as possible thereafter that would address their self-evaluation. There are numerous models and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB) is also available for guidance in this area.

Chairman Rowe thanked Mr. Barry and indicated that he recently dealt with this issue on another not-for-profit board. He reminded the Board that a survey was distributed about three years ago when he joined the Board. It would be beneficial to distribute another survey since there are several new members. For another board, he took a corporate self-assessment form and modified it to suit an academic research institution, which could be done for the Board. In order to bring the Board into compliance, he will work to provide members with an updated survey form. He encouraged Board members to provide suggestions if they wished.

Mr. Barry and Dr. Fox confirmed that that would bring the Board into compliance.

(b) Presenter: Mr. Scott Brohinsky, Director, University Relations
Presentation: 125th Anniversary Commemoration

President Austin reported that in anticipation of the 125th Anniversary of the University, a few years ago they commissioned a project documenting the history of UConn, which was lead by Emeritus Professor of History Bruce Stave. He retired about the same time this project was beginning. The document is now in its final stage, and will be available for the anniversary celebration in January. He acknowledged the AAUP, UCPEA, the Alumni Association, and The UConn Foundation, Inc. all of which participated in underwriting this venture along with the University. President Austin asked Mr. Brohinsky to lead a representative committee to
culminate in three to five celebrations along with other rotating exhibits. January will begin a year-long series of activities that will highlight the University’s growth, history, and contributions to the State.

Mr. Brohinsky gave a brief presentation on the University’s 125th Anniversary Commemoration.

Chairman Rowe asked if there was a need to reconcile the fact that the land was donated by a private party to the fact that we consider ourselves as a Land-Grant institution, which would ordinarily mean that the land was given by the Federal or State government.

Mr. Brohinsky responded that he believed that our Land-Grant designation came much later. Yale was the original Land-Grant institution in Connecticut. UConn was established in 1881 as an agricultural school and the institution has changed substantially.

(c) Nomination for Honorary Degree

This December we will hold our third winter Commencement. This year’s speaker and honorary degree recipient is world-renowned oceanographer Dr. Robert Ballard. He is also known for his discovery of the Titanic. He is associated with many institutions, including the University of Rhode Island. A brief biography was presented to the Trustees at their places.

On a motion by Dr. Burrow, seconded Ms. Bailey, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the honorary degree candidate, Dr. Robert Ballard, for the December 2005 Commencement ceremony. A copy of the handout is attached to the file copy of the Board minutes.

4. Academic Affairs Committee Report

(a) Report on Committee activities

Chairman Rowe gave the report of the Academic Affairs Committee on behalf of Dr. Jacobs. The Academic Affairs Committee met earlier today and conducted an extensive discussion on the reorganization proposal. Comments were heard from several members of the public. The Committee also acted on the discontinuation of the three programs that were voted on under the Consent Agenda (Attachments 2 – 4).

(b) Information item:

(1) Center for Globalization and Commerce at UConn Stamford Campus (Attachment 6)

5. Financial Affairs Committee Report

(a) Committee Chairman’s report on Committee activities

Mr. Drotch gave the report on behalf of Vice-Chair Nayden. The Financial Affairs Committee met this morning and reviewed the project updates represented in Attachments 7 through 19, which were recommended to the full Board for approval. The Committee voted to recommend these to the Board. The Committee also discussed the Construction Status Report, which will be forthcoming for each Committee meeting. Mr. Drotch said that it was an excellent summary of the status of various under UCONN 2000 and 21st Century UConn.

Mr. Drotch directed Trustee attention to the UCONN 2000 Book 21.
(b) Items requiring Board discussion and approval:

(1) Approval of Project Budget (2nd Design) for North Hillside Road Completion (Attachment 7)
   On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Mr. Drotch, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the 2nd Design Budget for the North Hillside Road Completion, in the amount of $11,500,000.

(2) Approval of Project Budget (Final) for Roof Repair and Rehabilitation of Monteith Hall (Attachment 8)
   On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Mr. Drotch, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the Final Budget of $250,000 for the Roof Repair and Rehabilitation of Monteith Hall.

(3) Approval of Project Budget (Final) for Partial Replacement of the Willimantic River Water Transmission Line (Attachment 9)
   On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Mr. Drotch, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the Final Budget in the amount of $657,000 to replace a 2,000 foot section of the Willimantic River water transmission line.

(4) Approval of Project Budget (Planning) for UConn Health Center (UCHC) Campus-wide Security Project (Attachment 10)
   On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Mr. Drotch, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the Planning Budget of $1,750,000 for the University of Connecticut Health Center Campus-wide Security Project.

(5) Approval of Project Budget (Planning) for UConn Health Center (UCHC) Cooling Coil Conversion (Attachment 11)
   On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Mr. Drotch, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the Planning Budget of $650,000 for the University of Connecticut Health Center Cooling Coil Conversion Project.

(6) Approval of Project Budget (Planning) for UConn Health Center (UCHC) John Dempsey Hospital Electro Physiology Lab & Catheterization Lab Renovation (Attachment 12)
   On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Mr. Drotch, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the Planning Budget of $3,500,000 for the University of Connecticut Health Center John Dempsey Hospital Electro Physiology (EP) Lab & Catheterization Lab Renovation.

(7) Approval of Project Budget (Planning) for UConn Health Center (UCHC) John Dempsey Hospital 4th Floor Renovation (Attachment 13)
   On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Mr. Drotch, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the Planning Budget of $800,000 for the University of Connecticut Health Center John Dempsey Hospital 4th floor renovation.
(8) Approval of Project Budget (Planning) for UConn Health Center (UCHC) John Dempsey Hospital 2nd Floor – ICU Renovation (Attachment 14)

On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Mr. Drotch, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the Planning Budget of $1,546,000 for the University of Connecticut Health Center John Dempsey Hospital 2nd floor – ICU renovation.

(9) Approval of Project Budget (Planning) for UConn Health Center (UCHC) Administrative Services Building (ASB) Renovation to Medical Services Building (Attachment 15)

On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Mr. Drotch, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the Planning Budget of $13,000,000 for the University of Connecticut Health Center renovation of the Administrative Services Building (ASB), for clinical use as the New Medical Services Building.

(10) Approval of Project Budget (Planning) for UConn Health Center (UCHC) Data Center Relocation to Munson Road (Attachment 16)

On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Ms. Bailey, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the Planning Budget of $4,500,000 for the University of Connecticut Health Center Data Center Relocation to 16 Munson Road.

(11) Approval of Project Budget (Planning) for UConn Health Center (UCHC) Munson Road Reconfiguration – Phase I (Attachment 17)

On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Ms. Bailey, THE BOARD VOTED to approve the Planning Budget of $2,100,000 for Phase I of the University of Connecticut Health Munson Road Reconfiguration.

(12) Storrs Center Municipal Development Plan (Attachment 18)

On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Ms. Bailey, THE BOARD VOTED to endorse the Mansfield Downtown Partnership’s Municipal Development Plan for Storrs Center. Trustee Abromaitis abstained from voting on this item.

(13) Conveyance of Property for Storrs Center Development (Attachment 19)

On a motion by Mr. Ritter, seconded Ms. Bailey, THE BOARD VOTED to approve revisions to its original authorization to sell University real estate located in the vicinity of Storrs Road (Route 195) and Dog Lane to be developed as a planned town center to serve both the campus and area residents. Trustee Abromaitis abstained from voting on this item.

(c) Informational item:

(1) UCONN 2000 Book #21 (Separate cover)
6. **Joint Audit and Compliance Committee Report**

(a) Committee Chairman’s report on Committee activities

Mr. Drotch gave the report of the Joint Audit and Compliance Committee of behalf of Vice-Chair Nayden. Mr. Drotch reported that the Joint Audit and Compliance Committee has not held a meeting since the last Board of Trustees meeting. He called to the Board’s attention the next meeting that is scheduled for December 7, 2005. The agenda will include presentations on three RFP’s for professional services to be discussed, which include 1) information technology audit services; 2) NCAA audit (there are some agreed upon procedures regarding revenues, expenses, and capital improvements that need to be conducted); and 3) construction management (assistance in developing audit plans for construction expenditures for the past two fiscal years and the current fiscal year). These will be presented to the full Board for information.

Chairman Rowe noted that one of the items that was voted upon was partial replacement of the Willimantic River transmission line, which is relevant to the comments he made earlier about the water issues.

7. **Health Center Report**

(a) Report on Health Center activities

Dr. Burrow announced that the University of Connecticut Health Center Board of Directors appointed three new members: Dr. Ann Slaughter, assistant professor and course director for geriatric dentistry at the University of Pennsylvania School of Dental Medicine; Mr. Brian Hehir, Vice-Chairman of Investment Banking at Merrill Lynch; Mr. Sanford Cloud, Jr., Chairman and CEO of the Cloud Company, LLC.

8. **Student Life Committee Report**

(a) Committee Chairwoman’s report on Committee activities

Vice-Chair Bailey reported that the Student Life Committee met last evening. The Committee received guests from Transportation and Parking Services, and Chief Hudd, who addressed questions regarding security, which had been raised.

9. **Institutional Advancement Committee Report – Mr. Treibick**

(a) Committee Chairman’s report on Committee activities

Trustee Barry gave the report of the Institutional Advancement Committee on behalf of Vice-Chair Treibick. At its last meeting the Committee welcomed two new members: Salmun Kazerounian and Michael Bozzuto.

There was a lengthy discussion on the State Matching Gift Program. To date $9.5 million has been earned. When all current pledges are paid, another $8 million more will be due for a total of $17.5 million. The future of the matching fund becomes very difficult to address with the changes that are being made in the program. The match has changed from $2:$1 to $4:$1.

Chairman Rowe asked if earlier pledges would be covered by the $2:$1 match. Trustee Barry responded that effective January 1, 2005, the match changed to $4:$1. Additionally, there are other requirements: 1) there is a limit of no more than $25 million per year and 2) the rainy day fund must be funded by 10% in order for the State Match to occur. It is questionable as to whether this will
ever be accomplished and the future of the Matching Fund as an incentive for donors is more troubling.

A report of was given on the October 21st Annual Meeting of The UConn Foundation. At this meeting, five new members were recognized and Ray and Carole Neag were honored for their generous support.

(b) Items requiring Board discussion and approval:

(1) Facilities Naming Recommendations (Attachment 20)

(a) School of Pharmacy

(1) Joseph A. Morosko Student Lounge
On a motion by Mr. Treibick, seconded by Mr. Shepperd, THE BOARD VOTED to authorize naming the student lounge in the Pharmacy/Biology Building as the Joseph A. Morosko Student Lounge.

(2) James M. Faucette Upper Terrace
On a motion by Mr. Treibick, seconded by Mr. Shepperd, THE BOARD VOTED to authorize naming the upper terrace in the Pharmacy/Biology Building as the James M. Faucette Upper Terrace.

(c) Development Progress Executive Summary (Attachment 21)

Trustee Barry directed attention to this item. He noted that $17 million has been raised in new gifts and pledges and for the corresponding period this year only $5.9 million has been raised. Mr. Martin reported that a year ago this time in the early stages there was a $10 million gift given.

Mr. Treibick added that the question of the Matching Grant Program ought to be revisited by the Board. Under the current Program, we must work hard to get very little money if it is even received. The University is placed in the position of waiting for the State to have enough funding in the rainy day fund in order to consider funding the Program. He feels that we should respect what the Program has become and adjust our negotiating position to reflect that.

Chairman Rowe asked Mr. Brohinsky for his view as this was an issue in the State budget negotiations. There was obviously a discussion on not only the match, but the operating budget of the University and other funds that come from the State to support our activities. It is a matter of balancing these different needs.

Mr. Brohinsky responded that he agreed with Chairman Rowe’s assessment. The way the provision has been changed is that it is not functional. We know the General Assembly changes its opinion from time-to-time. It was only a year ago that we received all of the funds that the State had owed us for three years. If we get a sense at the beginning of the Session from the Governor’s Office, from the bi-partisan leadership of the General Assembly, and the relevant committees that this can no longer be a priority, then we need to take that into account and act accordingly. He suggested that we test the water this year and see what the likelihood is. If we opt out of the Program completely, then it will be very difficult to get it back. If the Program was really to be used as a jump-start for the higher education units, then we have to take that into consideration as well.

President Austin asked for confirmation that the change in Program was in part a strategy to save the Program because it might have actually have been eliminated last year. Mr. Brohinsky
responded that Mr. Martin was more qualified to answer that question. The real problem is the uncertainty of when the funds will be received. The requirement that the rainy day fund be at a certain percentage and set so high is very problematic. We cannot tell a donor when the match would be received; therefore, it is not really functional in its present state.

10. Executive Session

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On a motion by Mr. Treibick, seconded by Ms. Bailey, THE BOARD VOTED to go into Executive Session at 2:27 p.m. to continue the morning discussion of matters pertaining to personnel and 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, Burrow, Dennis-LaVigne, Drotch, Gatling, Kazerounian, Kuchta, Ritter, Rowe, and Shepperd.

Trustees Lobo and Treibick participated by telephone.

University staff present were: President Austin, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Nicholls, Executive Vice President for Health Affairs Deckers, Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Aronson, Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Flaherty-Goldsmith, Dr. Schurin, Special Assistant to the President Callahan, and Chief Audit and Compliance Officer Walker. Assistant Attorney General McCarthy was also present.

11. Faculty Member Appeal

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On a motion by Mr. Treibick, seconded by Ms. Bailey, THE BOARD VOTED to go into Executive Session at 2:45 p.m. to discuss the appeal of Dr. Dina Goldin. 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, Burrow, Dennis-LaVigne, Drotch, Gatling, Kuchta, Ritter, Rowe, and Shepperd.

Trustees Lobo and Treibick participated by telephone.

When the Board voted to go into Executive Session, Trustee Kazerounian recused himself from the discussion and vote, because a family member is a member of the faculty in the same school as Dr. Goldin.

University staff present were: President Austin, Provost and Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs Nicholls, Dr. Schurin, Mr. Edward Marth, Executive Director of the UConn Chapter of the American Association of University Professors, Dr. Amir Faghri, Dean, School of Engineering, Dr. Ian Greenshields, Associate Dean, School of Engineering, Dr. Steven Demurjian, Associate Department Head of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Vice Provost for Academic Administration Singha, Dr. Dina Goldin, and Emeritus Professor Lester Lipsky. Assistant Attorney General McCarthy was also present.

Executive Session ended at 3:58 p.m. and the Board returned to Open Session at 3:59 p.m.
Chairman Rowe reconvened the meeting and stated that the Board discussed the matter in detail and found that there was no evidence to support that the process was flawed. Dr. Schurin read the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Board of Trustees reject the appeal of Dr. Dina Goldin of the Department of Computer Science and Engineering for an additional period for consideration for promotion and tenure; and

That the Board of Trustees approve a terminal one-year appointment of Dr. Dina Goldin as Assistant Professor in the Department of Computer Science and Engineering.

On a motion by Mrs. Gatling, seconded by Mr. Treibick, THE BOARD VOTED to add the recommendation to the agenda.

Chairman Rowe asked the Board to vote on the resolution. He stated that a vote of “yes” to support the resolution was a vote against Dr. Goldin’s request. A vote of “no” was a vote in favor of Dr. Goldin’s request.

Those voting in favor were: Trustees Abromaitis, Bailey, Barry, Dennis-LaVigne, Drotch, Ritter, Rowe, Shepperd, and Treibick. Those voting in opposition were: Trustees Burrow, Gatling, Kuchta, and Lobo. The resolution passed.

11. Adjournment

Chairman Rowe announced that the next meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 31, 2006 at 1:00 p.m. at the University of Connecticut, Rome Commons Ballroom (South Campus Complex), Storrs, Connecticut.

There being no further business appearing, the Board meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Louise M. Bailey
Secretary